

Title: Good Intercultural Practices in Social Services Projects.

Subtitle: Study on Good Intercultural Practices in Social Services projects developed in  
Andalusia.

Title: Good Intercultural Practices in Social Services Projects.

Subtitle: Study on Good Intercultural Practices in Social Services projects developed in  
Andalusia.

Authors:

Octavio Vázquez Aguado, PhD  
Universidad de Huelva  
Mailing: Escuela de Trabajo Social  
Avda. 3 de Marzo s/n. 27071  
Huelva, Spain.  
E-mail: [octavio@uhu.es](mailto:octavio@uhu.es)

Miriam Fernández Santiago, PhD  
Universidad de Granada  
Mailing: Facultad de F<sup>a</sup> y Letras.  
Campus de Cartuja, s/n. 18071 Granada  
Spain.  
E-mail: [mirfer@ugr.es](mailto:mirfer@ugr.es)

Manuela A. Fernández Borrero, BA  
Universidad de Huelva  
Mailing: Observatorio Local de Empleo  
U. de Huelva, Avda. 3 de Marzo s/n.  
27071  
Huelva, Spain.  
E-mail: [manufb13@gmail.com](mailto:manufb13@gmail.com)

Patricia Vaz García, MA  
Universidad de Huelva  
Universidad de Huelva  
Mailing: Escuela de Trabajo Social  
Avda. 3 de Marzo s/n. 27071  
Huelva, Spain.  
E-mail: [patri.vaz@gmail.com](mailto:patri.vaz@gmail.com)

**Abstract**

This article reflects part of the results obtained from a wider research project aimed at the elaboration of a “Map of Good Intercultural Practices” in several areas of Social Intervention in Andalusia (Spain) and reports the results obtained from the analysis portion related to the participating projects within the Social Services. Intercultural assessment was conducted at the level of institutional intervention through a 32-item questionnaire that was sent to 139 intercultural project-leading institutions, but also considered the intercultural sensitivity factor of the individuals answering the questionnaire. A definition of the fundamental concepts of “Interculturality” and “Good Practice” is given to support the foundations of “Good Intercultural Practice” (GIP). Such definitions help in the design and validation of a GIP Scale that was used in the analysis of 60 Social Services Projects with an intercultural component. The results obtained underline the relevance of aspects such as intercultural empathy and show significant differences between the Social Services and other intervention sectors. The relevance of this study relies on the future possibility to find an explanation to such differences and to study GIPs in other intervention sectors. With respect to this, the private sector offers a completely blank area of research both in itself and in comparison with the results obtained from the public one. Also, the transferability of the instruments and methodology used makes it possible that the research presented in the present article is conducted in other geographical area.

**Key-Words:** Social Services, Intercultural Practice, Interculturality, Social Intervention.

## **Introduction**

The term “interculturality” has recently been defined as a social practice involving social elements or individuals with diverse cultural backgrounds (Vázquez 2009). The term appeared in the United States in the late sixties and developed in the seventies linked to the Civil Rights Movement in its claim for a fairer treatment of the ethnic difference (Husen & Opper 1994). Flecha (1994) defines “interculturality” as a form of intervention on social diversity that emphasizes the relationship among people with different cultural backgrounds. Interculturality is understood within the context of—though not mistaken with—related fields of study such as those developed on cultural and intercultural competence (Chen 1996; Cross 1989; Pedersen 2000), and multicultural/cross-cultural education (Nieto 2000; Banks 1994; McAllister 2000). All of these terms are used more or less indistinctively to refer to a same reality—where interaction among individuals with diverse cultural and/or ethnic background takes place.

The intercultural perspective—traditionally related to SL learning—is raising increasing academic and institutional interest within the field of Social Work and in relation with social programmes and services aimed at migrant populations (Hernandez-Plaza 2006; Cabrera 2003; Martínez 2006; Hernández 2003). Such interest is mainly due to the growing number of migrant population from developing or underdeveloped economies towards richer countries; an social encounter resulting in the clash of often radically different cultural backgrounds and value systems. Over the last years, many European countries have developed a increasing series of culturally sensitive social services aimed at lessening the effect of this clash (Hernández-Plaza, S.; Alonso-Morillejo, E. & Carmen Pozo-Muñoz, C., 2006). However, the implementation of culturally informed and culturally sensitive social interventions is bound to the

possibility to assess them in a professional, academically reliable way that would also allow for a better design of intercultural social services.

Although most of them include the institutional level in their definition—development of policies, administration, service delivery, etc. (Cross 1989) intercultural constructs are usually built at the individual level (e.g. development of individual skills), and are often linked to the psychological perspective. For instance, when defining the dimensions of a notion of cultural competence that supposedly involves the institutional level, Campinha-Bacote (1998), and Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) include ideas such as “consciousness,” “knowledge,” “skills” or “interaction;” dimensions that clearly refer to the individual, personal sphere rather than to the institutional one. Though somehow theoretically shy some steps have been taken in this direction within the field of Health Services (Betancourt 2005; Fox 2005; Cross 1989), and Psychology (Weissman 2006; Cardemil 2008) but there is still a remarkable theoretical and instrumental lack in determining and evaluating what a Good Intercultural Practice is at the institutional level that the present work intends to fill.

