



*“ANOTHER BRICK IN THE WALL”
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS*

**International Association for Intercultural
Education (IAIE)**

June 2020



Amsterdam

11-15 November 2019



ISBN: 9789090333755

About Proceedings

This document contains 20 articles submitted from participants of the IAIE conference “Another Brick in the Wall” in Amsterdam, 11-15 November 2019. In total, the Conference content was divided into 8 strands. However, not all strands submitted papers for the Proceedings. Below are represented the following:

Strand 1. Intercultural Competence

Strand 2. Bilingualism and Multilingual Education

Strand 3. Cooperative Learning and other interactive learning approaches

Strand 6: Education relating to migrants and refugees

Strand 7. (Global) Citizenship Education

Strand 8. Miscellaneous

The Proceedings are organized as it follows:

First, all abstracts are displayed per strand. Consequently, the whole article, including abstract, main text and graphs, as well as notes and references, are included. All abstracts and articles can be found in the Content table below.

The Conference Proceedings were prepared by Ivona Hristova and Hana Alhadi.



Introduction by The IAIE President

As President of the International Association for Intercultural Education, I would like to once again thank everybody who helped contribute to these Proceedings. A large amount of work went into this publication. But special thanks go to Hana Alhadi and first and foremost Ivona Hristova.

These Proceedings are the final outcome of the IAIE Conference ‘Another Brick in the Wall?’ that took place in Amsterdam from November 11- November 15, 2019. The conference itself represented a blend of inspiring field trips (e.g. Black Heritage tour in Amsterdam, a VIP visit to the Anne Frank House and a visit to the International Criminal Court), some 40 workshops and more than 150 presentations and panel discussions. Close to 400 educators participated from some 25 countries.

The conference allowed teachers, students and academics to share insights and experiences, and to be exposed to the state-of-the-art research on issues relating to diversity and education.

The Conference was a true collaborative effort between the IAIE and a number of other organizations active in the fields of Intercultural Education, human rights education, education about sexual diversity, democratic education, active citizenship education, global education, bilingual and multilingual education, and related fields. These organizations include the Denise School, the Hellenic Association for Intercultural Education, International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education (IASCE), the Rutu Foundation, Learn to Change: Change to Learn, the Korean Association for Multicultural Education (KAME), the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME), Euroclio, and human-ed. We once again thank our partners and look forward to collaboration once more in our future conferences.

Recent events continue to highlight the importance of the work that everybody in this field is doing. The papers published in these proceeds will certainly provide clues and guidelines as to how we be better prepared for the challenges facing us in the coming years.

Warmest wishes to all,

Barry van Driel

President IAIE

www.iaie.org

Contents

Abstracts. Strand 1: Intercultural Competence	6
Verhaeghe Kaat ^{ab*} and Wastijn Bert ^{ac*} . Strong with Diversity through a narrative competent system	7
Cinzia Zadra ^{a*} and Simona Bartoli Kucher ^b . Preparing students for diversity: using transcultural literature to foster intercultural competence in Higher Education	8
Kovács Ivett Judit, Czachesz Erzsébet; Vámos Ágnes. Individual Needs Or Cultural Differences? – Inquiry Into The Beliefs of Teachers Working In Multicultural Early Years Settings (Case study in Hungarian Context).....	9
Irina Sikorskaya and Natalya Nykyforenko. The inquiry for intercultural learning in higher education in Ukraine	10
Domiziana Turcatti and Kiara Assaraf. Lessons Gained from a Case Study of a Latin American NGO in London: The Role Intercultural Competence Plays in the Delivery of Services to Migrant Communities	11
Abstracts. Strand 2: Bilingualism and Multilingual Education	12
Bora Kim. Obstacles and Ways Forward in the implementation of Intercultural Bilingual Education in Peru	13
Abstracts. Strand 3: Cooperative Learning and other interactive learning approaches	14
Giovanna Malusà. Challenges experienced by teachers in implementing cooperative learning activities after brief in-service training	15
David Duran & Jesús Ribosa. Learning by teaching: How can students learn by teaching their peers	16
Paola Giorgis, Isabella Pescarmona, Federica Setti Who is ‘the Other’? A Cooperative Intercultural Experience	17
Claudia Matini. Cooperative Learning (CL): An inclusive approach to education. Workshop.	18
Giovanna Malusà. Playing as you learn. Facilitating an inclusive climate through the Findhorn games	19
Abstracts. Strand 6: Education relating to migrants and refugees	20
Dr. Virginia Signorini. Power and (dis)empowerment in the Italian refugees’ reception system	21
Maura Sellars PhD, Scott Imig PhD. School Leadership, Reflective Practice and Education for Students with Refugee Backgrounds: A Pathway to Radical Empathy	22
Mafalda Franco Leitão, Albino Cunha, Manuela Malheiro Ferreira. Refugees in Portugal: four case studies of refugee integration in schools in the receiving country”	23
Abstracts. Strand 7: (Global) Citizenship Education	26
Arlette Audiffred. Knowledge to Action K2A Projects in Cherán Michoacán SDG # 11 Sustainable Cities and Communities to promote the intercultural competence of global citizenship	27
Ricardo Vieira, Ana Vieira, Pedro Vieira. Education for citizenship, development and sustainability: a critical look at the transfer of knowledge	28
Abstracts. Strand 8: Miscellaneous	29



