British Journal of Sociology of Education
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Bridging boundaries with Bernstein: Approach, procedure and results of a school support project in Catalonia

Journal:	*British Journal of Sociology of Education*
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original
Keywords:	School success, mentoring, Basil Bernstein, inequalities

Abstract: This article presents the theoretical foundations, methodological approach, and results of a school support project involving 154 primary school pupils, with low academic performance, in a region of Catalonia (Enxaneta Project). Drawing on Basil Bernstein's model of analysis of educational codes, the project sets out, on the theoretical level, to build bridges between institutional (school) and informal (family) pedagogy; between the elaborate codes of the school and the restricted codes of families; and between different pedagogical models (invisible and personal versus visible and positional). Methodologically, the project works through an intense, professional mentoring with children and families and is based on mixed pedagogies (Morais 2002). The results obtained (quasi-experimental design) enable us to affirm that the Enxaneta children improve significantly more than the non-Enxaneta children in linguistic and mathematical tests, but not in school marks.

Bridging boundaries with Bernstein: Approach, procedure and results of a school support project in Catalonia.

Abstract

This article presents the theoretical foundations, methodological approach, and results of a school support project involving 154 primary school pupils, with low academic performance, in a region of Catalonia (Enxaneta Project). Drawing on Basil Bernstein's model of analysis of educational codes, the project sets out, on the theoretical level, to build bridges between institutional (school) and informal (family) pedagogy; between the elaborate codes of the school and the restricted codes of families; and between different pedagogical models (invisible and personal versus visible and positional). Methodologically, the project works through an intense, professional mentoring with children and families. It is based on mixed pedagogies (Morais 2002) with four objectives: a) to act as a bridge between pedagogies and school and family codes; b) to enable families to enter physically and symbolically the 'sacred space' of the school and share it with mentors and teachers (Bernstein 1996; Dubet 2002); c) to improve teacher expectations towards children and families; d) to reduce or subvert, as the final goal, initial inequalities. The results obtained (quasi-experimental design) enable us to affirm that the Enxaneta children improve significantly more than the non-Enxaneta children in linguistic and mathematical tests, but not in school marks.

Key words (3-6)

School success, mentoring, Basil Bernstein, inequalities.

1. Introduction

School disaffection, school failure or early school leaving remains, despite much effort over the last few decades, a central concern of European societies. The dream of a genuinely equitable schooling that is inclusive in its access, processes and results to all pupils is still far from being a reality (Demeuse and Baye 2005; Dyson and Squires 2016). Since the 1960s, there has been a wealth of research that has provided highly relevant data on how parents' educational and economic capital (Bourdieu 1997), the degree of school segregation (Vincent and Ball 2006) or teacher's expectations (Weinstein 2002) facilitate the reproduction of existing social inequalities in schools. This has meant that, to a significant degree, the reserves of social, cultural and economic capitals that parents can deploy in support of their children still remains today one of the great predictors of school success or failure (OECD 2015). Therefore, while there is robust evidence as to *what* happens in the formal education system as a place that reproduces social inequality, it is also true that there is less research that focuses on *how*, in a concrete, daily and precise manner, these processes of reproduction of inequality in schools occurs. So on the one hand, the research that analyses the school results highlights this difficulty schools have in reversing inequalities related to family socioeconomic background; yet on the other hand, we still

have few tools that show us how and in what way these inequalities are reproduced in the school on a daily basis, which would enable us to combat them more effectively. This is clearly the main contribution of Basil Bernstein to the sociology of education in the second half of the twentieth century, a period in which he spent four decades opening up and researching the black box of how the cultural transmission and socialisation of new generations takes place. For Bernstein the goal was to understand how the macro (inequalities, power relations, dynamics of control) became translated into a concrete and precise form in the everyday life of the school (sociology of pedagogy), (re)producing previous inequalities and identities of the children (Barrett 2017). He lays out his research project explicitly, in the classic book edited by Michael Young that proposed a 'new sociology of education', in the following way:

> How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control. From this point of view, differences within and change in the organization, transmission and evaluation of educational knowledge should be a major area of sociological interest (1971, 47)

We believe that Bernstein's analysis of *how* the educational micro-processes within the school and their connection with the social dynamics of inequality, power and control in relation to educational knowledge is key when it comes to building a project of school support against disaffection and school failure. In this article, we present the theoretical and methodological foundations of the Enxaneta school support project, together with its results after it had been in action for one year with children and families in the region of Osona, in semi-rural Catalonia. This project, designed and promoted jointly, from the start, by the Regional Council, the university, 12 town halls and 15 school boards, aims to provide support to children that obtained low marks in the first years of primary school. The target children were in the first three years (6/7 – 8/9 years old) with average marks of between 3 and 6 out of 10 in instrumental subjects (languages and maths). In Catalonia and Spain, marks are between 0 and 10, with a typical pass mark of 5. The project was undertaken via professional mentoring carried out by graduates in primary school teaching, social education or psychology, selected and trained specifically for the project (30 initial hours plus 2 hours specific training every month). This mentoring included four afternoons a week of one mentor with 2 children for 90 minutes, plus a weekly session with all the children, their fathers and/or mothers and a teacher of the school. The project's approach is based on the idea of mixed pedagogies (Morais 2002) that enable the families and school to build bridges over the differences and inequalities between their respective codes and pedagogies (Bernstein 1971, 1973a, 1973b, 1996): elaborated and restricted; aggregated and integrated; visible and invisible. With this approach, the project not only aimed to prevent disaffection and future school failure, but also took as a hypothesis that the original (family) inequalities need to be subverted and that the children of the project (target group of 154 children and their families) should improve more than their class mates (control group of 1297 children) in their marks and basic skills tests between October

2015 (pre-test) and May 2016 (post-test). First, we will examine the theoretical foundations of the project and its hypothesis.

