



© 2024 Zhizhko, Huerta-Vazques & Beltran. This article is distributed under the terms of CC Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International as described at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>

DOI: 10.31499/2306-5532.1.2024.309764

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION: STATE OF KNOWLEDGE AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES FOR ITS STUDY IN MEXICO

Elena Zhizhko

*PhD and Doctor in Science hab., Full professor
Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico,
ORCID: 0000-0001-9680-8247; e-mail: eanatoli@yahoo.com*

Mónica-Adriana Huerta-Vázquez

*EDD Student, Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico,
ORCID: 0000-0003-1713-7452; e-mail: huerta.monica@uabc.edu.mx*

Gali-Aleksandra Beltrán

*EDD, Full prof. of the Universidad Tecnológica de Durango, Durango, México,
ORCID: 0000-0001-7186-332X; e-mail: gali.beltran@utd.edu.mx*

This article presents the results of a historical-pedagogical investigation, which objective was to present the state of knowledge and analyze the theoretical approaches for the study of Mexican intercultural education. The study was carried out using the documentary-bibliographic research method. The authors found that regarding the state of knowledge about the problems of intercultural education at international and national levels, it can be stated that in the eighties of the 20th century, social changes at a global level induced the phenomena of multi and pluriculturalism, also requiring the development of teaching methodology based on the precepts of interculturalism; intra and intercultural dialogue; transdisciplinarity and respect for difference-similarity. Several researchers agree that it is necessary to build intercultural didactics from the reinterpretation of the curriculum using the critical perspective. Likewise, the analysis of theoretical approaches for the study of intercultural education leads to defining intercultural didactics as an operational didactic model that pursues intercultural education and teaching of the language/s. On the other hand, research on Mexican intercultural education must provide for the analysis of educational programs that involve, on the one hand, indigenous students and, on the other, migrant students returning from the United States.

Key words: Mexican intercultural education; state of knowledge; theoretical approaches; intercultural didactics.



У статті надані результати історико-педагогічного дослідження, метою якого було представити стан дослідженості проблеми міжкультурної освіти та проаналізувати теоретичні підходи до її вивчення у мексиканському освітньому просторі. Дослідження проведено за допомогою документально-бібліографічного методу. Автори виявили, що стосовно стану дослідженості проблеми міжкультурної освіти на міжнародному та національному рівнях у вісімдесятих роках ХХ століття соціальні зміни на глобальному рівні спричинили явища мульти- та плюрикультурності, вимагаючи розробки нових методів викладання, заснованих на принципах інтеркультуралізму; внутрішньо- та міжкультурному діалозі; трансдисциплінарності і поваги до відмінності-подібності. Деякі дослідники погоджуються, що необхідно будувати міжкультурну дидактику на основі переосмислення навчального курикулуму з використанням критичної перспективи. З іншого боку, аналіз теоретичних підходів до вивчення міжкультурної освіти дозволив авторам визначити міжкультурну дидактику як оперативну дидактичну модель, спрямовану на забезпечення розвитку міжкультурних навичок в учнів; однією з її основних стратегій є навчання мовам (як рідній, так й іноземним, або мовам етнічних груп). Авторами встановлено, що дослідження мексиканської міжкультурної освіти має передбачати аналіз курикулярних проєктів, а також вивчення соціально-економічних, культурних, психологічних особливостей, з одного боку, учнів, які належать до корінного населення Мексики, а з іншого боку, учнів-мігрантів, сім'ї яких повертаються зі Сполучених Штатів Америки.

Ключові слова: мексиканська міжкультурна освіта; стан дослідженості проблеми міжкультурної освіти; теоретичні підходи; міжкультурна дидактика.

Introduction. Social, political, cultural and linguistic changes cause the transformation of societies, therefore, the approach to intercultural education is one of the great challenges that pedagogy faces at a global level to achieve human coexistence in peace. In this sense, democratic expansion is central, in addition to political reforms and educational programs to sustain the new migration context. In particular, in Mexico, it is “an urgent call for attention” (Apodaca, *et al*, 2004, p. 52).

The debate on the intercultural education’s topic opens in relation to ideologies, concepts, epistemologies that make it an interdisciplinary interest, with various political-pedagogical, conceptual, and methodological proposals. The emergence of intercultural didactics within the Mexican educational system contributes to the full inclusion of indigenous and migrant families’ children returning from the United States.

The problems related to the intercultural didactic approach, studied internationally Aguado, 2003; Casillas and Santini, 2006; Delgado and Mariscal, 2007; Favaro and Luatti, 2004; Fiorucci, 2008; Giglia, 2003; Mato, 2009; Moser, 1998; Nanni, 2007; Perotti, 1994; Sánchez, 2012; Santerini, 2009; Touraine, 1981; Walsh, 2003; among others. Likewise, Mexican scientists dedicated their works to its: Ávila and Cortés,



2008; Berrenechea, 2014; Díaz-Barriga, 2010; Dietz, 2012, 2013, 2016, 2017, 2018; Fábregas, 2009; Mateos, 2000; Moctezuma, 2012, 2018; Martínez and Pérez, 2012; Salas and Salas, 2013; Zhizhko, 2010, 2011, 2014, 2017, 2019; among others.

The purpose of the article. The objective of the work which results are presented below was to present the state of knowledge and analyze the theoretical approaches for the study of Mexican intercultural education. The study was carried out using the documentary-bibliographic research method.

Results. The study carried out showed that the problem of intercultural education is widely studied at international and national levels. Therefore, Touraine (1981) from Cambridge University, after having analyzed social movements, has proposed a methodological approach to sociological intervention, considering it as a kind of academic advice on the new migratory reality. The author maintains that the school has required pedagogy based on the intercultural discourse, beginning with multicultural practice, due to two circumstances: from the academy as a platform for the demands of social movements, which were presented in the eighties of the 20th century, giving rise to the multicultural phenomenon and pioneering movements of multiculturalism (Perotti, 1994).