The paradoxical, empirical evidence of the low use of social services by the ethnic minorities that need them most (Hernández Plaza 2006) can be explained from Nelson’s ecological-cultural perspective and theory of oppression, and faulty assumptions of universality and essentialism (Atkinson et al., 2001; Bernal&Scharrón-del-Río, 2001; Bernal y Sáez-Santiago, 2006; Martínez & Martínez, 2006; Cardemil, 2008). According to this perspective, social services are designed according to the cultural values of a dominating social group so as to maintain the hierarchical structure that controls the use of available resources. Therefore, the accesibility of cultural and ethnic minorities to social services is restricted due to their organizational lacks in cultural competence that are listed as 1) lack of ideological compromise with diversity;

2) power imbalance/inequality in the professional-user relationship, 3) administrative and attentional practices unadapted to human diversity, and 4) professionals poorly trained in assisting users in a new demographic reality (Martínez & Martínez, 2006).

The present article outlines the creation of an instrument that would help overcome the above-mentioned restricted accessibility of cultural and ethnic minorities to social services by providing both a theoretical frame and orienting guidelines and an evaluating tool of the intercultural aspect of social services at the institutional (and not merely at the personal) level. Results are obtained from the application of such an instrument as applied to intercultural social service projects analyzing them in relation with the results obtained from a parallel study of intercultural projects in other sectors of intervention.

### **Defining GIPs:**

The intercultural social intervention aims mainly at the social cohesion resulting from preventing the rupture of the social tissue or from repairing it once it has been damaged by the social imbalances or injustices resulting from an inadequate relationship of coexistence among individuals in a culturally diverse environment. Such interventions involve promoting and establishing models of relationship and dialogue resulting from the mutual knowledge, respect and appreciation/valuing of different cultures in situations of discrimination and social inequality for cultural reasons. Thus, although the idea of interculturality itself is based on the acknowledgment, acceptance and valuing of cultural difference, it is also founded on the principle and search of social equality.

Our definition of a GIP is mainly based on the adaptation of previous studies on intercultural sensitivity developed by Milton J. Bennet (1986) and Chen & Starosta

(2000), the dimensions of interculturality elaborated by Liévano (2003), and Jordan's proposals for intercultural education (1996) to the institutional, organisational and associative levels of initiatives of intercultural social intervention. We consider that a Good Intercultural Practice (GIP) is a good practice of social intervention that aims at reinforcing social cohesion in societies that are culturally diverse by promoting intercultural relations among the diverse social collectives that conform such diversity. It includes social interventions of either systemic or organisational, and professional or individual nature. Taking into account the conceptual frame developed to define both good social-intervention practices and intercultural action (Vázquez, Fernández, Fernández and Vaz, 2009), we consider that a GIP should take into account the following guidelines:

- 1.- Its should guarantee the consultive and representative participation of culturally diverse subjects in all the aspects of the intervention.
- 2.- It should be spatially, temporally and socially feasible.
- 3.- It should involve the social whole (and not only minorities) in the planning and execution of the services/activities.
- 4.- The services/activities developed should be accessible to all its beneficiaries.
- 5.- The services provided/activities developed should be temporally sustainable or periodically repeatable.
- 6.- All the aspects of the services/activities should be comprehensibly evaluated and continuously monitorised.
- 7.- The practice should be transferable to diverse contexts.
- 8.- It should contribute to increase social cohesion.

The definition of GIPs will therefore refer to the management of cultural diversity by the involved agents within the frame of basic criteria of social justice, equal

opportunities, individual freedom, social cohesion and democratic values. In an upward 1-5 scale, the defining elements described above can determine that an intercultural service/activity is a GIP when:

1. The cultural diversity existing within a context is acknowledged.
2. A non-hierarchical reference frame is established for the processes of interaction developed among subjects with diverse cultural backgrounds.
3. Cultural diversity is accepted and tolerated.
4. There is social adaptation to cultural diversity.
5. Interculturality is promoted as a positive value.

The present study reflects part of the results obtained from a wider research project aimed at the elaboration of a “Map of Good Intercultural Practices in Andalusia” (Spain). The main objective of this project was the design of, and experimentation with an instrument that would measure Good Intercultural Practices (GIP) and their incidence in recent projects of intercultural social intervention. Here, we report the results obtained from the analysis of projects developing intercultural interventions within the area of Social Services and contrast them with those obtained in other sectors of intervention such as health, employment, or education. Both results and analyses might be relevant in providing empirical information for the implementation of policies and actions aimed at the management of diversity within a territory.

## **Methodology**

### *Participants*

Project assessment was conducted on a whole of 139 intercultural projects developed in Andalusia by diverse social agents. The selection criteria of eligible projects were: 1) a minimum of one-year duration, starting 2002-2007; 2) total or



partial, public-funding support; 3) activity aimed at immigrant population in Andalusian territory.

The activity variable—taken into account for identification purposes in later analyses—shows a high percentage for social services (43.4% of evaluated projects). Projects with an educative purpose make a 20.3% of the total; which leaves the 11.6% for projects aimed at employment/labour market and a remaining 1.4% for the health sector. Nevertheless, the second majority sector identified by the instrument was labelled “others” (23.2%), including projects from diverse areas absent from the options offered, such as the sector of communication, services, legal defense, mediation, etc. The social agent was another project-identification variable in this study. 59% of participating projects were developed by social organisations (associations, foundations, and NGOs); 32.4% were developed by city halls (community social services, local offices, diverse city councils, etc.); and the remaining 8.6% were developed by other Public Administrations.