2. Building bridges between codes, pedagogies and places of socialisation to subvert school inequalities. Theoretical Foundation of the Enxaneta school support project.

Basil Bernstein (1973b, 85) constructed and reconstructed his theory of cultural transmission and socialisation basing his work, fundamentally, on three key concepts: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. He defined them saying: 'Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of the knowledge on the part of the taught'. For Bernstein, *what* is transmitted in education, *how* it is transmitted and its *evaluation* are the three elements closely connected to macro elements like the different social classes, social division of labour, inequalities, control or relations of power (Bonal 1998, Sadovnik 2011). For Bernstein, schools are not a placid place of consensus as the early functionalists and today much of New Public Management would have us believe. The school, like society, is a place of conflict, of cultural and social shock and where there are unequal power relations. For this reason, following Nancy Fraser (2008), the starting point of the Enxaneta project is to understand disaffection and school failure as a 'cultural injustice', understanding that schools' institutionalized patterns of cultural value generate misrecognition and status inequality for particular children and families. From this starting point, disaffection and school failure are not the 'failed results' of a neutral educational process but rather, quite clearly, processes that reveal to us that within the school there is cultural injustice that the project wishes to help subvert.

Bernstein, through his dichotomous system of organisation of the pedagogies and codes, allows us to create a clear (and at times perhaps too simple) map of what we could call 'cultural shock' between the school and working class and / or immigrant families that are at the base of the cultural injustice that is disaffection and school failure (Neves and Morais 2005). Bernstein points here to three complementary dimensions (Bernstein 1973a, 1973b, 1990). First, it seems clear that schools work within an institutional pedagogy understood as 'that which is carried out in official sites, with accredited providers and where acquirers are concentrated voluntary as a group or category' (Bernstein 1996, 78). In contrast, families tend to educate through a 'segmental pedagogy that is carried out usually in the face-to-face relationships of everyday experience and practice by informal providers. This pedagogy may be tacitly or explicitly transmitted and the provider may not be aware a transmission has taken place' (Bernstein 1996, 78). Second, we can see how the school communicates and educates from an elaborate sociolinguistic code, both with respect to linguistic elements (richness of vocabulary, grammatical complexity, abstraction, explicit and expository language and so forth) and with respect to socialising elements (centred on the person, on arguments, individualising and so on). This elaborate code often generates incomprehension in those working class or immigrant families that may

communicate and educate from a restricted code. Third, and finally, we can see that these families usually educate from a visible (or collection code) pedagogy with strong pedagogical (frame) practices and classification, whereas in schools an invisible pedagogy with weak frame and classification is used. This implies that the hierarchical relations between adults and children; the pacing and rhythm of learning; the rules of control and discipline; the forms of assessment, reward and punishment and so on, all tend to be clearly differentiated in the two socialising contexts. As decades of research has shown (European Commission 2011), this promotes school disaffection (understood as the feeling of incomprehension and strangeness towards the what and how of the school) school failure (understood as the failing to complete compulsory education), and early school leaving (not continuing one's post-compulsory education between the age of 18 and 24) of certain collectives of children – above all those that come from working class and/or immigrant families.

There is thus a cultural shock between the school and certain working class and/or immigrant families that has different dimensions, and that the analytical tools constructed by Bernstein (1973a, 1973b, 1996, 1997) have helped us to identify and, above all, to know how they operate in a practical and everyday way in schools. This everyday cultural shock - in relation to the forms of socialisation between the school and families; the different codes and pedagogies; the different contents and forms of assessment and so on that have been analysed by Bernstein and other researchers (Lahire 1995; Bourdieu 1997; Lareau 2003; Neves and Morais 2005; Vincent and Ball 2006; Bonal and Tarabini 2013; Vincent 2017; among others) – is the key element that the Enxaneta project wishes to help combat. It is a structural cultural shock that is at the root of the everyday educational (re)production of the school inequalities and, consequently, of the processes of school disaffection and failure of children of certain families. Drawing on Bernstein's perspective, Rochex and Crinon define this cultural shock from a relational point of view that proposes understanding it:

> as a confrontation between, on the one hand, the sociocognitive and sociolinguistic characteristics and dispositions of the pupils, who are connected to their non-school models of socialisation (above all family and peer group) and that prepare and dispose them unequally when it comes to facing the requisites of school learning. And on the other hand, the opacity and implicit character of these requisites, the way in which the educational system functions, the professional practices and the ways working that are demanded of the pupils (2011, 9).