On the other hand, Moser (1998) from Sussex University has carried out the research "Towards alternative educational thinking. First approach", which was financed by World Bank Group. The author points out that education has as its object of study a set of visions and theoretical positions to address its problems, focusing on the educational field from the perspective of vulnerability, considering it as part of an "[...] educational service, which integrates articulated axes of population and development, but which have been diminished by the state" (Salas, Salas, 2011, p. 12).

Likewise, Delgado and Mariscal (2007) from the Universidad Mayor de San Simón Bolívar (Caracas, Venezuela), developed a work that aims to contribute to intra- and intercultural dialogue through "[...] spaces coordinated with public entities and civil society that promote educational reforms considering the cultural and biological diversity of Latin America and the world" (Delgado, Mariscal, 2007, p. 33-40). This work shows, from a theoretical-methodological perspective, feeling and wisdom in a social reality, being an inseparable unity among its peers as a process of *being-locate*.

This research combines transdisciplinarity and respect for the difference-similarity of each identity of reality. The authors observe that transdisciplinarity is not only necessary, but it is also essential to bring together professionals from different disciplines. Similarly, they maintain that this is being applied in Western science, mainly in Europe, "[...] social teaching-learning between grassroots organizations, municipalities and universities with a very precise objective of strengthening interculturality and creating intercultural dialogue" (Delgado, Mariscal, 2007, p. 111).

In turn, Mato (2009), from Amawtay Wasi Intercultural Community University of Nationalities and Indigenous Peoples (Quito, Ecuador), with respect to intercultural education, specifies that it is necessary to opt for specific cultural curricular contents. Likewise, the cultural particularity of the curriculum forces us to additionally think about actions that reinforce the language through teaching materials and native language texts. An interaction called dialogues of knowledge is also considered



relevant. This involves designing careers based on people's needs in linguistic, sustainable, cultural, democratic, civic and community development issues.

The key aspect of the above derives from and has to do with the importance of people and organizations actively participating throughout the intercultural process. Equally, following Bourdieu (in Giglia, 2003), higher education institutions play an important role, regardless of whether or not they have an intercultural approach, since they must play a key role, promoting reflection within the same society.

On the other hand, Nanni (2007) from the Italian university Università Urbaniana emphasizes some of the human abilities to understand and live with the Other. The author highlights the importance of the prefix "inter" in the concepts "interexchange", "interaction" and overcoming the unidirectional process of knowledge transmission. Above all, he highlights empathy as an emotional investment, of "falling in love" and esteem for another culture. He speaks of decentralization as an antidote to intolerance and racism; conceptual transitivity, since the mind processes knowledge and transfers it to new knowledge. It is about the learning obtained through an intercultural pedagogy that requires "[...] educational policies with the objective of implementing civil coexistence, dialogue, and peace" (Nanni, 1989, p. 234).

Fiorucci (2008) from the Università Tre di Roma (Italy), in one of his investigations, talks about the school for all, presents the ideas and proposals for intercultural didactics of pedagogical discipline focused on the social and reinterpretation of the curriculum. He believes it is necessary to propose didactic content with an intercultural key in all the knowledge of school teaching: music, history, geography, biology, mathematics. On the other hand, he proposes cultural mediation, convinced that pedagogy, "the art of good education", is a path that leads to different disciplines: philosophy, science, historiography and experimental research (Fiorucci, 2008, p. 10). In the author's opinion, "[...] intercultural training and education makes sense only when new steps are taken in the direction of a democratic school, a space for personal and social growth and emancipation" (Fiorucci, 2008, p. 19).

Similarly, in the words of Sánchez and Mora (2013), to achieve an inclusive school of diversity, it is necessary to review the curricular models, and encourage the participation of all actors involved in education, including families and the entire society. On the other hand, Walsh's (2009, Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Quito, Ecuador) reflection is distinguished by a critical perspective. According to this author, intercultural education itself will only have significance, impact and value when it is critically assumed as a pedagogical act of political support that intervenes in the "re-foundation of society", as Paulo Freire (1997) said.

It consists of the reconstruction of its structures that racialize, inferiorize and dehumanize from three points: first, in the understanding of interculturality and its multiple aspects. Regarding the second point, it takes a tour of the use of interculturality in education and educational policies, from bilingual intercultural education and the multiculturalist reforms of the nineties of the 20th century, to the new emerging policies of intercultural education of the 21st century, including those that, on the one hand, advance the neoliberal project and, on the other, link the



“educational re-foundation” with the state re-foundation. In the last point, the author tries to deepen the “[...] understanding of critical interculturality as a political-social-epistemic-ethical project and as a de-colonial pedagogy, giving clues for a different praxis” (Walsh, 2009, p. 20).

The reflections of Sánchez (2012), from the Rafael Landívar University (Guatemala), about intercultural education in Latin America, revolve around the need to forge knowledge from differences, that is, the intercultural must be proposed to the curriculum as a permanent component, but not as its rector. He proposes a teaching-learning methodology from an intercultural approach that is capable of combining theory and practice, incorporating ethnology as a means of empirical and experiential approach. He suggests applying a problematizing and reflective pedagogy, addressing class issues as issues to be resolved, placing greater emphasis on their role in forming capable and creative people; pay double attention to foreign students inside and outside the classroom: every student must be assumed as a carrier of knowledge (Sánchez, 2012).

Equally, for this author, it is vital to consider different cultural contexts of the students, having certain culturally established ways of learning. Also, the pedagogical advice is important that allows monitoring of students and the ways in which people belonging to this population socialize and learn, this being a very broad and complex task, necessary for intercultural teaching. Intercultural teaching (according to King, Schielmann, 2004) moreover includes incorporating members of the teaching staff from different nationalities, local or regional specialists in topics of interest to the training programs.

On the other hand, in Mexico, intercultural didactics is proposed as an innovation project put into practice within the school, since it is argued around the social reality of the changing world. Furthermore, in 2008, Ávila and Cortés from the Universidad Veracruzana (Xalapa, Mexico), developed an investigation into the action of the main actors of interculturality through the illustration of a graphic called “The actors participating in the creation of interculturality”, providing information to the field of interest (Dietz, Mateos, 2011).