Also, most of these projects were rather recent. At the moment they were evaluated (2007), these projects had been working at least for one year. 69.8% of the 43 projects that provided this information were the most recent in time (2002-2007); 20.9% began between 1996 and 2001; and the remaining 9.3% began between 1990 and 1995. As for the number of users, the results obtained showed that most of these projects were aimed either to a very general target population or to very specific and restricted target users. The largest percentage corresponds to projects with 200 users or less (33.3%), whereas the percentage corresponding to those projects with more than 1000 users was 23.8%. The total budget of the project makes the last project-identification variable. The highest percentage (33.7%) goes to projects with a budget inferior to 10.000€, which should not seem strange considering that most of them are funded by subventions

aimed at specific actions. This very reason would explain the fact that the number of projects shows a declining tendency as the budget increases. 15.1% of them reach a twenty-thousand-euro budget, 12.8% reach thirty-thousand, and 12.8% more than eighty thousand.

### *Instrument*

The Good Intercultural Practice Scale (GIPS) was specifically designed for the elaboration of a Map of Good Intercultural Practices in Andalusia (Vázquez et al. 2008) with the purpose of evaluating the adequacy of a project or initiative of social intervention to the concept of “Good Intercultural Practice.” It was part of a wider questionnaire that was structured in two separate parts; the first of them was addressed to action and intervention projects whereas the second was addressed at the person who was responsible for the project. The first part of the questionnaire included a series of project-identification questions (used to describe assessed projects above) such as: project/activity denomination, name of organization, year beginning activity, number of users/beneficiaries in the last year, main funding source, approximate total budget, city and main working sector. Also included in this first part was the GIPS, which is a thirty-two-item, five-point agreement/disagreement Likert scale where 1 corresponds to “completely disagree” and 5, to “completely agree.” The scale covers the following dimensions, factors and item-distribution which allow to score a GIP on the basis of their graded relevance:

	DIMENSION	CRITERIA	FACTOR	ITEM
			Contextual.....	5
1	Theoretical	Acknowledgement of Diversity	Diversity-Perception	5
			Diversity-Elements..	6
2	Ethico-ideological	Defense of Equality/ Promotion of Interaction		5

3	Socio-political	Dynamics of social transformation	7
4	Intercultural Empahty	Promotion of diverse educative processes presenting cultural interaction in equal conditions.	4

Initially, the scale included 50 items, together with several identificative questions in relation with the project and the legal entity responsible for it. This initial scale was revised by a group of experts using the item-objective congruence method, which allowed the modification, inclusion and exclusion of diverse items. The scale was then validated by a piloting process and basic descriptive, correlational and factorial analyses (Vázquez et al. 2008). The data resulting from the piloting and validation of the scale were used to construct the definitive version of the GIPS (APPENDIX I).

The second part of the questionnaire (addressed individually to the person responsible for the project) was composed of identification questions and Chen's Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (2000). Personal identification data included years working for/collaborating with the organisation/entity developing the project, city and province of residence, age, gender, nationality, education, labour category (employee/volunteer), function and position within the entity/organisation, stay in a foreign country (indicating duration) and political inclination. The reduced version of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale is a twenty-four-item, five-point agreement/disagreement Likert scale where 1 corresponds to "completely disagree" and 5, to "completely agree." Items are grouped into five dimensions, namely; implication in interaction, respect for cultural differences, confidence in interaction, enjoyment of interaction and attention to interaction. The object of the present article is the first part of the questionnaire, in relation with the analisis of project-identification data and the GIPS as an intercultural assessment tool.

This study developed a GIP Score (GIPSco) composed of eight items including the most representative ones of each dimension. In a unifactorial solution, the GIPSco permits to know in a much faster way, to which extent can a particular intercultural intervention be considered a GIP. Such items are:

- 1.- The service/project develops in an intercultural environment.
- 2.- The service/project includes among its objectives promoting understanding among the different cultures coexisting in the context of intervention.
- 3.-The beneficiaries' degree of literacy is considered.
- 4.- The service/project includes among its objectives promoting tolerance for the diverse cultures coexisting in the context of intervention.
- 5.-The service/project includes among its objectives promoting respect for the diverse cultures coexisting in the context of intervention.
- 6.- The service/project includes the participation/inclusion of individuals from different cultures.
- 7.- The service/project includes among its objectives promoting relations among the diverse cultural identities coexisting in the context of intervention.
- 8.- The service/project includes among its objectives the celebration of intercultural encounters of groups of individuals with different cultural backgrounds

### *Procedure*

The selection criteria for participants in the construction of the research universe were:

1. Preference for projects beginning in 2005 or later.
2. Projects that had been developing for a minimum of one year.
3. Projects involving basic intercultural criteria (cultural differences of users, objectives, etc.)

#### 4. Total or partial public funding.

The above criteria rendered a whole of 773 projects in the Andalusian territory, which served to create an initial database. The piloting process having involved 50 of them, the remaining 723 were sent the final version of the GIPS using the e-mail when available and ordinary mail otherwise). The mails included an introduction to the project and instructions for the cumplimentation of the questionanire. The whole process of sending and receiving the questionnaires took two months.

The resulting data (from the 139 questionnaires received) were analysed using SPSS 14.0; including correlations, fiability analysis, and mean comparisons for independent samples (Student's t-distribution). Contingency tables were used for the analyses of association for nominal variables.

### **Results**

In the sector of Social Services, the basic descriptive statistics of each dimension of the instrument show that the the highest mean is found in the intercultural-empathy dimension (4.26), whereas the lowest mean is recorded for the ethico-ideological dimension (3.61). The highest mean in the three factors of the theoretical dimension was obtained for the contextual factor (4.24); the lowest, for elements of diversity (3.45),—showing a high typical deviation of 1, 13 (Table 1). The fiability analysis of internal consistency offers an adequate fiability of .79, calculated using Cronbach's Alpha. The analysis of calculations shows statistically significant correlations ( $p < .05$ ) among all the dimensions of the scale, except for the one exisiting between the theoretical and intercultural-empathy dimension (0.1). In the theoretical dimension, only the factors of "Diversity-Perception" and "Diversity Elements" do not show a statistically significant correlation (Table 2).