The cultural shock between those children whose families are familiar with and know the codes, requisites and school pedagogies and those who do not is, as we said, a cultural injustice. Above all, because such proximity or distance remains invisible due to a 'homogenous' (though not equal) school treatment: each person is treated regardless of their unequal degree of separation or interconnectedness with school practices. This has the effect that, apparently, it is an 'individual error or difficulty of the child' and his/her family when he/she fails to follow the dynamic, content, pedagogy,

model of socialisation, tasks and school evaluation. These are presented as natural or neutral, despite being closely tied to the codes and pedagogies of the indigenous middle class of each region. Finally, a key question emerges - one for which, in our view, the sociology of education also needs to help find a response. Once the diagnosis has been made, what can we do to combat this cultural shock, understood as a cultural injustice and that (re)produces on a daily basis the processes of school inequality like disaffection or failure? The Enxaneta project, based on the approach outlined above, was set up in order to help find an answer to this question.

3. Methodology

3.1 Problem, project and target group

The Enxaneta[1] Project was born out of the need to rethink school support practices that so far have been carried out in Osona, practices that were based on the voluntary, often spontaneous and practical (without any theoretical orientation) response of different municipalities, independently, to the need for school support for certain children with school disaffection and / or failure. As a result, the Regional Council and various town halls and school boards asked the university to accompany them in a joint process to rethink existing school support and build a new, more robust and effective one. This process of debate lasted 2 years (2013-2015) and the result is the Enxaneta Project. This project, undertaken outside the school class timetable, has four objectives:

1) To make a significant contribution to improving the academic results of the project's pupils by improving their basic learning skills.
2) Empower the families of the project's pupils so that they can accompany them in the school support autonomously.
3) Inform the pupils and their families about the educational and sociocultural resources available both at school and community and promote their daily use.
4) Contribute to the (self)critical debate in schools in relation to their role in the reproduction of existing social inequalities and the concrete mechanisms that facilitate them.

The target group of the Enxaneta Project are the first, second and third year pupils of primary school (years two, three and four in the English system), whose academic results lie, approximately, between 3 and 6 out of 10 in the basic learning skills of reading, comprehension, expression (Catalan and Spanish) and operations and problem solving (numbering and calculation, space and measures; relations and

[1] Since the 19th century, in Catalonia there has existed the tradition of building human towers. The most complex, of up to 10 floors or levels, require some 500 people between the Castell (Castle) and the "pinya" (support base) so that a child can arrive to the top and crown the tower. This child is called the Enxaneta. The metaphor of the name of the project is clear: there needs to be a common project that involves cooperation between children, teachers, families and local government mentors to enable all children to achieve school success.

change) and preferably, but not only, from working class or immigrant families. There is a double justification for choosing these particular target groups. First, we know from research that if pupils reach the fourth-fifth year of primary school without a minimum mastering of the basic learning skills, especially in reading comprehension, the tendency to school disaffection increases considerably since they lack the tools to follow the academic year (European Commission 2011; Cebolla 2014; Collet-Sabé et al., 2014 Dyson and Squire 2016). Second, children that in the first years of primary education obtain under 3 marks out of 10, in many cases are immersed in a highly complex social situation. We believe that the project, given its resources, is unable to deal with such cases of high social complexity related to SEN and/or family complexities. These two criteria were made concrete in a target population of the project that we describe below, in contrast to the children of the control group – those children from the same school classes as the Enxaneta children but who did not take part in the project. All the data was obtained through a questionnaire on the socio-economic conditions of the families that was given to the parents.

First, regarding the work of the parents, we can see how 31.2% of the Enxaneta children have a parent with a managerial or professional job as against 36.5% of the non-Enxaneta children. With respect to the work of the mother, only 8.4% of mothers of the Enxaneta children had a managerial or professional job, compared to 17.7% of the non-Enxaneta children. There is a statistically significant difference (p-value ≤ 0.001) in the occupations of the mothers. Second, if we take the variable of how many books a household has, we can see that 68.6% of the homes of the Enxaneta children tick 'without or very few', a much higher percentage than the non-Enxaneta children (44.9%). This difference is also statistically significant (p-value ≤ 0.001). Third, as regards the country of origin of the mother, 21.4% of the Enxaneta children had a mother born in Morocco (the leading country of origin of immigrants in Catalonia), while in non-Enxaneta children this percentage falls to 12.8%. There was also significant differences with respect to the mothers' country of birth (p-value ≤ 0.01). Table 1 below provides the sociodemographic data of the Enxaneta and non-Enxaneta children and families.

Table 1. Summary of sample characteristics for enxaneta and non-enxaneta children

	Enxaneta	Non enxaneta	p- value
Gender			
Girls	45.3	46.5	0.798
Boys	54.7	53.5	
Mother Origin			
Catalonia	49.4	48.3	
Morocco	21.4	12.8	0.004
Others	29.2	38.2	
Father occupational level			
Managerial and professional	2.6	9.2	
Intermediate	39.5	40.3	0.011
Routine and manual occupations (and unemployed)	57.9	49.5	
Mother occupational level			
Managerial and professional	8.4	17.7	
Intermediate	19.7	20.7	<0.001
Routine and manual occupations (and unemployed)	71.9	61.6	
Books in the household			
Without or very few	68.6	44.9	
One bookcase	22.6	36.1	<0.001
Two or more bookcases	8.8	19.0	
N Number of children	154	1683	

Data represents percentages. P-value of χ^2 test.