Fábregas (2008; 2011), one of the founders of the Intercultural University of Chiapas (UNICH, San Cristóbal de las Casas, Mexico), proposes promoting genuine interethnic coexistence inside and outside the classroom, based on ethnopsychology, as in the case of the University of Quintana Roo (UIMQROO, Chetumal, Mexico), where students spend the summers living with and in specific communities, as well as the UNICH. According to this author, autonomy is extended through the existence of variants of the general design, using a practical model within the classroom. In terms of teaching, he intends to apply the constructivist and intersubjective method established in the Educational Model¹ that supports the official intercultural universities in Mexico (Fábregas, 2008).

In his essay “The management of intercultural higher education in Mexico. Challenges and perspectives of intercultural universities”, the author suggests that interculturality implies a way of understanding science and its application in countries

¹ Educational Model for Compulsory Education in Mexico from the Ministry of Public Education, 2017.



that, like Mexico, are debated in the schemes of social inequality and discrimination (Fábregas, 2011).

The researches of Díaz-Barriga (1997) and Díaz-Barriga and Hernández (2010) from the National Autonomous University of Mexico, also stands out. In their opinion, reinvention should not be considered exclusively as the incorporation of tools without an educational intention. In this sense, the need emerges to review the didactic contents, to engage in discourse on the topic of “curriculum” (according to Taba, 1974) as an integral part of educational knowledge.

In turn, De-Alba and González (1997) consider that at the end of the 20th century, due to the internationalization of the educational discipline, the curriculum has been the subject of extensive debate since the end of the last century, requiring the revision of plans and programs to meet the institutional needs of the educational system, capable of providing concepts such as “needs diagnosis”, that is, being designed based on each type of culture and without losing sight of where they will be carried out, with a vision of the present and towards the future (De-Alba, González, 1997).

Likewise, Díaz-Barriga (2008) proposes that in curricular design, concepts such as the reference framework of a study plan, analysis of professional practice, and transformation objectives must be established. The curriculum must be able to generate a significant experience in relation to the modular system: “[...] what we are today is the result of what has happened to humanity as a whole” (Díaz-Barriga, 2008, p. 58).

On the other hand, Dietz (2012) from the Universidad Veracruzana, proposes the study of intercultural education, understanding it as something more than a mere section within an anthropology of migrations, multicultural society or education. The study starts from the analysis of the intergroup and intercultural structures and processes of integration and differentiation of contemporary societies. From this perspective, the proposal that advocates multiculturalism and seeks to develop interculturality and diversity in education is part of a project that aims to redefine and reinvent the conceptions of the *State* and the *Nation* that the Western tradition has built, as well as to review the relations between the State and contemporary societies (Dietz, 2012).

Dietz, Williamson and Flores (2015) maintain that, both in Latin America and in the rest of the world, the best intercultural education is one that does not require the adjective “intercultural”, because it does not need to be “adjectived” with a term limited to certain educational subsystems or educational services to “minorities” to maintain privileges of general education intended for supposed “majorities”. Ethnographic and dialectical traditions have originated “intercultural education”, following an “inter” and “intra” disciplinary methodology, supporting the vision of diversity education, inclusive, democratic, considering the sources of multiplicity (cultural, linguistic, ethnic, gender, religious, etc.). Therefore, it will change from being called “intercultural”, rather “[...] it will simply be known and recognized as good education” (Dietz, Williamson, Flores, 2015, p. 10).

In turn, Zhizhko and Díaz-Romero (2015) from Autonomous University of Zacatecas (Zacatecas, Mexico), in their book “Mexicans in British Colombia, Canada:



academic integration of the second generation of migrants”, maintain that starting in the nineties of the 20th century, it begins the study of the pedagogical principles of intercultural education, and the role of the school involved in educating for diversity is fundamental for the learning of the language and culture of origin in the learning process of the migrants’ children, in particular, the role of language as a fundamental mediating element, not only to designate and identify objects and phenomena of reality, but also for communication between human beings (Zhizhko, Díaz-Romero, 2015).

Equally, Zhizhko (2017) in her book “Teaching by competencies: Historical-cultural approach”, affirms that education is a result of the social dynamics that, in a historical development, have been shaped and transmitted to generations through their purposes, values and contents, according to the historical moment and the predominant trends. Education manifests the problems of global society; it is reflected in the differences and social inequalities that are not erased, but rather accentuated. The Mexican educational system is immersed in the same destructive and regenerative phenomena that occur in the world (Zhizhko, 2017).

According to Moctezuma (2018), scientific activity in migration dynamics suggests the need to design different care programs to facilitate and promote the social integration of migrant children in public schools at the primary level, which task is to foster a “culture of transnational and intercultural integration”. These practices, which are summarized in abandoning nationalist schemes, must lead first to recognizing social diversity and then, the simultaneity of these actions. In this way, the author highlights the importance of preserving the English language in the case of returning Mexican children, and learning the Spanish language. In the event that the child is part of an indigenous community, the model to be implemented must also incorporate the dialect.

Now, what theoretical approaches should be considered in research on intercultural education in Mexico? Firstly, it must focus on intercultural didactics as a pedagogical method for coexistence, which strengthens the conviction that man “[...] is capable of learning and can be educated in his diversity to become aware of peace” (Gadotti, 1998, p. 73). Consequently, the main concepts that must be analyzed are “pedagogical method”, “interculturality”, “intercultural education”, “didactics” and “intercultural didactics”.

Thus, one of the main works that have governed pedagogy is that of Jan Amos Comenius (17th century), who in his work “The Great Didactics” (*Didáctica Magna*) contributed to universal education by placing the learner as the central point, having as a principle “teaching everything to everyone”. He describes the aspirations and recommendations that illustrate how to achieve an optimal method in the teaching-learning process. This work reformed society in general, placing pedagogy as a science of education (De-la-Mora, 1992).