Sanja Španja and Ana Kurtović. Assessing the relation between intercultural sensitives and personality traits in high school teachers in the city of Vukovar, Croatia	30
Ee Lin Lee. The (De)Construction of the Other Through International Volunteerism	31
Michael Gómez Dobrott. An analysis of a school experience for the First Nations in Canada: Organization, Structure, Philosophy and Attention to Cultural Diversity	32
Kelly C. Davenport and Lisa S. Hoffstein. The Freire Schools Model	33
Articles. Strand 1: Intercultural Competence	34
Verhaeghe Kaatab* and Wastijn Bertac*. Strong with Diversity through a narrative competent system	35
Cinzia Zadraa* and Simona Bartoli Kucherb. Preparing students for diversity: using transcultural literature to foster intercultural competence in Higher Education	55
Kovács Ivett Judit, Czachesz Erzsébet; Vámos Ágnes. Individual Needs Or Cultural Differences? – Inquiry Into The Beliefs of Teachers Working In Multicultural Early Years Settings (Case study in Hungarian Context).....	78
Irina Sikorskaya and Natalya Nykyforenko. The inquiry for intercultural learning in higher education in Ukraine	99
Domiziana Turcatti and Kiara Assaraf. Lessons Gained from a Case Study of a Latin American NGO in London: The Role Intercultural Competence Plays in the Delivery of Services to Migrant Communities	113
Articles. Strand 2: Bilingualism and Multilingual Education	134
Bora Kim. Obstacles and Ways Forward in the implementation of Intercultural Bilingual Education in Peru	135
Articles. Strand 3: Cooperative Learning and other interactive learning approaches	158
Giovanna Malusà. Challenges experienced by teachers in implementing cooperative learning activities after brief in-service training	159
David Duran & Jesús Ribosa. Learning by teaching: How can students learn by teaching their peers	179
Paola Giorgis, Isabella Pescarmona, Federica Setti Who is ‘the Other’? A Cooperative Intercultural Experience	185
Claudia Matini. Cooperative Learning (CL): An inclusive approach to education. Workshop.	193
Giovanna Malusà. Playing as you learn. Facilitating an inclusive climate through the Findhorn games	203
Articles. Strand 6: Education relating to migrants and refugees	220
Dr. Virginia Signorini. Power and (dis)empowerment in the Italian refugees’ reception system ...	221
Maura Sellars PhD, Scott Imig PhD. School Leadership, Reflective Practice and Education for Students with Refugee Backgrounds: A Pathway to Radical Empathy	234
Mafalda Franco Leitão, Albino Cunha, Manuela Malheiro Ferreira. Refugees in Portugal: four case studies of refugee integration in schools in the receiving country”	248
Articles. Strand 7: (Global) Citizenship Education.....	264
Arlette Audiffred. Knowledge to Action K2A Projects in Cherán Michoacán SDG # 11 Sustainable Cities and Communities to promote the intercultural competence of global citizenship	265



Ricardo Vieira, Ana Vieira, Pedro Vieira. Education for citizenship, development and sustainability: a critical look at the transfer of knowledge	275
Articles. Strand 8: Miscellaneous	292
Sanja Španja and Ana Kurtović. Assessing the relation between intercultural sensitives and personality traits in high school teachers in the city of Vukovar, Croatia	293
Ee Lin Lee. The (De)Construction of the Other Through International Volunteerism	312
Michael Gómez Dobrott. An analysis of a school experience for the First Nations in Canada: Organization, Structure, Philosophy and Attention to Cultural Diversity	328
Kelly C. Davenport and Lisa S. Hoffstein. The Freire Schools Model.....	347



Ricardo Vieira, Ana Vieira, Pedro Vieira. Education for citizenship, development and sustainability: a critical look at the transfer of knowledge

The increasing complexification of contemporary societies, as a result of globalization processes, both invite uniformity and stimulate the defence of fundamentalist identities.

An education for multicultural citizenship is needed to construct individuals with plural identities capable of articulating local belonging with national and global belonging, and understanding their world as well as others, always dynamic and between cultures.

It is also crucial to think education not only as the engine of economic growth but fundamentally as a lever for human development.

Universities and schools in general, if they want to innovate and contribute to social and intercultural development, have to investigate and learn from local cultures before they want to teach them. Therefore, it has to consider the local knowledges and to build bridges between the local cultures and the hegemonic culture of each nation-state. In this sense, school cannot be inculcating a new order of life, economy, technology, culture, etc., out of context in relation to the environment and the community in which it operates.

In opposition, it is a transfer of knowledge that contributes more to rural exodus and massive emigration than to human and social development.

Keywords: development and sustainability; empowerment; Education for (Dis) involvement; socio-educational intervention; transfer of knowledge



Ricardo Vieira, Ana Vieira, Pedro Vieira. Education for citizenship, development and sustainability: a critical look at the transfer of knowledge

The increasing complexification of contemporary societies, as a result of globalization processes, both invite uniformity and stimulate the defense of fundamentalist identities.

An education for multicultural citizenship is needed to construct individuals with plural identities capable of articulating local belonging with national and global belonging, and understanding their world as well as others, always dynamic and between cultures.