The Enxaneta children, therefore, start with a clear socioeconomic disadvantage with respect to their classmates, a disadvantage that places them, statistically, at a greater risk of experiencing school failure through all the processes and mechanisms of school disaffection and detachment that we have seen in Bernstein's analysis: a greater distancing from both the school's institutional and invisible pedagogy, its elaborate sociolinguistic code and its weak frame and classification. That is why this project is focused on these children just when they are constructing this detachment and possible disaffection. In contrast, we have excluded the small number of children whose detachment and general difficulty with school is already high in these early years, since this is usually related to very complex social and family realities and

vulnerabilities that require a more comprehensive approach that lies beyond the scope of this project. Further, as research has shown, this type of programme of school support with mentoring achieves little improvement in such children with situations of great social complexity (Alegre 2015, 11).

3.2 Methodological innovations

a) Starting the educational support beforehand

We know from research that the first years of life are crucial for the construction of conditions for the possibility of learning (Heckman 2011; Cebolla 2014; OECD 2015). As a result, all policies of social support that address children up to the age of 8 or 9 becomes, de facto, a policy of preventing school failure and dropping out. Research indicates the importance of quality environments that are stable and stimulating in the early years, since its positive effects remain throughout life with respect to academic success, continuing education and better jobs as an adult. That is why our project proposes a prevention policy that is implemented much earlier than is usual in Catalonia and Spain (after year 5). The Enxaneta project focuses on years 2-4 because this is when, in certain groups of pupils, the cultural shock, detachment and school disaffection in its various dimensions and through the different mechanisms that we have outlined guided by the work of Bernstein, are constructed and produced (prevention).

b) Professional mentoring

School support mentoring has a long tradition in the Anglo-Saxon world, especially in work with or between young people, but this is not the case in Catalonia or Spain where the first initiatives in this area began some 10-15 years ago (Prieto-Flores, Feu and Casademont 2016). Mentoring has often been evaluated as a strategy with real possibilities of contributing to the well-being of children and young people, to their inclusion and also to the prevention and / or struggle against school failure if certain characteristics are fulfilled (Alegre 2015). In our view, and following Bernstein's theoretical model regarding what school disaffection is and how it is produced, we define the role of the Enxaneta project's mentoring as professionals (graduates in primary school teaching, social education or psychology, with an initial 30-hour training focused specifically on the project and a 2-hour per week follow up) who build bridges between codes, pedagogies and socialising agents. They do this both in the session with children (one mentor for 2 children for 90 minutes per week – 29 weeks in the academic year) and in that of the children and families working on issues related to the school with the support of mentors and teachers (2 hours per week – 29 weeks in the year). These *bridges* aim to create conditions where children can be active learners; and this is generated by a type of mentoring that is done in accordance with five key elements (Bernstein 1996 Morais 2002):

- 'Bernstein repeatedly argued that successful learning depends to a great extent on the weak framing on pacing, that is, on conditions where children have some

control over the time of their acquisition (…) For that reason, only those children who have access to a second site of acquisition have been likely to succeed' (Morais 2002, 560). For children of the Enxaneta project, perhaps the family is unable to become this second site as for many other children, but mentoring could. It could become a time in which the children can control the pacing of their acquisition without pressures or deadlines. The project would like to become, temporarily, this second site for the children and families because, via the 'bridge' of the project, they themselves can become this second site for all their children. In this sense, we would also highlight our desire to have an impact on the whole family system and prioritise the entrance of older siblings into the project because the learning of the parents could also benefit the other siblings.

- 'Our research has showed how changes in other characteristics of pedagogic practice may create conditions for weakening the framing of pacing. For example, when the process of transmission-acquisition is characterised by a weak classification between the various scientific contents to be learned, that is, in a condition of intradisciplinarity, children are conducted to higher levels of abstraction and, therefore, to a more meaningful scientific understanding, while also being given more time to learn because they are constantly turning back to concepts previously learned'. (Morais 2002, 561). An example of these weak boundaries (or 'bridges' in our terminology) between contents in the Enxaneta is when one of the mentoring sessions works with reading, maths and geography together based on a list of the Spanish football league and, above all, on the tables of forwards who have scored the most goals. Mentoring is also understood as a bridge between content.
- 'A weak classification of spaces (...) and a weak framing of the hierarchical rules creates a context where children can question, discuss and share ideas thus straightening the framing of evaluation criteria' (Morais 2002, 561). The mentors incorporated these two characteristics, understood as helping to build bridges between the worlds of school and family, into both the session with children and the session with the families.
- Finally, Morais argues that 'a close relation of communication between academic and non-academic discourses has the potential to make knowledge more meaningful, more understandable and applicable' (Morais 2002, 561). Here the mentoring session becomes the bridge between the academic and non-academic, translating them both and at the same time recognising both as valuable – with the aim of avoiding family incomprehension of the school world as one of the sources of school disaffection.

c) Work with families

To combat the generational reproduction of school failure, it is not enough just to work with vulnerable pupils but also with their families. While the project is only a strategy of school support, it operates from the perspective of empowerment (Kagan et al. 2011).