Starting from the fundamental idea that education is for everyone and is universal we are considering the new cultural diversity of students in schools. According to Flórez, pedagogy is a “[...] humanistic discipline that reworks and shares fields with other humanistic disciplines, it is like a super knowledge” (1997, p. 32). Based on Kant’s pedagogical philosophy, good education is precisely what all good in



the world comes from, that is, freedom without differing in the freedom of others. Its ideal principle is that “[...] the child should not be educated with a view to the best possible state of the human race today, but thinking about the best future state, that is, in accordance with the idea of world peace through education” (UNESCO, 1993, p. 5).

Put into practice, intercultural didactics also uses the method of learning through experience, as proposed by Dewey (1938) in his work “Experience and Education”: learning is the result of an (active) construction through experiences of social and cultural life and is influenced by the socio-emotional context in which the student finds himself. This affects his “[...] particular vision of ethics, given that the good cannot be isolated from the consequences of the action” (Sabatini, 2017, p. 11). The pragmatic sense in Dewey is observed when he points out that the moral development of the student cannot be separated from social improvement.

For Dewey, education takes into consideration two dimensions: individual and social. From this constructivist current², the intercultural psychological emergency has been used to consider some aspects related to acculturation, enculturation and adaptation of people within different cultures. In this sense, it is worth mentioning that Abbagnano and Visalberghi (1957) consider the American philosopher Dewey as “[...] the greatest exponent of democracy, the revolutionary universalist of Marxist doctrine and practice” (Abbagnano, Visalberghi, 1957, p. 9). It is also important to specify that at that time (beginning of the 20th century) Mexican pedagogy was influenced by the Catholic Church, therefore, the Deweyan school (Marxist: secular, social, liberal) was supposed to be hostile.

Another theoretical foundation of intercultural didactics can be considered the New School, which views pedagogy as a “mystical current”. It is postulated by a pedagogical anthropology, having as its purpose the cultivation of humanity from the relationship of the disciple to the teacher, from whom he learns and from whom he teaches in a community. Starting from the work of Rousseau (1712-1778) with a positivist matrix, where it is conceived that “man is good by nature” focusing attention on the natural evolution of the child, and education through direct and practical subjects. Rousseau breaks with all the teaching techniques and models of the time, proclaiming that the child will not be anything other than what he should be: “[...] living is the job that I want to teach him, when he leaves my hands he will not be [...] neither magistrate, nor soldier, nor priest: above all, he will be a man” (Châteu, 2014, p. 68).

Therefore, begins a series of masterpieces with this methodology that include the active pedagogy of great authors. For example, Leo Tolstoy (Russia, 1828-1910) stands out. He created a school for peasants on his Yasnaya Polyana estate based on the idea of the freedom of the student. As well, Anton Makárenko (Ukraine, 1888-1939) founded in the 1920s in the USSR the Gorky Colony and the Félix Dzerzhinskiy Children’s Commune, both dedicated to abandoned childhood. The teacher explained his educational method in his work “Pedagogical Poem” (1933). It is characterized by training under the principle of firmness in the collective sense, practice, and the importance of work and organization in all social dimensions (Châteu, 2014).

² Authors’ note: Some authors who belong to this current are Piaget, Ausubel, among others (interactive constructivism); Vygotsky, Leontiev, Luria, among others (social constructivism).



For her part, Maria Montessori (Italy, 1870-1957) also took care of the children's education in the orphanage home in the Franciscan convent in Rome, Italy. She was an activist in defense of children's rights. Her pedagogical method applied in *La casa dei bambini* (1909) illustrates the "freedom of schoolchildren" by proposing that to promote the individual development of the child, it is necessary to resort to the permanent observation of the child within his own nature freedom: "[...] the pedagogical method of observation is fundamental about the freedom of the child, and freedom is also an activity" (Bosna, 2015). In 1946, Montessori published her work "Education and Peace", essential for carrying out research on intercultural education in Mexico.

What concerns interculturality, within the educational framework, it takes a first form, postulating itself as an alternative project, which the formation of homogeneous societies breaks (Delors, 1996). In view of this, the intercultural field recognizes that in every human relationship there is a conflict that is constitutive. Consequently, interculturality is a discourse constructed from the context defined transversally and related to alternative pedagogical practices and strategies (Tovar, 2003).

In this vein, it is valid to consider education from Butelmán's (1983) position based on the theory of educational institutions' analysis: "[...] because it consists of a body of indications, regularizations and norms that have emerged through the history of society [...] useful to achieve favorable and lasting changes in their behaviors" (Butelmán, 1983, p. 19).

As educational institutions at the service of the State, schools exercise central power in people's lives, in such a way, in the words of Althusser, "[...] the apparatuses of the State take the form of school, family, religious, legal, political, union, cultural and information apparatuses" (Althusser, 1979, pp. 21-22). To mitigate this situation, in the sixties of the 20th century, the pedagogy of the oppressed emerged. This method proposed by Paulo Freire (Brazil, 1969) is the literacy awareness strategy and dialogic matrix that makes education the ideal place to be an apparatus for the liberation of the oppressed. In Freire's opinion, the pedagogy is nourished by the suggestions of anthropology, because it imposes the way of thinking and the way of "living education as a practice of freedom" (Freire, 1997, pp. 5-26). In this sense, the author suggests that becoming literate is not learning words or reading words, it is expressing oneself by manifesting how the world is conceived through words; it implies communicating, dialoguing (understanding the dialog as the practice that establishes awareness of the world and creator of culture).

In this sense, Claude Claret (France, 1993) defines intercultural education as "[...] the set of psychic, relational, group, institutional processes, generated by the interactions of cultures, in a relationship of mutual exchange and in a perspective of safeguarding a relative cultural identity" (Claret, 1993, p. 21).

Another definition that should be presented is the one that considers intercultural education as the practice that builds coexistence through an "empathic educational process" (Rehaag, 2010), to promote the ability to recognize the reciprocal diversities that exist between subjects, emphasizing the hybrid and interactive, as it



recognizes the plurality and heterogeneity of indigenous and non-indigenous identities (Mato, 2007).