It is also crucial to think education not only as the engine of economic growth but fundamentally as a lever for human development.

Universities and schools in general, if they want to innovate and contribute to social and intercultural development, have to investigate and learn from local cultures before they want to teach them. Therefore, it has to consider the local knowledges and to build bridges between the local cultures and the hegemonic culture of each nation-state. In this sense, school cannot be inculcating a new order of life, economy, technology, culture, etc., out of context in relation to the environment and the community in which it operates.

In opposition, it is a transfer of knowledge that contributes more to rural exodus and massive emigration than to human and social development.

Keywords: development and sustainability; empowerment; Education for (Dis) involvement; socio-educational intervention; transfer of knowledge

Education: models for change

The late twentieth century was lavish in producing models of change and socio-educational intervention. Despite the announcement of the need for an education for human development that would go beyond growth and lead to the empowerment of learners, as the well-known report by Jacques Delors (Delors et al, 1996), which advocated education for 21st century based on four pillars: learning to know; learning to do; Learning to live together and with others; learning to be.

The almost 20 years we have already spent within the new century and the new millennium do not seem to have gone far beyond the speech and practice of education for economic purposes. It is urgent to change this focus and develop education for active citizenship and human development through an intercultural education.

Let us first look at some of the paradigms that marked the end of the twentieth century.

In the 1960s, the processes of change were based on an approach that became known as technological. The models already tried in industry and agriculture were transported to education (Huberman, 1983, 70). In an attempt to move from theory to practice, an intention more or less common to all models that point to educational changes, the introduction of school changes generally went through three phases: designing a project and planning its application; investigating ways to develop, evaluating and experimenting with it; disseminating and implementing it. Thus, social change and educational innovation with technological change were, in some way, identified.

In French-speaking culture, this model became known as the RDD paradigm (Recherche, Développement et Diffusion), in Spanish by IDD (Investigación, Desarrollo Y Difusión) and in English by RDD (Research, Development, and Dissemination). It presumed to be able to think about social and educational change for a more or less vast system, in an abstract way and applicable to all social, school institutions, in which the actors had to understand the new message and readjust their practices to the proposed external change. In education systems, in particular, teachers were conceived as passive and obedient agents and "it is thought that learning can be reduced to a set of tasks; these tasks can be identified as learning objectives and measured through "Objective" evidence. Teaching focuses on these concrete objectives, making use of techniques and materials that allow the best possible accomplishment of these tasks "(House, 1988, 10).

The educator was considered to be at the base of the educational hierarchy, as a mere executor and passive consumer of ideas produced by those who investigated. It was and still is sometimes. The reforms of the Portuguese educational systems, for example, were being presented to teachers as a legal building to be implemented, because the Law so ordered.

However, in the 1970s, it is realized that an innovation cannot succeed without dialogue, enlightened and interested involvement of all educational partners, and the person for whom education and/or intervention is addressed is taken into account. (Vieira, 2009). Little by little, the intention to build a new paradigm for building transformations and innovations is being

developed. Against the mechanistic and technological paradigm of which the RDD is perhaps the best-known example, a paradigm more linked to the confrontation and interaction of all the subjects involved in the social and educational processes emerges, from the protagonists linked to the conception of new ideas to those close to the implementation and those present on the ground (Vieira, 1999). There is talk, then, of a new approach usually called politics (House, 1988) or diplomatic.

It is considered that change is always the object of tensions, cultural shocks, and conflicts between the subjects who submit to it, as there is no unanimity of representations about the ideal to be pursued. It is believed, therefore, that cooperation should be negotiated between the protagonists of the educational process since it is likely to have clashes of ideas between intentions and practices and on the other hand in the way in which different subjects reinterpret them. In any case, it is believed that the debate will provide the discovery of alternatives and innovations appropriate to the local context. In school systems, the problem arises, precisely when there is difficulty in reaching consensus in this diplomatic interaction and negotiation, not only between parents and teachers, for example, but also between parents and teachers themselves, who sometimes have different positions about what it must be abandoned in terms of educational practices and what must be acquired or implemented (Silva and Vieira, 1996). And as Idália de Sá-Chaves says,

this process of trying to reach consensus, commitments, understandings, and participation is not easy. The "cultural gap" existing between the different participants proved to be extremely difficult to bridge. In the United States, Walcott (1977) shows through an anthroposocial analysis the cultural divergences between each of the elements of the group, each one having its representation of the world, its interpretation of the facts, its own culture. The attempt to reconcile the differences was often understood as an attempt to "acculturate" teachers, which explains a large number of resistance to the proposals. It is a matter of getting to grips with values, practices and specific knowledge, made definitive and almost immutable values. However, it was not only with individual resistance that the new paradigm conflicted. (Sá-Chaves, 1989, 24-25).

To implement a change conceived outside an institution or a social system, without communicating and discussing it with the subjects that inhabit them, is to run the risk of seeing and hearing your subjects saying "they don't know what is happening on the ground, they are in the offices ...".

By the 1980s, it became more common to speak of a third paradigm called Anthropological or Ecological. The innovation process is conceived as always the result of an interaction between cultures. This approach is alerted to take into account not only the cultural world of the social workers but also of all stakeholders in the social and educational process of each group, institution or community. Huberman (1983) considers as a fundamental characteristic of this model the fact that the change must be desired by the recipient himself, who must contribute to its construction. It is considered necessary, by way of example, to understand and apprehend each educational system, school or non-school, as a particularly complex totality. We move towards the system's vision, not so much with a fixed structure that we have to investigate to know how to implement it, but more as a process in constant structuring, de-structuring, restructuring.