This seeks to help pupils and their families recognise and enhance their knowledge, capacities, powers and skills, which enables them to access their own academic and life agency and control (Freire 1973; Bernstein 1990). Empowering always involves a learning process that leads towards a recognition and awareness of their own individual and collective capacities, and using them through their own agency (Bacqué and Biewener 2013). The sessions with children, families, mentors and teachers have served to construct these bridges and enable teachers and families, in an informal context and small group, to come closer together both physically and symbolically – and with this, include them and help them feel included in the school world; and recognise and be recognised as also knowledgeable, competent and capable in this domain. With Bernstein (2000) and Dubet (2002), we can say that the Enxaneta bridge has served to enable families (profane) to enter the "sacred school space" both physically and symbolically, to share it with the teachers and mentors and, as a result, make it more their own, less alien and more understandable. And as we will see, also to question aspects of the school that foster the distancing and disaffection of these children and families.

d) Transform expectations, transform language

For some years (Ribeiro-Pedro 1981; Bernstein 1996; Morais and Neves 2011, 2016), research has shown us that class, gender and ethnic expectations condition what is taught, how it is taught, how pupils (and families) are spoken to, how teachers relate to and evaluate them. The fewer expectations teachers have, the more control there is, the more hierarchical relations and evaluations there are, the less negotiation there is, the greater pupil passivity that is expected and so on. And the opposite applies to middle-class pupils. As we mentioned at the beginning, Bernstein's analyses help us to understand *how* expectations (Weinstein 2002) contribute to the (re)production of inequalities in the school and, at the same time, they provide clues as to how to combat them. That is why the Enxaneta project aims - through the mentoring and especially the sessions with families, children and teachers – to break the low initial expectations towards the children that 'do not adapt to school because they have a strong culture' (culture shock) (Ballestín, 2015, 367). Mentoring is considered, for teachers, families and children, as a bridge between the low initial expectations (in line with stereotypes of social class and/or ethnic origin) and the new expectations of children who have support that allows them, for the first time, to present to the class homework that they have done with their parents, put their hand up to ask the teacher a question or to get a good mark. In this way, the self-fulfilling prophecy that affects their self-concept and identity as pupils, their motivation, their self-confidence and so on, is broken.

e) Work with schools

The final methodological innovation is that the Enxaneta project seeks to avoid a dynamic that is fairly common in many of the Catalan school support programmes (Alegre 2015): one in which the school understands the project as a means of 'externalising' children with 'more difficulties' without asking themselves about the

underlying causes and without promoting internal changes designed to avoid them. This involves questioning the belief that pupils that 'do not fit in' with the procedures, curriculums, pedagogies, times, calendars, homework or evaluations established by the school are 'problematic', a belief that is rooted in a conception that individualises and 'externalises' the aforementioned cultural shock. Instead, they need to be seen as challenges that enable teachers to re-examine and improve the teaching and school practices as a whole and for all pupils. In order for this to occur, the research team held two obligatory pedagogic meetings during the year with each school board, in which the theoretical and methodological foundations of the project were presented. In these training and debate sessions, a plan of concrete action against disaffection and school failure of all the pupils was also jointly drawn up in the following areas: homework, relations with different families, the method of teaching, type of language and kind of evaluation. And what actions should be taken to bring the school culture closer to all pupils was also agreed upon.

4. Evaluation and results of the Enxaneta Project

The evaluation of the project aims to verify if it is able to reduce existing inequalities between children that form part of the Enxaneta project and the rest of their classmates. In order to achieve this goal we used the method of 'double difference' or 'difference in difference' in relation to school marks and a skills test.

> Double difference measures outcomes and covariates for both participant and non-participant in pre and post-intervention periods. Essentially this method compares treatment and comparison groups in terms of outcome changes over time relative to the outcomes observed for a pre-intervention baseline (...) Difference is calculated between the observed mean outcomes for the treatment group and control group before and after program intervention (Khandker, Koolwal, and Samad 2010, 71-72).

In our particular project, we collected the marks for mathematics and Catalan of the first and third term scored by the Enxaneta children (target group N=154) and by the rest of each class where there were children of the project (control group N=1683). Table 2 shows the pre and post results of the Enxaneta and non-Enxaneta children and their progress in the school marks.

Table 2. School marks in mathematics and language for enxaneta and non enxaneta children

	Enxaneta	Non enxaneta	p- value
Language			
Pre	5.18±1.05	6.42±1.45	<0.001
Post	5.33±1.01	6.68±1.56	<0.001
Difference Pre-Post	0.13±0.76	0.25±0.90	0.103
Mathematics			
Pre	5.36±1.34	6.64±1.58	<0.001
Post	5.50±1.28	6.89±1.69	<0.001
Difference Pre-Post	0.11±1.12	0.26±1.35	0.332

Note: Data presented as mean ± SD of the marks. P-value of the Mann-Whitney U Test. Statistically, the results of the skills tests do not exceed of Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test with correction of Lilliefors. As a result, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used. There are significant differences in the results of the Enxaneta test, but there are not significant differences in the improvements.

Table 2 highlights three things. First, the Enxaneta children (target group) start off with marks that are clearly lower than those of the non-Enxaneta (control group) children. Second, the improvement in the marks in Catalan and mathematics between the start and end of the year is much greater in the non-Enxaneta children than in the Enxaneta children. In both cases it is almost double. This seems to show the limitations of the project in enabling the children to demonstrate 'academically' that which they learnt 'as skills' in the project. This is discussed more fully below. Third, the fact that the Enxaneta children improve less than the non-Enxaneta children during the year measured by school marks, contrasts greatly with the results of the skills tests.

Table 3 shows the pre and post results of the Enxaneta children (target group) and the non-Enxaneta children (control group) in some *ad hoc* skills tests. These tests follow the line of pedagogical skills used by PISA, which the Catalan government also uses for its Standard Assessment Test in years 4, 7 and 11.