In general, cultural education distinguishes three sociocultural contexts: multiculturalism, pluriculturalism, interculturality. The first two terms are not interchangeable expressions, they are considered references to understand and explain intercultural pedagogy in life contexts, emphasizing the development of a methodology for systematizing knowledge that requires the collaboration of families, community, school and the university, from “own education and school education” (Quilaqueo, Quintriqueo, 2008, pp. 81-110). The interculturality considered from a philosophical perspective is to take into account “[...] the transfiguration of one’s own and that of others on the basis of the common, involving the creation of a common space determined by coexistence” (Fornet, 2007, p. 63).

From the Mexican framework, the concepts of multiculturalism and interculturality refer to “bilingual intercultural education”, suggested by “wise bearers of social knowledge” with the aim of contextualizing school knowledge with the cultural and educational knowledge of indigenous peoples (Quilaqueo, Quintriqueo, 2008). Likewise, they give the idea of the nation that combines diversity, recombining a framework of political and cultural integration.

The origin of intercultural education has been an evolution of multiculturalism (Dietz, 2009). In this context, “multiculturalism” is understood as a set of social movements demanding their right to cultural diversity, gaining strength in the United States (sixties and seventies of the 20th century), based on merit in the recognition of differences to exercising the right to equality. In a scientific context, it was American anthropology to alleviate the rights of minorities, applying a “culturalist” model (thus, in the seventies of the 20th century the Spindlers were pioneers on it), emphasizing the monocultural dimension in the schooling processes, promoting on the one hand, distancing and putting minority cultures in difficulty (D’Orsi, 2017).

The intercultural studies aspire to a methodology from the “inter” and “intra” disciplines, considering their origin of ethnographic and dialectical tradition. In effect, this perspective interprets the cultural logic itself for its revaluation, for the empowerment of the cultural group, strengthening identity through the contrast with “the others”, “the different” (Dietz, Mateos, Mendoza-Zuany, 2013). By the way, they use three dimensions devised by Dietz (2008, p. 364):

- The “inter-cultural” dimension, which brings together cultural complexities in pedagogical practice, responding logically to the cultural encounter. It refers to an inclusive school with a flexible nature, stemming from the nationalist idea.

- The “inter-actor” dimension, which is enriched or nourished by the set of knowledge shared by academics, activists from different associations. Is a perspective that takes advantage of the knowledge of a great diversity of actors, in order to contextualize, and/or apply knowledge from all disciplines or subjects, relevant to culture.

- The “inter-lingual” dimension, contextualized in ethnolinguistic richness, that is, is a relational perspective between students and teachers of different languages, which advantage helps to develop “translation” skills.



On the other hand, according to José Cunha, Margarita Baleiras-Couto, Pedro Fevereiro, Luis Carneiro, José Eiras-Dias (Lisbon, Portugal, 2007) the “multicultural solution” understood as a juxtaposition of “ethnic groups”, postulates cultural discontinuity, does not give the step to the global dimension, multiculturalism being the first step towards interculturality. By the way, it is “[...] confrontation, cultural exchanges, for an idea of coexistence of different cultures in the same space” (García-Canclini, 2004, p. 15).

Finally, a historical and current multiculturalism is suggested in favor of the cultures that share a territorial space, in turn, constitute the national identity. In this sense, Will Kymlicka (from Department of Philosophy, Queen’s University, Ontario, Canada, 1996) points out two fundamental ways through which pluriculturalism is present in a State: “[...] plurinationality and polyethnicity place their presence in all States” (Kymlicka, 1996, pp. 25-46). As well, pedagogy has noted a correlation between seven different currents of ideas, which appear to stand out in intercultural teaching with “ethnocultural” elements: compensatory; insulating; anti-racist; that of knowledge of cultures; that of equivalent heterocentrism; that of social education; that of collaboration (Page, 1993).

Consulting the works of European researchers Demetrius 2001; Duccio and Favaro, 1992; Favaro, 2000; Fiorucci, 2000; Fischer, 2003; Susi, 1999; Portera, 2008, 2013, among others, it can be stated that, for example, in the European Union’s countries, intercultural pedagogy is observed from the relationship between the approach and dynamics of two concepts: “identity” and “culture”. It is presented as a proposal for autonomous and, at the same time, interdisciplinary status. On the other hand, in the opposite direction, the multicultural perspective is on hand, with which a “[...] relativistic model is designed where the image of so many cultures located side by side is shown” (Portera, 2013, p. 23). Intercultural pedagogy, in turn, is proposed with the intention to promote “[...] relationships, coexistence, and, without denying the conflicts that this entails; its objective is education for all, aiming to overcome special education” (Portera, 2013, p. 48).

This challenge has been demanding the right for different “educational systems to take charge of their own diversity” (Portera, 2008, p. 485) through the inclusive structure policies, which have considered the characteristics of a pedagogical-intercultural paradigm (Portera, 2013; Fischer, 2003). For Duccio and Favaro (1992, p. 11), “[...] intercultural education is the appropriate proposal of pedagogy capable of educating native citizens and immigrants for reciprocal coexistence.”

Regarding the need to have a bilingual (or multilingual) teacher to attend the cultural diversity of the group, in this aspect, the European Union’s countries converge with what is determined in Mexican intercultural education: the bilingualism of the teacher, his linguistic skills facilitate mediation between the educational institution, the community, and families. By the way, the teacher-mediator is considered in Mexico as a “teacher-missionary.” Thus, Mexican researchers Caballero (2002), Jiménez-Naranjo (2009), Dietz (2012), among others, consider the role of these missionaries fundamental in the teaching-learning process.

Likewise, in Mexico, several authors (Ahuja and Berumen (2001), Casillas (2004), among others) propose an “intercultural education for all” linked to the Public



Education system; others address the intercultural perspective to develop a special didactics: Byram (1997); Oliveras (2000); Sánchez (1997); Vanik (1997); Escandell (2014); Bown and Levis (1987); Leech (1983), among others.