The Student-t distribution analyses of the diverse sectors participating in our study also show statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) in all dimensions but the theoretical one, assuming equal variances according to Levene's test (in cases with significant differences). In the intercultural-empathy dimension, differences are found in the sectors of "health" ( $t = 2.08$ ,  $d.f. = 59$ ,  $p = .041$ ), and "employment" ( $t = 3.64$ ,  $d.f. = 73$ ,  $p = .000$ ), with a mean significantly higher in the sector of Social Services in both cases. Conversely, the sector of Social Services shows significantly inferior means in relation with the sectors of education ( $t = -2.01$ ,  $d.f. = 85$ ,  $p = .039$ ) and the group "others" ( $t = -2.44$ ,  $d.f. = 88$ ,  $p = .016$ ) in the socio-political dimension. The last statistically significant difference can be found between the sectors of social services and health within the ethico-ideological dimension ( $t = 3.64$ ,  $d.f. = 59$ ,  $p = .001$ ), with a higher mean for social services (3.61) (Tables 3-10).

Contingency tables have been used to determine the possible existence of an association between the variable of the intervention sector and the diverse project-identification variables, showing that a significant association is only established between the intervention sector and the type of entity responsible for the projects developed ( $\chi^2(8, N = 138) = 42.7$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Such association occurs between the sector of Social Services and projects developed by city halls, between the sector of health and social organisations, and between the sector "others" and projects developed by other types of public administrations (Tables 11 and 12).

The GIPSCO was used to analyse projects within the sector of Social Services in relation with several project-identification variables such as type of entity, number of users and total budget. The highest mean for the type of entity corresponds to cityhalls—maybe due to the fact that many projects are vinculated to Community Social

Services or specific local projects. Still, the GIPSCO mean of the projects developed by social entities is very close to that of cityhalls (Table 13).

The variable indicating number of users reveals a higher mean for projects with a higher number of users (4.63). This mean increases parallel to the increase in the number of users, except for the interval between 401 and 600 users, which shows the lowest mean (3.91). Concerning the budget variable, the highest mean corresponds to projects with budgets ranging between 60000 € and 70000 € (5), followed by budgets ranging between 20000 € and 30000 € (4.71).

When considering the scores obtained for projects within the sector of Social Services by each item in the GIPSCO (Table 14), the item corresponding to the contextual-theoretical dimension (item 2) shows the highest mean (4.69), followed by item 5—corresponding to the ethical dimension (4.68). In any case, the means obtained are higher than 4.3 for all items except for item 3 (3.42), corresponding to the dimension representing elements of diversity, and that reflects the literacy of users—which does not seem to be too relevant an aspect in the assessment of GIP.

A final analysis of all projects using this GIPSCO rendered the following results: Projects within the sector of Social Services showed a mean of 4.39 and a typical deviation of 0.53. The contrasts between the sectors of Social Services and Employment and between Social Services and Health (Tables 13 and 14) show statistically significant differences—( $t= 3.59$ ,  $d.f.=73$ ,  $p= .001$ ) and ( $t= 2.21$ ,  $d.f.=59$ ,  $p=.031$ ) respectively—with the highest mean ( $\bar{X} > 4$ ) for the sector of Social Services in both cases.

## Discussion

The results obtained from the psychometric analyses of the data provided by participating projects support the reliability of the GIPS as a unique and innovative tool

for the assessment of intercultural projects showing evidence of construct validity. Since public administrations keep a record of those projects that have received public funding on the basis of subject matter, public funding support was the criterion followed in a first search of intercultural social service intervention projects. Thus, we are aware that many private-funds projects are thus not included in our research. Our results are thus restricted by this circumstance. Taking into account such restrictions, the data obtained was used to assess the current status of intercultural social interventions within the sector of Social Services in Andalusia. It can be argued that this sector shows statistically significant differences when contrasted with the sectors of Health and Employment in both the Intercultural Empathy and Ethico-ideological Dimensions (which is also confirmed by the data obtained by the GIPSCO analysis). Despite the Ethico-ideological Dimension presenting the lowest mean within the sector of Social Services, it is significantly higher than in the sector of Health. Further research is needed to reveal the possible causes of these differences between sectors involving such a strong ethical and ideological load. The Intercultural Empathy Dimension gains a special relevance in the results obtained for the Sector of Social Services since it does not only present the highest mean, but also significantly exceeds the sectors of Health and Employment.

Another remarkable aspect is the difference existing between the sector of Social Services and the sector of Education, which are only significant in the Socio-Political Dimension. The sector of Education shows, together with Social Services, one of the highest percentages of projects researched in this study. Both sectors are acknowledged a recent noticeable activity in relation with intercultural matters. This fact might explain the means in the different dimensions not varying significantly in either sector—except for the above-mentioned Socio-political dimension and this maybe for



Social Services being both historically involved in the sociopolitical sphere and linked to political public administrations. As for the relation existing between the sector of Social Services and the entities responsible for projects, the above-mentioned relevance of cityhalls could be explained by the fact that most of them provide Community Social Services, whose competences involve the development of intercultural actions at the local level; a circumstance that would require further research of the connection existing between interculturality and public administrations. The relevance of this study is related to the possibility to deepen in the relation between social intervention and interculturality and to study GIP in other intervention sectors. It also allows for the inclusion of new variables that can be studied and contrasted with the ones already analysed, such as the political orientation of the institution.