It is not, however, an absolutely new view on the processes of change. Anthropology has always considered social systems as carriers of culture. It is a model that has been taken up by the educational sciences and the social sciences, and, indirectly, conceived and manipulated by the decision-making bodies of educational changes. Even so, it remains an unfamiliar model or, at least, much less known than the technological and political models.

Idália Sá-Chaves, who produced interesting work in Portugal on teachers and axes of change, added that

[...] the anthropological approach, having a "shattered" view of society, considering that there is a greater consensus between each group than between groups, [...] leads to a concept of self-management in each, according to their particular determinants and (1989, 26).

We would say that the anthropological perspective is aware not so much of a "shattered" society, but, essentially, the existence of a heterogeneity of cultures in each society, which implies a global and comprehensive approach to the phenomena, attitudes, and representations of the different individuals, all of them also with a very personal culture. If you want to think about changes to be introduced in school institutions, in groups or communities, it implies, first, doing fieldwork and direct and participant observation to get to know the other with whom to discuss and project new futures (Vieira, A. and Vieira, R., 2019). It implies gaining conscience that the human and social sciences and educational sciences, which we include in the first, cannot establish general and universal laws, because the phenomena are historically and culturally conditioned (Vieira, 1999). It involves thinking about carrying out case studies, in

specific contexts (Caria, 2003), and not just in an abstract, model and monocultural system, since, in fact, it is always diversified and very multicultural (Vieira, 2009).

Anthropological work on issues of social change dates back a long time. House (1988, 13) mentions two aspects: that of cultural materialism and that of multiculturalism. In the first, it integrates the relativistic current for which cultural change has to do with “a tradition or history of culture” and the evolutionist who, as we know, conceived change through an unilinear model of development.

The evolutionist model dates back to the 19th century and was based on a conception of development and universal evolution. However, criticisms of evolutionism forged the model of multilinear evolutionism (Shalins and Service, 1960; White, 1969) that supposes an ecological view (ecology - cultural) of social systems and that “adapting to the environment intensifies cultural change” (House, idem, 14).

In the second aspect - multiculturalism - referred by House, it is considered that a society does not correspond to a single culture, but rather to a plurality and that “to account for a change, it is necessary to recognize the differences between these subcultures, in which individuals learn to orient themselves ”.

In summary, and despite the very different classifications attributed to the models of implementation of changes and innovations, there is more or less consensus that the technological, modeled on the industry, as mentioned, focuses innovation on its characteristics and on the methodology (technology) of how to introduce it, neglecting the understanding of the target audience. There is a structured and detailed planning and a concern to reduce heterogeneities. It is accepted that the diplomatic or political, attends a lot to the context and the relations between hierarchically superiors and inferiors and that, therefore, the planning is flexible and negotiable. The project is here attentive to the conflicts and interests of the subjects involved. Finally, the anthropological, cultural or even ecological approach, not only emphasizes the context and the structuring of work in the system, but also the way in which individuals conceive and interpret innovation and, therefore, meanings and values. The design of the project is constructed throughout the work; innovation takes into account the cultural interests and needs of the actors involved and resistance phenomena are analyzed and valued (Cortêsão, 1990).

It is within this anthropological perspective that, in part, a new way of doing research has emerged, action research, closely associated with Social Work, and in particular with Social

Education (Vieira, A. and Vieira, R., 2019). The processes are naturalistic, insofar as they approach the real lived, and distance themselves from the quantitative methods that ratify the positivism that is also conveyed by the technological paradigm, seeking to understand the set of factors in interaction in a given situation, as well as the different representations that they have the different individuals with whom the Social Worker, be it a Social Educator, a Social Assistant, an Animator, or a teacher, will work.

Citizenship education and local / global articulation: diagnose, plan, execute and evaluate with the entire educational community

The increasing complexification of contemporary societies, as a result of globalization processes both invite uniformity and stimulate the defense of fundamentalist identities, the cultural frontiers, as Barth (1969) explained in *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. “It is increasingly clear that the replacement of the static approach by the interactionist one, concerning ethnicity, brings about a similar change in the study of culture, affirming Barth that the book *Ethnic groups and boundaries* implies a postmodern notion of culture (Vermeulen and Govers, 2004, 11).

And it becomes more and more difficult to manage diversity in this complex interactionist game because

“It also creates, in those who live it or try to manage it, a range of contradictory tensions, in a context of complete change. [...] The individual feels confused, given the complexity of the modern world, which changes the references to which he was accustomed. [...] Contemporary Man is in danger of facing the developments that operate beyond the borders of his immediate belonging group as threats and, paradoxically, being tempted, by an illusory feeling of security, to close in on himself, with possible consequences in the rejection of the other ”(Delors, J. et al, 1996, 41).

This is why an education for multicultural (Souta, 1997), glocal (Robertson, 1992) citizenship is needed to construct subjects with plural identities (Lahire, 2002) capable of articulating local belonging with national and global belonging, and understanding their world as well as others, always dynamic and between cultures (Vieira, 2009; 2014).