Mexican scholars have identified how the new school context impacts students, the fact of being inserted into the group/class that matches their age; they have studied, how this contributes to communicating and learning the rules of the group, how the student develops his linguistic, cognitive and cultural skills, and in what way this process could be facilitated, reinforce his motivation, support the new student in school for through intensive courses in the language he need (Spanish, in the case of Mexico). The authors conclude that it is convenient to open extracurricular courses to support migrant students in completing their school tasks. It is necessary to suggest that educational managers review the curricula, opting for transversal and interdisciplinary content; monitor the professional training of the educator in the field of intercultural education.

Equally, for research on intercultural education in Mexico, it is important to define the concepts “didactics” and “intercultural didactics”. Therefore, didactics is a pedagogical discipline which study centralizes the teaching-learning processes and guides educational purposes. It is a science committed to the improvement of all human beings, “[...] thanks to the understanding and constant transformation of socio-communicative processes, to the adaptation and ideal development of the teaching-learning process” (Medina, Mata, 2009, p. 7).

On the other hand, Krüger (2006), following Weniger (1962), considers didactics a science of teaching and learning in interaction between the teacher and students, which delves into the fundamental effects of the educational, open and imaginative content of what is put into action. In addition to the above, it entails the selection, sequence and organization to expose the knowledge contained of the didactic act to be developed (Krüger, 2006, p. 215). According to Santarone, didactics is a pedagogical research activity, considering that it selects “[...] a set of knowledge for the elaboration of educational design, in turn, the teaching model must be contextualized, located within the historical and accurate cultural values” (Santarone, 2012, p. 11).

At the same time, according to Frabboni (2007), didactics brings into communication the cognitive, socio-affective aspects, and personal development, in relation to the symbolic cultural objects (structures of humanistic, scientific knowledge, and ways of life), knowledge disseminated by educational institutions: family, school, associations, churches, etc., “[...] which methodological purpose is to practice a formative mediation between the nature of the student and the culture of society” (Frabboni, 2007, p. 44). In turn, Ferretti (2002) has broken down some cognitive competencies involved in the intercultural didactic task:

- The didactics of comparison that foresees identifying analogies and differences between the various cultural references or personal experience in search of possible convergences;
- The didactics of points of view, putting oneself in the place of the other, presenting a plurality of perspectives that allow a comparison;



- Anti-racist didactics, or education for peace and solidarity, from the psychological dimension capable of contrasting stereotypes by applying cooperative methodologies to develop these attitudes;

- The didactics of expressiveness, which pays attention to the differences in artistic expression, dance, music, folklore, to know and enter into a relationship with different ways of understanding space, time, sounds, movement (Ferretti, 2002).

Nevertheless, the didactic repertoire requires other objectives. Hence, Gobbo (2004) adds to the points mentioned above the capacity for “[...] empathy, to contrast prejudices, tolerance; the ability to listen and to dialogue” (Gobbo, 2004, p. 44). Likewise, the pedagogical principles and strategies of the intercultural teaching model have been designed around the intercultural context, using creativity and applying appropriate creative content or the most effective method (Wood, Boyle, Hubban, 1999, p. 3). The intention is for the student to learn and adapt to the variety and complexity of the context. This didactics uses “[...] ingenious strategies, intended to provoke student learning and to raise awareness of the opportunities that arise to awaken that learning” (Jeffrey, Wood, 1997, p. 6). The acquired learning “[...] allows students to have control of their learning process and be the owners of the knowledge they produce” (Wood, Boyle, Hubban, 1999, p. 2).

At the same time, cultural diversity is organized under the principle of bringing together all the cultural particularities of the society in which we live, and the curriculum relates the different cultures. It is well known that human learning embraces the heterogeneities that culture establishes. In this sense, the use of different languages within an educational institution enriches the learning of all citizens, without considering the first languages of the students. Multilingualism, which develops communicative skills in different languages, is capable of “[...] reinforcing the learning of the L1 (mother language), in addition to promoting the acquisition of a second language” (Medina, Mata, 2009, pp. 400-401).

Conclusions. As a result, the study carried out allows us to make the following conclusions. Firstly, the analysis of the state of knowledge about the problems of intercultural education at international and national levels shows that in the eighties of the 20th century social changes at a global level induced the phenomena of multi and pluriculturality, also requiring the development of teaching methodology based on the precepts of interculturalism (Touraine, 1981; Perotti, 1994, Moser, 1998; Salas and Salas, 2011; among others); intra and intercultural dialogue; transdisciplinarity and respect for difference-similarity (Delgado and Mariscal, 2007; Nanni, 2007; Mato, 2009; among others). Several researchers agree that it is necessary to build an intercultural didactics based on the reinterpretation of the curriculum using a critical perspective (Díaz-Barriga, 1997; Fiorucci, 2008; Walsh, 2009; Díaz-Barriga and Hernández, 2010; Dietz and Mateos, 2011; Fábregas, 2011; Sánchez, 2012; Dietz, 2012; Sánchez and Mora, 2013; Dietz, Williamson and Flores, 2015; Zhizhko and Díaz-Romero, 2015; among others).

As well, the analysis of theoretical approaches for the study of intercultural education leads to defining intercultural didactics as an operational didactic model that pursues intercultural education and teaching of the language/s. At the same time, research on Mexican intercultural education must provide for the analysis of



educational programs that involve, on the one hand, indigenous students and, on the other, migrant students returning from the United States. In this sense, the aspects that must be taken into account are the following.

It is important to know if the programs provide for activities that involve all students in the classroom (indigenous or not; migrants or not) to create the conditions for the adequate reception of children and young people from other cultures; to foster empathy among students, project welcome and accompaniment/support during the school year for this type of student; for fair valorization of cultural and linguistic diversity and the stimulation of dialogue.