The possible practical applications of the results obtained involve the creation of a reference point for the design of funding criteria, planning future interventions, taking methodological decisions for future projects and self-evaluating the intercultural aspects of ongoing projects. The diffusion of such results in the political and technical spheres could contribute to increase the social visibility of many intercultural projects that are currently being developed and allow for both their internal and external evaluation so as to better contribute to the increase of social cohesion and integration of cultural diversity.

## References

- Atkinson, D.R., Bui, U., & Mori, S. (2001). Multiculturally sensitive empirically supported treatments—An oxymoron? In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., 542–574). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Banks, James A. (1994). *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Allyn and Bacon Inc.: Needham Heights.
- Bernal, G., & Scharrón-del-Río, M.R. (2001). Are empirically supported treatments valid for ethnic minorities? Toward an alternative approach for treatment research. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*, 328–342.
- Betancourt, J.R.; Green, A.R.; Carrillo, J.E.; and Park, E.R. (2005). Cultural Competence And Health Care Disparities: Key Perspectives And Trends. *Health Affairs, 24*, (2), 499-505.
- Cabrera, P. J. (2003). La importancia de las Buenas Prácticas en los proyectos sociales. Ponencia del Seminario ‘Buenas Prácticas en la Inclusión Social’. Madrid: Cruz Roja Española.
- Cardemil, E.V. (2008). Culturally sensitive treatments: need for an organizing framework. *Culture & Psychology, 14*,(3), 357-367.
- Chen, G. M. & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. The Annual Meeting of the National Communication. (86th, Seattle, WA, November 8-12). Retrieved December 16, 2006 from [http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal;jsessionid=GbNH1LHMpQQQXIMTPxcKLzQQg921KkWchrbGV0b0VTT4lJrzvVN8!779436061?\\_nfpb=true&\\_pageLabel=ERICSearchResult&\\_urlType=action&newSearch=true&ER](http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.portal;jsessionid=GbNH1LHMpQQQXIMTPxcKLzQQg921KkWchrbGV0b0VTT4lJrzvVN8!779436061?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=ERICSearchResult&_urlType=action&newSearch=true&ER)

ICExtSearch\_SearchType\_0=au&ERICExtSearch\_SearchValue\_0=%22Chen  
+Guo-Ming%22

Cross, T., Bazron, B., Dennis, K. & Isaacs, M. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent system of care: A Monograph on Effective Services for Minority Children Who Are Severely Emotionally Disturbed: Volume I* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Child Development Center.

FEAPS (2003). Buenas prácticas FEAPS. ¿Qué son y cómo se valoran? *Red de Calidad*. Retrieved December 10, 2007 from  
[http://www.feapscv.org/web/pdf/que\\_es\\_buena\\_practica.pdf](http://www.feapscv.org/web/pdf/que_es_buena_practica.pdf)

Flecha, R. (1994). Las nuevas desigualdades educativas. En Castells, M. y otros: *Nuevas perspectivas críticas en educación*. Barcelona: Paidós, 55-82.

Fox, R.C. (2005). Cultural Competence and the Culture of Medicine. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 353, (13),1316-1319.

Hernández, s. (2003). *La Otra Cara de la Inmigración: Necesidades y sistemas de Apoyo Social*. Almería: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Almería.

Hernández-Plaza, S.; Alonso-Morillejo, E. & Carmen Pozo-Muñoz, C. (2006). Social Support Interventions in Migrant Populations. *British Journal of Social Work*. 36, (7), 1151-1169.

Husen, T. y Opper, S. (1984). *Educación multicultural y multilingüe*, Madrid, Narcea.

Jordán, J.A. (1996). *Propuestas de Educación Intercultural para Profesores*.  
Barcelona: Ed. CEAC.

Martínez, M. (2006). “La Competencia Cultural como referente de la Diversidad Humana en la Prestación de Servicios y la Intervención Social.” *Intervención Psicosocial*. 15, (2), 1-20.

- Martinez-Brawley, E. & Vázquez Aguado, O. (2008). The professionalization of Spanish social work: moving closer to Europe or away from its roots? *European Journal of Social Work*, 11, (1), 3-13.
- McAllister, G.; Irvine, J. (2000). Cross Cultural Competency and Multicultural Teacher Education *Review of Educational Research*, 70, (1), 3-24.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*. New York: Longman.
- Pedersen, P. (2000). *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness*. (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Sutton, M. (2000). Improving Patient Care, *Family Practice Management*, 7 (9). Retrieved December 11, 2008 from <http://www.aafp.org/fpm/20001000/58cult.html>
- Vázquez Aguado, O. (2005). La competencia intercultural y las habilidades de intervención en mediación social intercultural en *Manual de Atención social al inmigrante*. Córdoba: Almuzara, 107-125.
- Vázquez, O. Fernández, M., Fernández, M. A. y Vaz, P. (2009). *Mapa de Buenas Prácticas Interculturales. El Caso de Andalucía*. Granada: Comares.
- Weisman, A., Duarte, E., Koneru, V. y Wasserman, S. (2006). The Development of a Culturally Informed, Family- Focused Treatment for Schizophrenia. *Family Process*, 45 (2), 171-186.