Contemporary educational processes must, in addition to the dimensions of technical training and a more cognitive nature, also reinforce reflexivity on the complexity of identity processes (Vieira, 2014) and on the need to learn to affirm not only the difference that separates us from others but, above all, the similarity that can unite us for the construction of intercultural bridges (Vieira, R. and Vieira A. 2017) and for the construction of societies that are more hospitable and better able to put pedagogies of how to live together (Jares, 2007). It is up to education to

“A special responsibility in building a more supportive world, and the Commission thinks that education policies must make that responsibility very clear. It is, in some way, a new humanism that education must help to be born with an essential ethical component, and a wide space dedicated to knowledge and respect, of cultures and spiritual values of different civilizations, to counterbalance a globalization in which only economic or technical aspects are observed. The feeling of sharing common values and destiny is, in the final analysis, the foundation of any international cooperation project” (Delors, J. et al, 1996, 43-44).

It is also up to the school, more than educating and preparing for the exclusive activity in an insularized local community, to teach learning to learn and to encourage emancipation and autonomy. In the words of Guilherme de Oliveira Martins,

“To talk about Education as a citizenship priority is not to repeat a commonplace but to appeal to learning as a factor of emancipation, freedom, and responsibility. Educating, in the sense of the Greek *paideia* and the Latin *humanistas*, is, therefore, to correspond to the changes and challenges of the *society of culture*, in which it is important to laboriously build personalities and projects and awaken consciences for autonomy and for the capacity to respond, by knowledge, the call of others to be led to understand the world concerning those who challenge us” (Martins, 2009, 49).

In this line of local / national / global intercultural dialogue, and in search of a socio-educational intervention, Glória Perez Serrano's book (2008) is structured around four elements to elaborate a project (diagnosis, planning, application-execution, evaluation). Regarding social diagnosis and finding needs, the author criticizes the imposing social intervention and reiterates the need for social pedagogy and intercultural mediation, to obtain the real needs of the other (Vieira, A. and Vieira, R., 2016):

The project must be based on a real need for which a solution is to be found and, also, that this can be solved with the collaboration of all. It is convenient to study the needs and resources that we have, both personal and material, to meet the needs realistically. We understand by necessity a discrepancy between the existing situation and the desired situation, that is, the distance between what is and what should be [...]. At this moment, the project's creator is looking for a way to ensure that the Social Project does not start from the top (project planners, the Administration), but that it gives way to the situation itself as a framework for disseminating the conditions and the guiding purposes of the Social Action. In other words, it seeks to favor that projects are not merely imposing, allowing them to appear spontaneously (Perez Serrano, 2008, 31).

Isabel Guerra (2002), on the other hand, seeking to characterize the foundations and processes of a sociology of action and planning in social sciences shows how the new “social problems” lead to a search for the academy to help in its intervention/resolution, a perspective which remains less developed than scientific production on

the theoretical frameworks - on social exclusion and marginality, changes in the types and functions of families, youth and their expectations, etc. - evolve faster than the methods of analysis and intervention, which have stabilized around traditional methodologies, mainly document analysis, observation, questionnaire, and interviews. We desperately lack methods to support research and intervention in new professional fields (Guerra, 2002, 51).

This author sees action-research as a way to articulate theory and action, research and intervention “which associates with the act of knowing the intention to bring about social change” (idem, 51). He considers that there is nothing very new in action-research, concerning the paradigms of the social and human sciences, “since in most cases it uses traditional methodological procedures, but it is above all its attitude towards knowledge and action that puts in such a problematic and critical dimension ”(idem, 53). Isabel Guerra is well aware, throughout this work, about the role of the researcher who “is not a mere observer, but a supporter of the persons involved in the action” (idem, 54).

Also for Isabel Guerra “a good diagnosis guarantees the adequacy of responses to local needs and is fundamental to guarantee the effectiveness of any intervention project” (idem, 131) since any intervention needs to have a good information base, collected from diversified sources that the author correctly refers to as being from sources exogenous to the place, but also from “endogenous information of a quantitative and/or qualitative character” (ibidem). Thus, it calls for ethnographic work and direct or participant observation for the construction of the diagnosis,

which is not a simple “monograph” but which “harmoniously integrates the quantitative elements collected and the qualitative elements that come, whether from the field experience, either from the target population itself (*ibidem*).

For this author, the diagnosis, although it can be presented in different ways, is structured in four phases of the project:

The first phase of the construction of the project is the emergence of a collective will for change and the finding of resources (human, material, symbolic, etc.) capable of supplying sufficient energy to set up the project. The second phase, on which the entire project is based, is the situation analysis and the diagnosis. The third phase can then be considered as the design of the action plan and, finally, the fourth phase refers to the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project.

Obviously, in real life, these phases interpenetrate and, for example, the diagnosis is often already an intervention, and the evaluation is a permanent process that accompanies the execution itself. (Guerra, 2002, 127).