On the other hand, it is worth investigating whether the educator teaches his classes by placing the school context as a vital space so that the indigenous student or returning children are motivated to search for and rework their (Mexican) cultural DNA. In this case, it should be noted that unlike the use of the abbreviation "DNA" in the biochemical field, which refers to deoxyribonucleic acid, which ability is to unite fragments of different origin, in studies on intercultural education, this term refers to "cognitive and metacognitive DNA" and is related to the identity elements that make up a culture.

The above, in line with Gardner (in his work "Formae mentis", 1987) who proposes an anthropological perspective to identify different ethnic groups, maintaining that, despite their contrasts and location in distant territories, among these ethnic groups there are similarities in their cognitive processes, that is, they use the same contextual instruments to interpret and understand the world. Therefore, Duccio and Favaro (2000) return to what was said above in the intercultural pedagogical field, stating that people from different cultures are capable of interrelating and communicating because there is a cognitive DNA, based on the symbolic-representative, as well as metacognitive: the ability to think and reflect in the process of developing knowledge (Duccio, Favaro, 2000). In this framework, knowing the Mexican cultural and linguistic elements will help indigenous and migrant children to identify themselves as part of this culture, in order to strengthen solidarity and cooperation.

Another important aspect to consider when developing programs for the improvement of intercultural education is the teaching of languages (Spanish as L2, foreign language(s), classical languages). Without a doubt, for the linguistic and cultural social inclusion of indigenous and migrant children who come to Mexican schools, the process of learning and daily use of the language(s) is vital. On the other hand, it is worth addressing the convenience of reinforcing the mother tongue (L1) of these children, stimulating their bilingualism.

Finally, in order to achieve the proposal of intercultural didactics, specific teaching activities and methods, the creation of linguistic, intercultural, artistic and interdisciplinary laboratories, must be proposed.

Further research. In future research, it is pertinent to address the specific theoretical-methodological issues for the development of Mexican intercultural didactics.

References



- Abbagnano, N., Visalberghi, A. (1957). *Lince di storia della pedagogia*, Torino, G. B. Paravia & C.
- Althusser, L. (1979). *Ideologías y aparato ideológico de Estado*, Buenos Aires, Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Apodaca, E., Bertely, M., Cituk, A., Gómez, P., Iturralde, D., López, L., Schmellkes, S., Sichra, I., Williamson, G. (2004). *Educación en la diversidad. Experiencias y desafíos en la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*, Buenos Aires, IPE - UNESCO.
- Bosna, V. (2015). "Maria Montessori uno sguardo diverso sull'infanzia", *Foro de Educación*, 13(18), 37-50.
- Butelman, I. (1983). *El abordaje psicopedagógico institucional. El análisis Institucional en Educación*, tesis de la Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires. Departamento de Ciencias de la Educación.
- Château, J. (2014). *Los grandes Pedagogos*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Clanet, Claude (1993). *Introduction aux approches interculturelles et en sciences humaines*, Toulouse, Presses Universitaires du Mirail.
- D'Orsi, L. (2017). *Cultura, scuola, educazione: la prospettiva antropologica. A cura di Fabio Dei*, Pisa, Pacini Editori.
- De Alba, A., Gonzáles, E. (1997). *Evaluación de programas de educación ambiental: experiencias en América Latina y el Caribe*, México, UNESCO, CESU-UNAM, CECADESU-SEMARNAP.
- De la Mora, G. (1992). *Juan Amós, Didáctica magna, estudio introductivo*, México, Porrúa.
- Delgado, F., Mariscal, J. (2007). *Educación intra e intercultural. Alternativas a la Reforma Educativa Neocolonizadora*, La Paz, AGRUCO - COMPAS.
- Delors, J. (1996). *La educación encierra un tesoro. Informe de la Comisión Internacional sobre la Educación para el Siglo XXI*, París, UNESCO.
- Desinan, C. (1999). *Orientamenti di educazione interculturale*, Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Díaz Barriga, F., Hernández, G. (2010). *Estrategias docentes para un aprendizaje significativo. Una interpretación constructivista*. 2ª ed, McGraw-Hill
- Diáz Barriga, A. (1997). *Didáctica y currículum: convergencias de estudio*, México, Paidós.
- Diáz Barriga, F. (2008). *Metodología de diseño curricular para la Educación Superior*, México, Trillas
- Dietz, G. (2012). *Multiculturalismo, interculturalidad y diversidad en la educación. Una aproximación antropológica*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Dietz, G., Mateos, L. (2011). *Interculturalidad y educación intercultural en México: un análisis de los discursos nacionales e internacionales en su impacto en los modelos educativos mexicanos*, México, SEP CGEIB.
- Dietz, G., Williamson G., Flores, F. (2015). *Estado del arte de la Educación Intercultural bilingüe en Chile, 1990-2013*, Santiago de Chile, Ediciones Universidad de la Frontera, Facultad de Educación, Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades.
- Dietz, G.,(2009). "Los actores indígenas ante la interculturización de la educación inclusiva en México: ¿empoderamiento o neoindigenismo?", en: *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Inclusiva*, Santiago de Chile, Universidad Central de Chile, Vol. 3 (2), 55-75.