## Appendix I.

## GIP SCALE

ITEM	DIMENSION
1. The Project/activity is developed in a multicultural context	THEORETICAL
2. The Project/activity considers the position of involved agents within the social structure	THEORETICAL
3. The Project/activity includes among its objectives promoting the <u>recognition</u> of cultural diversity in the intervention context	THEORETICAL
4. Making a <u>previous study</u> of the cultural diversity of the collectives in contact is considered important.	THEORETICAL
5. The project/activity includes among its objectives promoting the <u>mutual understanding</u> among cultures coexisting in the intervention context.	THEORETICAL
6. The project/activity considers the possible existence of <u>discriminatory practices</u> based on cultural differences.	THEORETICAL
7. Possible <u>conflicting points</u> among the diverse cultural collectives in the intervention context are foreseen.	THEORETICAL
8. The project/activity identifies the existence and nature of prejudices based on cultural differences.	THEORETICAL
9. The project/activity identifies the existence and nature of discriminatory practices based on cultural differences.	THEORETICAL
10. The project/activity explicitly condemns racist stereotypes and messages.	THEORETICAL
11. Education/Training of the agents of the project/activity is considered.	THEORETICAL
12. Education/Training of the beneficiaries of the project/activity is considered	THEORETICAL
13. Possible differences between the literacy levels/education-training areas of agents and beneficiaries of the project/activity are considered.	THEORETICAL
14. The religious confession of all the agents involved in the design and execution of the project/activity is considered.	THEORETICAL
15. The eating habits of the agents involved in the project/activity are considered.	THEORETICAL
16. The health habits of the agents involved in the project/activity are considered	THEORETICAL
17. The project/activity includes among its objectives teaching cultural minorities the language of the host community.	ETHICO-IDEOLOGICAL

---

ITEM	DIMENSION
18. The project/activity includes among its objectives providing cultural minorities with training in the ethical values of the host culture.	ETHICO-IDEOLOGICAL
19. The project/activity includes among its objectives providing cultural minorities with training in the civic values of the host culture.	ETHICO-IDEOLOGICAL
20. The project/activity includes among its objectives providing cultural minorities with academia/professional training according to the methodological model of the host culture.	ETHICO-IDEOLOGICAL
21. The project/activity includes among its objectives promoting tolerance for the diverse cultures coexisting in the intervention context.	ETHICO-IDEOLOGICAL
22. The project/activity includes among its objectives preventing possible conflicts among individuals with different reference cultural patterns who coexist in the intervention context.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
23. The project/activity includes among its objectives promoting respect for the diverse cultures coexisting in the intervention context.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
24. The project/activity promotes actions against mutual prejudices and discriminatory attitudes developed and sustained by the diverse cultures coexisting in the intervention context.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
25. The project/activity includes among its objectives the non-discrimination for cultural reasons among the agents involved in it.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
26. The project/activity includes the participation of individuals from cultures different from its own.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
27. The project/activity includes a protocol for the solution of possible intercultural conflicts.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
28. The project/activity promotes cultural pluralism among the agents involved in it.	SOCIO-POLITICAL
29. The project/activity includes among its objectives promoting relations among the diverse cultural identities coexisting in the intervention context.	INTERCULTURAL EMPATHY
30. The project/activity includes among its objectives the celebration of cultural events involving at least more than one reference culture.	INTERCULTURAL EMPATHY
31. The project/activity includes among its objectives spreading cultural identity marks of groups of individuals with diverse reference cultures (history, art, traditions, values, popular beliefs, etc)	INTERCULTURAL EMPATHY
32. The project/activity includes among its objectives the celebration of intercultural encounters among groups of individuals with diverse reference cultures.	INTERCULTURAL EMPATHY

---

Appendix II

TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

DIMENSIONS	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Typical Deviation
CONTEXTUAL	60	2.20	5.00	4.2425	.61118
CONCEPTION	58	1.80	5.00	3.7000	.78159
ELEMENTS	60	1.17	5.00	3.4500	1.12885
ETHICAL	59	1.80	5.00	3.6153	.77633
SOCIOPOL	59	2.43	5.00	4.1570	.60884
EMPATHY	59	1.25	5.00	4.2585	.93076
THEORETICAL	60	2.25	5.00	3.7881	.68651
GIP SCORE	59	2.63	5.00	4.3919	.52597
N	58				

Table 2. Correlations

		CONTEXTUAL	CONCEPTION	ELEMENTS	ETHICAL	SOCIOPOL	EMPATHY	THEORETICAL
CONTEXTUAL	Pearson Correlation	1						
	Sig. (bilateral)							
	N	60						
CONCEPTION	Pearson Correlation	.480(**)	1					
	Sig. (bilateral)	.000						
	N	58	58					
ELEMENTS	Pearson Correlation	.524(**)	.216	1				
	Sig. (bilateral)	.000	.104					
	N	60	58	60				
ETHICAL	Pearson Correlation	.289(*)	.198	.322(*)	1			
	Sig. (bilateral)	.026	.136	.013				
	N	59	58	59	59			
SOCIOPOL	Pearson Correlation	.530(**)	.365(**)	.248	.387(**)	1		
	Sig. (bilateral)	.000	.005	.058	.002			
	N	59	58	59	59	59		
EMPATHIC	Pearson Correlation	.309(*)	.103	.140	.308(*)	.535(**)	1	
	Sig. (bilateral)	.017	.440	.291	.018	.000		
	N	59	58	59	59	59	59	
THEORET	Pearson Correlation	.788(**)	.645(**)	.863(**)	.369(**)	.442(**)	.216	1
	Sig. (bilateral)	.000	.000	.000	.004	.000	.101	
	N	60	58	60	59	59	59	59

\*\* Correlation is significant at level 0,01 (bilateral).