It is quite clear here the idea that the diagnosis is neither neutral nor objective as it implies the entry of the researcher into the field, which, in this sense, when questioning the world of those who live “the social problems” to intervene is no longer just to investigate, to produce knowledge about others as well as to intervene (Vieira, 2003; Caria, 2003). However, it is not entirely clear whether the author refers to an investigation of the context and people or, as we have argued, an investigation of the people in the context to intervene (Vieira, A., 2016; Vieira, A., and Vieira, R., 2016; Vieira, A. and Vieira, R., 2019), although, when initially referring to action-research techniques, affirm that “knowledge is produced in confrontation with the trying to transform it, and social knowledge is produced collectively by social actors deconstructing the role of “specialist” normally assigned to the social scientist” (Guerra, 2002, 75).

Education for (reducing involvement) (dis) involvement: a mediating and empowering socio-educational intervention

The second half of the twentieth century was a time of economic growth unprecedented in human history, a consequence of scientific development and productivity education. As Caride, Freitas and Vargas (2007, 9) remind us,

“At the United Nations General Assembly, held in 1996, the Declaration on the Right to Development insisted on defining development as “a global, economic, social, cultural and political process that tends towards the constant improvement of the well-being of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in their own development and the fair distribution of the benefits derived therefrom ”.

These goals are denied by the capitalist model, whose neoliberal production and consumption systems, besides accelerating the destructive appropriation of the planet, add risks of political instability, marginalization and social segregation.”

Indeed, the development model based solely on economic growth has been very uneven and “the rates of progression are very different according to the countries and regions of the world” (Delors, 1996, 61).

That is why it is crucial that we think of education today not only as the engine of economic growth but fundamentally as a lever for human development. "Some countries, unable to participate in the international technological competition, will be ready to constitute pockets of misery, despair, and violence impossible to reabsorb through assistance and humanitarian actions" (idem, 65).

That is why UNDP (United Nations Development Program) proposed in its first Human Development Report in 1990, that human well-being should be considered as the purpose of development and development indicators should also include data on health, food and nutrition, education and the environment, equality between social and gender groups, and level of democratic participation.

Also the concept of,

““Sustainability ”complements that of human development, by emphasizing the long-term viability of the development process, the improvement of the conditions of existence for future generations, as well as respect for the natural means on which life depends in the world" (Delors, 1996, 71).

For this reason, Caride, Freitas, and Vargas (2007, 10), argue that “education and development are processes and realities that are intrinsically linked, to the point that Education without Development and Development without Education cannot be conceived”.

That is why it is essential to educate also for sustainability. For development and sustainability.

Moreover, without endogenous development, made from the needs listed with the populations and without sustainability and respect for different cultures, there is no true development. On the contrary, there is involvement, continuous dependence on foreign aid, as opposed to autonomy and social balance. Social segregation is another consequence when society doesn't include different cultures within themselves, that would be the real social inclusion.

Still in the words of the report coordinated by Jacques Delors (1996, 74-75), “education is not only used to provide qualified people to the world of economics: it is not intended for human beings as an economic player but as the ultimate end of development”. Education serves to empower, help understand ourselves and others, and to mediate more local and global knowledge and values.

Somehow, in the socio-educational intervention modalities mentioned in the previous points, a model of social intervention was essentially underlined, often based on an idea of social pathology, starting from diagnosed “social problems”, which persists, even today, in seeing the difference as a disability and, therefore, to pathologize the socio-cultural heterogeneity (Vieira A., 2016; Vieira A. and Vieira R., 2016) that we call biomedical (Neri, 2004).

However, little by little, another model of intervention in social work emerges, more hermeneutic (Vieira et al., 2018) that prioritizes the point of view of the situation of the person being intervened from which the social worker makes an intervention socio-educational as we will explain below.

The biomedical paradigm does not only begin from a diagnosis so often made only from the outside, from the perspective of the specialist, who lists needs without the necessary active listening of those involved (Vieira, A. and Vieira, R., 2016 and Vieira, R. and Vieira, A., 2106), as well as, sometimes, in some projects, the last stage is called, using medical language, “end of treatment”: “the method was divided into several phases or stages - study (or research) of the situation, social diagnosis, treatment, evaluation and end of treatment ”(Robertis, 2011, 65). Like the doctor who studied biology, physiology and pathology, who knows the body, its “normality” and its diseases from which it studied causes, symptoms, manifestations, and means of treatment, the classic social interventor has also been working on the notion of norm and deviation, from which, once the diagnosis is made, can prescribe an intervention with a view to solving social ills.

In this model, and like the doctor, for the social worker, it is a matter of “treating” a “social disease”. It is the one who is able to take answers or solutions, to take “remedies” to those who suffer from a lack or from social dysfunction. The “treatment” is “prescribed” by the person who can define the social “diagnosis”, the evil from which the other suffers. The social service then tries to establish types of diagnosis and systematize the responses (treatments) that are capable of resolving each type of social “disease” (Robertis, 2007, 66).

Social intervention, whether more preventive and transformative or, on the contrary, more resolute, can, and should, whenever possible, have a practice fueled by mediation, that is, by communication, negotiation and not by the imposition of a single model and philosophy of life. In this sense, we refer to mediation as an area and a set of competences that span several professions, such as a hermeneutic philosophy, interpersonal and intercultural communication, as a systematic translation of the parties' interests in interaction and by the will of those involved. As highlighted by Torremorell (2008, 85), in

[...] An attempt to work with the other and not against the other, looking for a peaceful way to face conflicts in an environment of growth, acceptance, learning and mutual respect. [...] But, from a broader conception, we consider that “the culture of mediation configures ternary communicational spaces in which, with the contribution of the mediating person, subject agents generate shared symbolic horizons.