Table 3. Marks in the standard skills assessment test for enxaneta and non enxaneta children.

	Enxaneta	**Non enxaneta**	**p- value**
Pre	4.80±2.46	6.30±2.36	<0.001
Post	5.78±2.45	7.10±2.25	<0.001
Difference Pre-Post	0.98±2.25	0.80±2.01	0.323

Note: Data presented as mean ± SD of the marks. P-value of the Mann-Whitney U Test.

Overall, we can see how, in contrast to what occurred in the improvement of marks in Catalan and mathematics, in the skills test the Enxaneta children not only improved like the non-Enxaneta children between the start and end of the year; their improvement also exceeded that of the non-Enxaneta children by 0.18 points on average. Translated into the language of sociology of education, this means that the project is helping to reduce initial, and notable, inequalities between the Enxaneta and non-Enxaneta children. With respect to the theoretical framework that guides the project, we can say that the project's mixed pedagogies, which has sought to build bridges between the pedagogies and codes of the schools and families, have shown to be effective for all the Enxaneta children. If we examine in more detail the different ways in which the project has affected different profiles, we can see from Table 4 how the project has been especially effective in years 2 and 3 (English equivalent), when the bases of the basic linguistic and mathematical skills are constructed, confirming our hypothesis - that family inequalities can be subverted and that the children of the project can improve more than their class mates in their marks and basic skills tests.

The fact that the Enxaneta children of year 2 improve on average 0.59 points more than the non-Enxaneta children, bearing in mind that their initial marks in the skills tests

were on average 1.73 points lower, seems to us a highly relevant result that confirms the capacity of the project to generate significant improvements that reduce initial inequalities. In contrast, year 4 shows the contrary, with the non-Enxaneta children improving more than the Enxaneta children; while in year 5, once again the improvement in the Enxaneta children exceeds that of the non-Enxaneta children.

Table 4. Marks in the skills standard test for enxaneta and non enxaneta by course.

		Enxaneta	Non enxaneta	p- value
Year 2 (6-7 years old)	*Pre*	5.69±2.50	7.42±2.13	<0.001
	Post	7.13±2.37	8.28±1.76	0.003
	Difference Pre-Post	1.44±2.71	0.85±2.20	0.181
Year 3 (7-8 years old)	*Pre*	5.12±2.51	6.20±2.27	0.005
	Post	6.26±1.86	7.20±2.12	<0.001
	Difference Pre-Post	1.14±2.34	0.99±2.00	0.604
Year 4 (8-9 years old)	*Pre*	3.26±1.97	5.03±2.20	<0.001
	Post	3.72±1.82	5.84±2.19	<0.001
	Difference Pre-Post	0.46±1.86	0.80±1.86	0.477
Year 5 (9-10 years old)	*Pre*	5.74±1.62	6.83±2.04	0.019
	Post	6.43±2.26	7.06±2.30	0.264
	Difference Pre-Post	0.69±1.10	0.23±1.80	0.303

Note: Data presented as mean ± SD of the marks. P-value of the Mann-Whitney U Test.

Table 5 enables us to see in more detail still the profile of the Enxaneta children that have been most affected by the project. We can see that the Enxaneta boys improved 0.27 points more than the Enxaneta girls, while the opposite occurs with the non-Enxaneta children. Regarding the country of origin of the mothers, we see that the children with Moroccan mothers improved most in the skills tests of the Enxaneta group: an improvement of on average 0.33 points more than children with Catalan mothers and on average 0.46 more than children with mothers from other countries. With respect to the fathers, the Enxaneta children that improved most are those whose fathers or mothers have unskilled work, something which did not occur with the non-Enxaneta group. Finally, very much in line with the aforementioned goals of the project, the children with one or few bookshelves at home are those who benefitted most from the project. This is a group that corresponds to children in situations that are clearly remote from the codes, pedagogies, ways of working and objectives of schools, but not as remote as those who practically have no books, who were affected less by the project. From all this we can conclude that the profile of children that improved the most were boys (significant difference of 10%) with Moroccan mothers, with parents in unskilled (routine) jobs, and with some books (one bookshelf) at home.

Table 5. Difference Pre-Post in the skills standard test for enxaneta and non enxaneta children by characteristics

	Enxaneta	Non enxaneta	p- value
Gender			
Girls	0.95±2.07	0.87±2.04	0.826
Boys	1.22±2.19	0.73±2.00	0.055
Mother Origin			
Catalonia	0.94±2.28	0.71±1.92	0.478
Morocco	1.27±2.11	1.05±2.20	0.622
Others	0.81±2.33	0.85±2.05	0.889
Father occupational level			
Managerial and professional	1.00±0.81	1.06±1.77	0.950
Intermediate	0.76±2.40	0.61±2.01	0.681
Routine and manual occupations (and unemployed)	1.08±2.20	0.86±2.05	0.332
Mother occupational level			
Managerial and professional	0.33±2.46	0.80±1.89	0.339
Intermediate	1.33±2.10	0.74±2.08	0.251
Routine and manual occupations (and unemployed)	0.99±2.26	0.81±2.01	0.336
Books in the household			
Without or very few	1.02±2.11	0.72±1.99	0.218
One bookcase	1.31±2.31	0.89±2.09	0.229
Two or more bookcases	1.11±2.24	0.81±1.93	0.350

Note: Data presented as mean ± SD of the marks. P-value of the Mann-Whitney U Test.