\* Correlation is significant at level 0,05 (bilateral).

Table 3. Group Statistics (Social Services and Education)

SECTOR		N	Mean	Typical Deviation.	Mean Typical Error
CONTEXTUAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	4.2425	.61118	.07890
	EDUCACIÓN	28	4.1786	.74504	.14080
CONCEPTION	SOCIAL SERVICES	58	3.7000	.78159	.10263
	EDUCACIÓN	28	4.1286	.69754	.13182
ELEMENTS	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.4500	1.12885	.14573
	EDUCACIÓN	28	3.6036	.89555	.16924
ETHICAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	3.6153	.77633	.10107
	EDUCACIÓN	27	3.4796	1.11995	.21553
SOCIOPOL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.1570	.60884	.07926
	EDUCACIÓN	28	4.4456	.57713	.10907
EMPATHY	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.2585	.93076	.12117
	EDUCACIÓN	28	4.3065	.89122	.16842
THEORET	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.7881	.68651	.08863
	EDUCACIÓN	28	3.9500	.58983	.11147

Table 4. Independent Sample Test (Social Services and Education)

		Levene Test for Equality of Variance		T-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Difference Between Means	Typical Error for Difference	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
									Inferior	Superior
CONTEXT	Equal Variances Assumed	1.015	.317	.426	86	.671	.06393	.15017	-.23461	.36246
CONCEPT	Equal Variances Assumed	.205	.652	-2.465	84	.016	-.42857	.17388	-.77435	-.08280
ELEMEN	Equal Variances Assumed	2.883	.093	-.632	86	.529	-.15357	.24286	-.63636	.32922
ETHICAL	Equal Variances NOT Assumed	10.211	.002	.570	37.871	.572	.13562	.23805	-.34635	.61759
SOCIOPL	Equal Variances Assumed	.749	.389	-2.100	85	.039	-.28860	.13745	-.56189	-.01531
EMPATHY	Equal Variances Assumed	.025	.874	-.228	85	.820	-.04807	.21075	-.46711	.37096
THEORET	Equal Variances Assumed	2.020	.159	-1.075	86	.285	-.16181	.15052	-.46104	.13742



Table 5. Group Statistics (Social Services and Health)

SECTOR		N	Mean	Typical Deviation	Mean Typical Error
CONTEXTUAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	4.2425	.61118	.07890
	HEALTH	2	3.8000	.84853	.60000
CONCEPTION	SOCIAL SERVICES	58	3.7000	.78159	.10263
	HEALTH	2	3.9000	.70711	.50000
ELEMENTS	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.4500	1.12885	.14573
	HEALTH	2	3.2500	2.00347	1.41667
ETHICAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	3.6153	.77633	.10107
	HEALTH	2	1.6000	.28284	.20000
SOCIOPOL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.1570	.60884	.07926
	HEALTH	2	3.8571	.00000	.00000
EMPATHY	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.2585	.93076	.12117
	HEALTH	2	2.8750	.17678	.12500
THEORET	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.7881	.68651	.08863
	HEALTH	2	3.6250	1.23744	.87500

Table 6. Independent Sample Test (Social Services and Health)

		Levene Test for Equality of Variance		T-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Difference between Means	Typical Error for Difference	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
									Inferior	Superior
CONTEXTUAL	Equal Variances Assumed	.138	.712	1.000	60	.322	.44250	.44270	-.44303	1.32803
CONCEPTION	Equal Variances Assumed	.164	.687	-.356	58	.723	-.20000	.56123	-1.32343	.92343
ELEMENTS	Equal Variances Assumed	1.225	.273	.242	60	.809	.20000	.82582	-1.45188	1.85188
ETHICAL	Equal Variances Assumed	1.847	.179	3.637	59	.001	2.01525	.55406	.90658	3.12393
SOCIOPOL	Equal Variances Assumed	2.763	.102	.691	59	.492	.29984	.43403	-.56865	1.16833
EMPATHY	Equal Variances Assumed	1.796	.185	2.084	59	.041	1.38347	.66372	.05538	2.71157
THEORET	Equal Variances Assumed	1.382	.244	.325	60	.747	.16315	.50262	-.84224	1.16854

Table 7. Group Statistics (Social Services and Employment)

SECTOR		N	Mean	Typical Deviation	Mean Typical Error
CONTEXTUAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	4.2425	.61118	.07890
	EMPLOYMENT	16	4.0000	.63246	.15811
CONCEPTION	SOCIAL SERVICES	58	3.7000	.78159	.10263
	EMPLOYMENT	16	3.5438	.89440	.22360
ELEMENTS	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.4500	1.12885	.14573
	EMPLOYMENT	16	3.5000	1.09545	.27386
ETHICAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	3.6153	.77633	.10107
	EMPLOYMENT	16	3.4969	1.24666	.31166
SOCIOPOL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.1570	.60884	.07926
	EMPLOYMENT	16	3.8095	.82863	.20716
EMPATHY	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.2585	.93076	.12117
	EMPLOYMENT	16	3.2500	1.15830	.28958
THEORET	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.7881	.68651	.08863
	EMPLOYMENT	16	3.6708	.74877	.18719

Table 8. Independent Sample Test (Social Services and Employment)