In mediating between different cultural values, the social worker/educator emerges as a mediator between social groups and the most diverse public and private institutions, relying on a multitopic hermeneutics [diatopic in the words of BS Santos, 1997] with a view to the realization of rights and interests of the groups and subjects concerned in the interaction. The purpose of the mediation process is to seek the autonomy of these groups and people [*empowerment*]. It is a socio-educational and mediating intervention. This

Exists from the first contact: the look, the welcoming, the way of presenting, the quality of the listening and the questions asked already change anything, change the image that the person has of himself and his surroundings and introduce new data in the present situation. Social intervention is implemented immediately without waiting for the preliminary data collection steps and without the social worker having time to get to know people and situations in depth. [...].

The position of the social worker is no longer that of the person who knows, who will bring the medicine, who will heal. He became the one who will discover an unknown situation, who will examine this reality with the interested parties, who will ask them to find the most suitable situations and who - throughout this process - will introduce changes and he will find himself modified itself thanks to an exchange process (Robertis, 2011, 67).

On the other hand, as already mentioned, the model of socio-educational intervention does not start from what is considered pathological, but, rather, from the existing positive and dynamic elements, whether in an intervention with individuals, with families or with groups. Intercultural mediation, already mentioned, appears as a paradigm distinct from the resolution and essentially based on communication and relationship between people and groups. In this new social work paradigm, “there is a conception of the role of the social worker as an “ agent of change ” (personal or individual changes, family changes or social changes). The goal of change replaces the curative, preventive and promotional goals of the medical model” (idem, 68).

University Extension and “Transfer Of Knowledge”: A Critical Look

As an example of the dubious investment of some universities for development, we recall that it is common to hear that the functions of universities are like a tripod based on teaching, research and extension.

In fact, none of these dimensions can work in isolation. Let us think for a moment about the “extension” conveyed by ideological and political speeches eager to show the applicability of university knowledge as if it were a system of communicating vessels. We are talking about a full head that pours knowledge to empty minds, to remind Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592) or Paulo Freire (1921-1997).

The pride of some polytechnic and university deans emerges, who, probably unaware of the differences between knowledge and the process of knowing, are proudly discursive of their valences and knowledge transfer offices. They firmly believe that knowledge is produced, stored, and then simply sold, delivered to communities and society to update, transform, and modernize.

As Dewey (1933) said, knowledge is external but the act of knowing, this, is internal and implies a work of appropriation, of self-construction on a cultural background of knowledge and meaning. This implies a bilateral work of intercultural mediation between the educational

institution and the subjects, groups or communities. This implies attachment and not a simple extension assuming a reception with a sense for the target audience. The idea of knowledge transfer as a passage from an object from place A to place B is simplistic and makes no sense for human (dis) involvement.

This subject is very present in the entire work of Paulo Freire in the boldness of building pedagogies of autonomy. In his 1969 book [Extension or communication], Paulo Freire had already proposed the term of communication as marking a biunivocal, interactive and mediating dimension, necessary for development, unlike the extension that refers to monist, mechanistic, unidirectional and imposing relationships. Asymmetric relations of superiority of knowledge self-affirmed by those who deliver and of cultural inferiority postures of those who receive, a heteroconstructed inferiority by the cultural invaders equipped with the neutrality and objectivism of neopositivism incorporated in the magic coaching formulas to change the world with which some technocrats, engineers, managers, and politicians invade the specificity of the epistemology of the social sciences, perhaps without realizing it.

Universities need to involve all these cultures to operate social change and social innovation, and not only transfer knowledge like an inanimate object.

People and communities need to understand and appropriate the knowledge for universities to their own local knowledge.

In conclusion, an education for (dis) involvement is crucial.

Given the classic model of social intervention that starts from the diagnosis to solve social problems, approaching the work of the doctor, which is why it is so often classified as a biomedical paradigm, an alternative model emerges today, more concerned with citizenship, with contextualized change and transformation. This new model, interested in the education and autonomy of the persons, groups and communities involved, here called socio-educational intervention, is based, fundamentally on social pedagogy and intercultural mediation. This model implies thinking about education for (dis) involvement, not for involvement.

The diagnosis is replaced here by an analysis of the situation, requested by the individuals and/or groups to intervene, or by someone else, a self and hetero evaluation that is made from the first contacts between the interveners and those intervened in a very informal and involved way. The social worker and all the social interventors that are part of the paradigms of socio-educational social intervention, emphasize their action with and for others, in caring for others

and with others. This care, this help, can never be imposed and will always need the will and action of the users for their success and of the interventor.

It is urgent not only to change the practices of the relationship between universities and their surroundings, but also the speeches themselves, starting with the name of the things that mirrors the dominant philosophy in the materialization of the referred university tripod, increasingly formulated in the 21st century, of innovation [which they call social innovation, sometimes confusing it with technological innovation].

Therefore, the dialogue between universities, local communities and knowledge is essential to have a real development that is always local and global, sustainable and human, and producer of social inclusion. We need to learn how to live together.