In general, when analysing the results, we can see a clear contradiction. On the one hand, the Enxaneta children - especially boys from year 2 with Moroccan parents who work in manual jobs – show a greater improvement in the skills tests than their non-Enxaneta (control group) classmates. On the other hand, however, these improvements in the skills tests do not seem to spill over into an improvement in school marks – where the Enxaneta children improve much less than the non-Enxaneta children. In our view, which will need to be verified with new analyses of the results that the second year of the project will provide, this contradiction is related to two elements.

First that the school continues to focus on work from the perspective of contents rather than skills. The marks, marked by teachers, are closely related to the results of tests on content explained in class and very little to the capacity of the children to use the learning acquired autonomously and in diverse contexts. Further, the marks are also related to other elements, like behaviour and attitude, which is not measured in the results of the skills tests. Second, the key issue of different teacher's expectations lies in class and origin. There is a great deal of research (Nusche 2009; Ballestín 2016; etc.) that corroborates what, for example, Dinne and Gazeley highlight:

> Our analysis shows how teachers' identifications of underachieving pupils overlapped with, and were informed by, their tacit understanding of pupils' social class position. While many teachers resisted the influence of social class, they used stereotypes to justify their practice and expectations, positioning pupils within educational and occupational hierarchies (2008, 461).

We therefore believe that while in the skills tests the children interact directly with the exercises, the school marks are highly mediated by the unequal and differentiated expectations towards the children with the lowest marks in the group. The teachers see and experience these children as distanced from the culture, the language, the interests and the dynamics of the school (Bernstein 1973a), and so place them as 'bad students'. This type of expectation is difficult to combat through a project that, despite its connection with the school syllabus, homework and so on, is not implemented within the class and does not involve a direct and regular contact with the teacher. Consequently, as a hypothesis that needs to be explored in the following years, we see that the Enxaneta project has not been able to generate bridges between children-families, mentor and teacher that break these unequal distances and expectations. But it has been able to generate them in the children and families that, coming from situations of school disaffection, have through the project managed to improve in the skills tests more than their non-Enxaneta classmates, despite being in a worse school situation.

5. Conclusions, limitations and new avenues of research

The Enxaneta project - with its theoretical and methodological focus on building bridges between school and family codes, pedagogies and languages through mixed pedagogies; its aim to become a 'second site' for the children; its working with a more relaxed pacing; and its attempt to weaken the boundaries that separate the school and family worlds (Bernstein 1996; Morais 2002) - has managed to generate an impact on the children that have taken part in it. But these impacts, measured with the method of double difference (pre and post, target and control group), have revealed two contradictory realities. First, with respect to improving marks, the Enxaneta children improved less than the non-Enxaneta children. Second, in the skills tests, it was the Enxaneta children who clearly improved more than the non-Enxaneta children. This improvement was especially strong in year 2, and in boys with parents of Moroccan descent that had unskilled jobs and few books in the house. This contradiction, which

will be analysed in more detail once we have the results of the second year of the project, can be explained hypothetically based on two elements. First, the fact that Catalan schools in reality continue to work with a focus on content despite the decrees and laws that speak of skills. Even though Catalan laws in recent years speak a great deal about skills work, working on projects, skills and so on, recent research (Martínez 2016) shows that most classwork is focused on content, teacher explanation, exercises and exams, Second, the different and unequal expectations of the teachers who receive and treat the children in accordance with their assumed condition of social class and ethnicity, as distanced from the school world, and maintain these unequal expectations even though in the skills tests the children's results are the opposite of what teachers might expect.

These results reveal, on the one hand, the capacity of the project to generate a significant impact on the fight against school inequalities. On the other hand, they show the difficulty of 'entering' into the everyday school dynamic the bridges, mixed pedagogies, bonds and elevated expectations that have been generated between the children, mentors and families, which is where the inequalities of marks are generated and that the project has been unable to subvert. As a result, a clear clue as to how to improve is for the Enxaneta project to expand into the schools its principles and ways of working that we have defined along with Bernstein and Morais. Transferring to the school the new ways of educational-family work that the Enxaneta has generated as a project of school support outside the formal timetable has become, in our view, the most important challenge for the next year of the project. This has the aim of expanding the positive results of the struggle against school inequalities into the daily school dynamic.

References

Alegre, M.A. 2015. *What Works in Education: Classroom Grouping and Individual Tutoring*. Barcelona: Ivàlua and Fundació Jaume Bofill.

Bacqué, M.H., and C. Biewener. 2013. *L'émpowerment, una pratique emancipatrice*. Paris: La Découverte.

Ballestín, B. 2015. "De "su cultura es muy fuerte" a "no se adapta a la escuela" [From "their culture is really strong" to "he doesn't adapt to the school"]. *RASE* 8 (3): 361-379.

Barrett, B.D. 2017 (online first). "Bernstein in the urban classrom: a case study". *British journal of sociology of education* doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2016.1269632

Bernstein, B. 1971. "On the classification and framing of educational knowledge." In *Knowledge and Control* edited by M. Young, 47- 69. London: Collier-MacMillian

----1973a. *Class, codes and control, vol. 1*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

----1973b. *Class, codes and control, vol. 2*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

----1990. *Class, Codes and Control, vol. 4*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

----1996. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity. Theory, research and critique*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

----1997. "Conocimiento oficial e identidades pedagógicas." [Official knowledge and pedagògic identitities]. In *Ensayos de pedagogia crítica* [Critical pedagogic essays] edited by J. Goikoetxea and J. García, 12-28. Madrid: Popular.