		Levene Test for Equality of Variance		T-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Difference between Means	Typical Error for Difference	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
									Inferior	Superior
CONTEXT	Equal Variances Assumed	.024	.878	1.400	74	.166	.24250	.17320	-.10260	.58760
CONCEPT	Equal Variances Assumed	.142	.708	.686	72	.495	.15625	.22771	-.29769	.61019
ELEMEN	Equal Variances Assumed	.010	.921	-.158	74	.875	-.05000	.31574	-.67912	.57912
ETHICAL	Equal Variances Assumed			.470	73	.640	.11838	.25183	-.38351	.62027
SOCIOPL	Equal Variances Assumed	2.556	.114	1.868	73	.066	.34746	.18603	-.02331	.71822
EMPATHY	Equal Variances Assumed	1.361	.247	3.644	73	.000	1.00847	.27674	.45692	1.56003
THEORET	Equal Variances Assumed	.061	.805	.596	74	.553	.11731	.19684	-.27489	.50952

Table 9. Group Statistics (Social Services and Others)

SECTOR		N	Mean	Typical Deviation	Mean Typical Error
CONTEXTUAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	4.2425	.61118	.07890
	OTHERS	32	4.4891	.47276	.08357
CONCEPTUAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	58	3.7000	.78159	.10263
	OTHERS	32	3.9844	.88713	.15682
ELEMENTS	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.4500	1.12885	.14573
	OTHERS	32	3.6563	1.07758	.19049
ETHICAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	3.6153	.77633	.10107
	OTHERS	32	3.3469	1.05057	.18572
SOCIOPOLITICAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.1570	.60884	.07926
	OTHERS	31	4.4639	.46854	.08415
EMPATHY	SOCIAL SERVICES	59	4.2585	.93076	.12117
	OTHERS	32	4.2969	.92335	.16323
THEORETICAL	SOCIAL SERVICES	60	3.7881	.68651	.08863
	OTHERS	32	4.0127	.65322	.11547

Table 10. Independent Sample Test (Social Services and Others)

		Levene Test for Equality of Variance		T-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	gl	Sig. (bilateral)	Difference between Means	Typical Error for Difference	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
									Inferior	Superior
CONTEX	Equal Variances NOT Assumed	5.323	.023	-2.145	78.235	.035	-.24656	.11494	-.47537	-.01775
CONCEPT	Equal Variances Assumed	.097	.757	-1.574	88	.119	-.28438	.18064	-.64336	.07461
ELEMENT	Equal Variances Assumed	.143	.706	-.848	90	.399	-.20625	.24330	-.68960	.27710
	Equal Variances NOT Assumed	6.172	.015	1.269	49.749	.210	.26838	.21144	-.15636	.69312
SOCIOP	Equal Variances Assumed	1.730	.192	-2.449	88	.016	-.30692	.12532	-.55597	-.05787
EMPATHY	Equal Variances Assumed	.221	.639	-.188	89	.851	-.03840	.20378	-.44330	.36650
THEORET	Equal Variances Assumed	1.073	.303	-1.519	90	.132	-.22458	.14781	-.51822	.06907

Table 11. Main Sector of Intervention and Type of Entity

			Type of Entity			Total
			Public Adm. City Halls	Public Adm	Social Entities and Administrations	
SECTOR	SOCIAL SERVICES	Recount	36	2	22	60
		Expected Frecuency	19.6	5.2	35.2	60.0
		%SECTOR	60.0%	3.3%	36.7%	100.0%
	EDUCACIÓN	Residues Corrected	6.0	-2.0	-4.6	
		Recount	4	1	23	28
		Expected Frecuency	9.1	2.4	16.4	28.0
	%SECTOR	14.3%	3.6%	82.1%	100.0%	
	HEALTH	Residues Corrected	-2.3	-1.1	2.8	
		Recount	0	0	2	2
		Expected Frecuency	.7	.2	1.2	2.0
	%SECTOR	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	EMPLOYMENT	Residues Corrected	-1.0	-.4	1.2	
		Recount	1	3	12	16
		Expected Frecuency	5.2	1.4	9.4	16.0
	%SECTOR	6.3%	18.8%	75.0%	100.0%	
	OTHERS	Residues Corrected	-2.4	1.5	1.4	
		Recount	4	6	22	32
		Expected Frecuency	10.4	2.8	18.8	32.0
	%SECTOR	12.5%	18.8%	68.8%	100.0%	
	Total	Residues Corrected	-2.8	2.3	1.3	
		Recount	45	12	81	138
Expected Frecuency		45.0	12.0	81.0	138.0	
%SECTOR Main Sector of Intervention		32.6%	8.7%	58.7%	100.0%	

Table 12. Chi-square Test

	Value	gl	Sig. (bilateral)
Pearson Chi-square	42.741(a)	8	.000
Verisimilitude Quotient	44.271	8	.000
Linear by Linear Association	16.878	1	.000
N of valid Cases	138		

Table 13. GIPSCO Statistics (Project-identification Variables)

		Mean Score
Type of Entity	Public Administration (Cityhalls)	4.44
	Public Administration (others)	3.38
	Social Entities and Organisations	4.41
Number of Users	1 to 200	4.27
	201 to 400	4.28
	401 to 600	3.91
	601 to 800	4.54
	801 to 1000	4.58
	More than 1000	4.63
Budget	1 to 10000	4.44
	10001 to 20000	4.43
	20001 to 30000	4.71
	30001 to 40000	4.58
	40001 to 50000	3.06
	50001 to 60000	3.97
	60001 to 70000	5
	70001 to 80000	4.25
	More than 80000	4.28

Table 14. GIPSCO Statistics

Item	N	Mean	Dev.
1	60	4.43	.745
2	59	4.69	.650
3	60	3.42	1.533
4	59	4.64	.663
5	60	4.68	.651
6	59	4.41	.698
7	59	4.58	.675
8	59	4.31	1.149