References

- Barth, F. (ed.) 1969. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of culture difference*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Caria, T. (Org.). 2003. *Metodologias Etnográficas em Ciências Sociais*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- Caride, J., Freitas O. and Vargas, G. 2007. *Educação e Desenvolvimento Comunitário Local*, Porto: Profedições
- Delors, J. et al 1996. *Educação um tesouro a descobrir*, Porto: Edições ASA.
- Dewey, J. 1933. *How we Think*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company.
- Freire, P. 1983. *Extensão ou Comunicação?* RJ: Editora Paz e Terra. (obra original publicada em 1969).
- Guerra, I. 2006. *Fundamentos e Processos de uma Sociologia da Ação*. Cascais: Princípa.
- House, E. 1988. “Três perspectivas de la innovación educativa: tecnológica, política y cultural”, *Revista de Educación*, nº 286.
- Huberman, M. 1983. *Comment S' Opèrent les Changements en Éducation: Contribution à L' Etude de L' Innovation*, Lausanne: Unesco.
- Lahire, B. 2002. *O Homem Plural: os determinantes da ação*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes.

- Martins, G. 2009. “A educação como factor de cidadania”, in Medeiros, E. (coord.). *Educação Cultura(s) e Cidadania*, Porto: Ed. Afrontamento.
- Neri, A. et al. (Orgs.) 2004. “Biomedicalização da Velhice na pesquisa, no atendimento os idosos e na vida social” In: Diogo, M.; Neri, A. e Cachioni, M. *Saúde e Qualidade de Vida na Velhice*, Campinas, SP: Editora Alinea, 11-37.
- Perez Serrano, 2008. G. *Elaboração de Projetos Sociais*. Porto: Porto Editora.
- Robertis, C. 2011. *Metodologia da Intervenção em Trabalho Social*, Porto: Porto Editora.
- Robertson R. 1992. *Globalisation. Social theory and global culture*. Londres, Sage.
- Sá-Chaves, I. 1989. *Professores, Eixos de Mudança, o Pensamento Pedagógico na Pós-Modernidade*, Aveiro: Editora Estante.
- Santos, B. S. 1997. Por uma concepção multicultural de direitos humanos. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 48, 11-32,.
- Shalins, M. and Service, E. (Eds.) 1960. *Evolution and Culture*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Silva, P. and Vieira, R. 1996. “A Dialogue Between Cultures: A Report of School-Family Relationships in Pinhal do Rei Elementary School” In: Davies e V. Johnson (Eds.) *Crossing Boundaries - Multi-National Action Research on Family-School Collaboration*, Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning, Report nº 33, Janeiro.
- Souta, L. 1997. *Multiculturalidade e Educação*, Porto: Profedições.
- Torremorell, M. 2008. *Cultura de Mediação e Mudança social*, Porto: Porto Editora.
- Vermeulen, H. and Govers, C. 1994. *The Anthropology of Ethnicity beyond “Etnic Groups and Boundaries*, Amsterdam: Spinhuis.
- Vieira, A. e Vieira R. 2019. “Desocultando a Caixa Negra da Escola: Etnografia, Investigação-Ação e Pedagogia Social na Escola”, *Libro de comunicaciones completas y Conclusiones del Congreso Internacional SIPS: “Pedagogía social, investigación y familias”*, XXXI Seminario Interuniversitario de Pedagogía Social, Palma de Maiorca: Grup d’Investigació i Formació Educativa i Social, Universitat de les Illes Balears, 311- 328.
- Vieira, A. e Vieira, R. 2016. *Pedagogia Social, Mediação Intercultural e (Trans)formações*,

Porto: Profedições.

Vieira, A. 2016. *Educação Social e Mediação Sociocultural*, Porto: Profedições.

Vieira, R. and Araújo, N. 2018. “Políticas Municipais para a Inclusão Social. Da Mediação Intercultural à Mediação Comunitária: Mesa Redonda / Focus Group com as Câmaras da Batalha, Leiria, Marinha Grande e Pombal” In: VIEIRA, R. et al., (orgs.). *Da mediação Intercultural à Mediação Comunitária: estar dentro e estar fora para mediar e intervir*. Porto: Afrontamento, 126-176.

Vieira, R. 2014. “Life Stories, Cultural Métissage and Personal Identities” in SAGE Open, Jan 2014, 4(1), DOI: 10.1177/2158244013517241. Online ISSN: 2158-2440. pp. 1-13. The online version of this article can be found at: <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/4/1/2158244013517241>.

Vieira, R. e Vieira, A. 2016. “Mediações Socioculturais: Conceitos e Contextos” In: Vieira et al. (Orgs.): *Pedagogias de Mediação Intercultural e Intervenção Social*, Porto: Edições Afrontamento, 27-56.

Vieira, R. 2011. *Educação e Diversidade Cultural: notas de antropologia da educação*. Porto: Afrontamento.

Vieira, R. 1999. *Histórias de Vida e Identidades*, Porto: Afrontamento.

Vieira, R. 2009. *Identidades Pessoais*, Lisboa: Ed. Colibri.

Vieira, R. 2003. “Vidas Revividas: Etnografia, Biografias e a descoberta de novos sentidos”, In Caria, T. (Org.). *Metodologias Etnográficas em Ciências Sociais*. Porto: Afrontamento, 77-96.

White, L. 1969. *Technologie Médiévale et Transformations Sociales*, Paris: Mouton.