----2000. *Class, Codes and Control, vol. 5*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bonal, X. 1998. "La sociologia de la política educativa". [The education policy sociology]. *Revista de Educación* 317, 185-202.

Bourdieu, P. 1997. *Capital cultural, escuela y espacio social*. Madrid, Siglo XXI. [Cultural capital, school and social space].

Cebolla, H. 2014. "Previous school results and social background: compensation and imperfect information in educational transitions." *European Sociological Review* 30 (2): 207-217.

Collet-Sabé, J., Besalú, X., Feu, J., and A. Tort. 2014. "Escuelas, familias y resultados académicos." [Schools, families and school results] *Profesorado* 18(2):7-33.

Demeuse, M., and A. Baye. 2005. "Pourquoi parler d'équité?" [Why speak about equity?]. In *Vers une école juste et efficace*, edited by M. Demeuse, A. Baye, M.H. Straeten, J. Nicaise, and A. Matoul, 150-170. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Dubet, F. 2002. *Le déclin de l'institution*. [The decline of institutions].París: Seuil.

Dunne, M., and L. Gazeley. 2008. "Teachers, social class and underachievement" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29 (5): 461-463.

Dyson, A., and G. Squires. 2016. *Early school leaving and learners with disabilities and/or Special Education Needs*. Brussels: European agengy for special needs and inclusive education.

European Commission, 2014. *Tackling Early Leaving from Education and Training in Europe*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Fraser, N. 2008. *Scales of Justice. Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Cambridge - Malden: Polity.

Freire, P. 1973. *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.

Heckman, J. 2011. "The Economics of inequality. The value of early childhood education." *American Educator* 35 (1): 31-35.

Kagan, C., M. Burton, P. Duckett, R. Lawthom, and A. Siddiquee. (2011) Critical Community Psychology. London: Blackwell.

Khandker, S., G. Koolwal, and H. Samad. 2010. *Handbook on impacte evaluation*. New York: World bank.

Lareau, A. 2003. *Unequal childhoods*. Berkeley: UCP.

Lahire, B. 1995. *Tableaux de familles.* Paris, Seuil. [Scene of famílies].

Martínez, X. 2016. “Innovación y reestructuración educativa en España: las escuelas del nuevo siglo.” [Innovation and education reestructuration in Spain: the schools of the new century]. In *Informe España 2016* [Spanish rapport 2016] edited by A. Blanco and A. Chueca, 43-84. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas.

Maton, K.; Hood, S. And S. Shay. 2015. Knowledge - building. London: Routledge.

Morais, A. M., and I.P. Neves. 2011. “Educational texts and contexts that work: Discussing the optimization of a model of pedagogic practice”. In *Knowledge, pedagogy & society: International perspectives on Basil Bernstein`s sociology of education*, edited by D. Frandji and P. Vitale, 191-207. London: Routledge.

Morais, A. M., and I.P. Neves. 2016. “Vertical discourses and science education: Analyzing conceptual demand of educational texts.” In: *Pedagogic Rights and Democratic Education: Bernsteinian explorations of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment*, edited by P. Vitale and B. Exley, 174-191. London: Routledge.

Morais, A.M. 2002. “Basil Bernstein at the micro level of classroom.” *British journal of sociology of education* 23 (4):559-569.

Neves, I. P., and A.M. Morais. 2005. “Pedagogic practices in the family socialising context and children's school achievement.” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 26 (1): 121-137.

Nusche, D. 2009. *What Works in Migrant Education? A Review of Evidence and Policy Options.* OECD: Paris.

OECD. 2015. *Starting strong II: Early childhood education and care*. Paris: OECD.

Prieto-Flores, Ò., Feu, J., and X. Casademont. 2016. “Assessing Intercultural Competence as a Result of Internationalization at Home Efforts: A Case Study From the Nightingale Mentoring Program” *Journal of Studies in International Education* 20(5): 437-453.

Ribeiro-Pedro, E. 1981. *Social Stratification and Classroom Discourse. A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Classroom Practice*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Rochex, J.Y., and J. Crinon, J. 2011. *La construction des inégalités scolaires*. [The construction of school inequalities]. Rennes: PUR.

Sadovnik, A. 2001. “Basil Bernstein (1924-2000)” *Prospects: the quarterly review of comparative education* XXXI (4): 687-703.

Tarabini, A., and X. Bonal. 2016. *Los principios de un sistema educativo que no deje a nadie atrás.* [Educational tenets of an equitable education system]. Madrid: Save the Children.

Vincent, C. 2017. “The children have only got one education and you have to make sure it's a good one’: parenting and parent–school relations in a neoliberal age”. *Gender and Education* 29 (5): 541-557.

Vincent, C., and S. Ball. 2006. *Childcare, Choice and Class Practices: Middle Class Parents and their Children*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Weinstein, R. S. 2002. *Reaching higher: The Power of Expectations in Schooling.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Young, M. 1971. *Kowledge and control*. London: Macmillan.