- Dietz, G., Mateos, L., Mendoza-Zuany, R. (2013). "Multiculturalismo y Educación 2002-2010", en: ANUES. *Dossier. Los hispanos en Estados Unidos*, 13, 18-26.
- Duccio, D., Favaro, G. (1992). *Immigrazione e pedagogia interculturale: bambini, adulti, comunità nel percorso di integrazione*, Firenze, La nuova Italia.
- Frabboni, F. (2007). *Manuale di Didattica generale*, Roma-Bari, Laterza.
- Fábregas, A. (2008). *Diversidad Cultural e Intercultural en Educación Superior: experiencias en América Latina*, Caracas, UNESCO-IESAL.
- Fábregas, A. (2011). *Chiapas. territorio, fronteras, migraciones, desarrollo: visiones interculturales multidisciplinares*, Chiapas (México), Universidad Intercultural de Chiapas.
- Zadra, F. (2014). *Convivere nella diversità: competenze interculturali e strumenti didattici per una scuola inclusiva*. -
<http://www.eurac.edu/en/research/autonomies/minrig/Documents/Diversity4Kids/Convivere%20nella%20diversit%C3%A0-Franca%20Zadra.pdf>
- Fiorucci, M. (2008). "Definire il campo dell'educazione interculturale", en *Pedagogia Oggi*, 1-2, 73-81.
- Fisher, L. (2003). *Sociologia della Scuola*, Bologna, Il mulino.
- Flórez, R. (1997). *Hacia una pedagogía del conocimiento*, Bogotá, McGraw-Hill.
- Fornet, R., (2007). *Reflexiones de Raúl Fornet-Betancourt sobre el concepto de interculturalidad*, México, Consorcio Intercultural, D.R. Coordinación General de Educación Intercultural y Bilingüe.
- Freire, P. (1997). *La Educación como Práctica de la Libertad*, México, Siglo XXI.
- Gadotti, M. (1998). *Historia de las ideas pedagógicas*, México, Siglo XXI.
- García-Canclini, N. (2004). *Diferentes, desiguales y conectados: mapa conceptual de la interculturalidad*, Barcelona, Gedisa.
- Giglia, A. (2003). "Pierre Bourdieu y la perspectiva en las ciencias sociales", en *Desacatos*, No. 011, Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social.
- Gobbo, F. (2004). *Pedagogia interculturale*, Roma, Carocci.
- Jeffrey, B., Woods, P. (1997). "The relevance of creative teaching: Pupils' views", en Pollard, A., Thiessen, D., Filer, A. *Children and their Curriculum: The perspectives of Primary and Elementary School Children*, London, Falmer Press.
- Kant, (1793). *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft*. Texto de la edición de 1793 con adiciones de las variantes de la edición de 1794. Edición de Karl Kehrbach, Leipzig, Philipp Reclam jun. 1879, p. 46. Trad. española de F. Martiñez M. (1972), Madrid, Alianza.
- King, L., Schielmanns, S. (2004). *El reto de la educación indígena: experiencias y perspectivas*, París, UNESCO.
- Krüger, R. (2006). "The significance of the concepts "elemental" and "fundamental" in didactic theory and practice", en *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17 (4), 215-250.
- Kymlicka, Will (1996). *Ciudadanía multicultural*, Barcelona, Paidós.
- Makarenko A. (1935). *Poema pedagógico*, Biblioteca virtual Antorcha, Banderas sobre la torres y libros.
- Mato, D. (2007). "Cultura, comunicación y transformaciones sociales en tiempos de globalización", en *Cultura y transformaciones sociales en tiempos de globalización*.



- Perspectivas latinoamericanas.*
- Medina, A., Mata, F. (2009). *Didáctica General*, Madrid, Pearson Educación.
- Moctezuma, M. (2018). "Menores inmigrantes vulnerados por el gobierno estadounidense. Atrocidades y omisiones de las políticas públicas", en *Papeles de población*, [S.l.], Vol. 24 (98), 133-156.
- Montessori, M. (2004). *Educazione e pace*, Opera Nazionale Montessori, 1949, Roma, Garzanti.
- Nanni, C. (1992). *Educazione e pedagogia in una cultura che cambia*, Roma, LAS.
- Page, M. (1993). *Courants d'idées actuels en éducation des clientèles scolaires multiethnies*, Quebec, Conseil Supérieur de Education.
- Perotti, A. (1994). *La via obbligata dell'interculturalità*, Bologna, Coop. Sermis.
- Portera, (2008). "Intercultural education in Europe: epistemologica and semantic aspects", en *Intercultural*, 19 (6), 481-492.
- Portera, A. (2013). *Manuale di pedagogia interculturale*, Roma-Bari, Editore Laterza.
- Quilaqueo, D., Quintriqueo, S. (2008). "Formación docente en educación intercultural para contexto mapuche en Chile", en: *Cuadernos Interculturales*, primer semestre, año/Vol. 6 (10), Universidad de Valparaíso, Viña del Mar, Chile, 91-110.
- Rehaag, I. (2010). "La perspectiva intercultural en la educación", en *El Cotidiano*, 160, 75-83.
- Sabatini, M. (2017). *Pedagogia interculturale: prassi e teorie. L'influenza e le immaginabili funzioni della psicologia interculturale*, Trento (Italia), Tesi dottorato di ricerca in Scienze Psicologiche e della formazione XXX ciclo.
- Salas, M., Salas L. (2011). *Cultura, Historia y Políticas Educativas*, Zacatecas (México), UAZ, Unidad Académica de Docencia Superior, Programa de Maestría en Ciencias de la Educación.
- Sánchez, M. (2012). *Forjando saberes desde las diferencias. Reflexiones acerca de la educación en América Latina*, Guatemala, Cara Parens.
- Sánchez, N., Mora, C. (2013). *Educación inclusiva: Conceptos y rutas*, Bogotá, Editorial Javeriano-Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.
- Santarone, D. (2012). *Didattica e intercultural*, Roma, Armando Editori.
- Tovar, M. (2003). "Multiculturalismo, globalización e identidades: construyendo una mirada plural", ponencia presentada en el *Modulo I del Diplomado Diversidad: la intervención educativa en la construcción de la interculturalidad*, México, UPN.
- UNESCO (1993). "Kant", en *Perspectivas: revista trimestral de educación comparada*, París: UNESCO, Vol. XXIII, 3/4, 837-854,
- Walsh, Catherine. (2009). *Interculturalidad, Estado, Sociedad: Luchas (de)coloniales de nuestra época*, Quito, Ediciones Aby-Yala.
- Woods, P., Boyle, M., Hubban, N. (1999). *Multicultural children in the early years*, Clevedon, Multilingual matters publication.
- Zhizhko, E. (2017). *Enseñanza por competencias: enfoque histórico-cultural*, México, Pearson.
- Zhizhko, E., Díaz Romero, A. (2015). *Mexicanos en Colombia Británica, Canadá: integración académica de la segunda generación de los migrantes*, Kiev, Arial.