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ABSTRACT

The metropolitan area of Madrid has been transformed over the past decades under the leadership of the capital, but also under newly applied regional policies, due to the progressive increase of competencies assumed by the political regional authority (Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid), since 1983. Suburbanization and later periurbanization population dynamics of settlement, along with the spread of economical activities around the capital, driven by a constant policy of new infrastructures, have changed the relevance of its centrality. However, socio-spatial segregation between cities of the region is still as relevant as it is inside the city, where historical and new patterns of social and spatial inequality have been increasing over the past decade. In this context, the aim of this paper is to analyse the relationship between the increase and persistence of socio-economical inequality and the patterns of spatial social production, specifically focusing on the disparity in educational opportunities. Three variables will be taken into account: socio-spatial inequality, young students with educational problems living in disadvantaged areas, and regional education policy, attempting to discover how educational policies are managing social segregation and social vulnerabilities in the region. In order to analyse this relationship our paper will be divided in four sections. The first one will be focused on theoretical reflections on the persistence of socio-spatial inequalities in European cities, and the problems around this issue (lack of social cohesion, gentrification and gated communities, intergenerational reproduction of vulnerabilities, socio-spatial stigmatization and political disaffection). The second one will show how spatial segregation has been increasing in the region over the past decades, especially after the accelerated and recent arrival of immigrants. Thirdly, we will focus on education policy in the region, paying attention to educational plans designed for students with social, educational and spatial vulnerabilities, with regards to obtaining a compulsory secondary school degree.

Introduction

This paper is a work in progress resulting of new research centred on considering how social urban space is produced, especially in relation with inequality and political and social disconnection. In fact, this is not a new or isolated concern, but on the contrary it is placed in a Social Sciences debate in which space has been included in order to analyse social and political change in contemporary cities (Bourdieu 1999; Harvey 1990; Luton 1999, Massey 1993, Oberti 2007, Soja 1989; Wacquant 1999, 2001). This approach is mainly based on the consideration of space as a social fact and no longer just as a Euclidian scene –or a neutral landscape- where acts occur. Therefore in opposition to determinist conceptions of space and territory considered as natural
power resources, physical space is one which is produced, modified and designed constantly by
social and political actions through planning, acting and appropriating strategies and discourses
naturalized over time (Bourdieu 1999:122) and always in relation to an asymmetrical power
geometry (Massey 1993). In Lefebvre’s terms, space is intrinsically linked to social processes, but
not only to economical dynamics that modify spatial practises on all scales, but also to political
spatial discourses and collective and individual everyday spatial projections and utopias (Lefebvre
1991). Therefore, some scholars are also trying to analyse how daily interactions with space as
much as with spatial ways of knowing are also constructing our consciousness, the meaning of
where we are, how the others are seen by us, and about the possibility of changing those spatial

Moreover, it is generally accepted, how a strong pattern of increasing inequality in cities has been
developed last years, specially, in those cases of hyper-connected cities to global arena (Saseen
2001), where post-fordist production has already being spread (Wacquant 1999, 2000, Jessop
2004, Kesteloot 2003). In these global cities there are groups of citizens, located in the most
successful places of the city, working in the most demanded financial or high-tech services areas,
using private services (health, transport, education, security), and everyday connecting with similar
group of people mainly in just some exclusive areas of consumption and leisure. However these
spatial patterns are not new, most of European cities are being historically segregated, and
although Welfare States were able to reduce inequality after the Second World War, it is
underlined that nowadays the social mobility has been reduced, while States are not being able to
avoid societal risks of the population in a globalizing and interconnecting context. In that sense,
cities are considered segmented or dualised (Hamnett 2003, Mollenkopf and Castells 1991,
Marcuse 1989) because at the same time, there are groups of citizens living linked to economical
sectors less connected, less successfully located in the global and local scales, with low salaries
and precarious labour condition, not only just because they are low-skilled, as it could happen
years ago after deindustrialization, but also due to the difficulties to reach those more successful
jobs if your are not “in the correct place” or “able to be mobilised”

In that sense, social distance between citizens is enlarging, not only because of income differences,
but also, due to other factors related to the existing social distance, such as familiar and social
networks, differential places where people are able to study and live in, and the existence of less
possibilities for social mobility. Also, there are other factors leading to social exclusion, such as
“increasing numbers of female-headed households, immigration, the formation of ethnic enclaves,
exclusion of parts of the population from the labour force due to skills mismatch or disability, and
economic dualization between oligopolistic and competitive sectors of the economy” (Fanstein
2001: 85). These factors are creating a new regimen of marginality (Wacquant 2001). In relation
with the spatial expression of those new processes, one of the most characteristic elements in contemporary global cities, is the existence of different types of neighbourhoods living mostly spaced out, without territorial or symbolic continuity: “These may include neighbourhoods which have traditionally offered homes for people of the highest levels of income and wealth; neighbourhoods characterised by a diversity of recent economic migrant groups; neighbourhoods whose defining character arises from the combination of deindustrialisation and increased property prices; neighbourhoods of radical countercultures; and neighbourhoods of the expanding metropolitan classes characterised often by high levels of education” (Webber 2007: 184).

So, the point at hand would be how those differential spaces are interconnected, and if there are differences between the social life inside them, in order to link social spaces and inequality. In that sense, recently it seems that place matters, since some authors are showing how in the most connected cities such as New York, London or Paris, the increase of inequality is more severe than in other, less globalised cities. This is also due to different patterns of dealing with social segregation over the past decades. So, although we could talk about the appearance of a new generalized regime of marginality, Wacquant has shown that there are quite substantial differences between American ghettos, French banlieus, and for example depressed areas in Madrid or Barcelona, in Spain. In that sense, for some scholars the neighbourhood effect is less significant in Europe than in cities of North America (Musterd et al. (2002), Luton (2003), Wacquant (2001)).

However, as Fainstein pointed out: “Although scholars have shown that growth and equity do not necessarily reinforce each other, and in contemporary cities growth seems to be driving the tendency toward greater inequality. Nevertheless, it does not demonstrate that appropriate policy cannot produce both economic development and greater social welfare” (2001: 85), and also we could add how the absence of some public policies could enlarge the social distance already produced between social groups.

---

1 Según Mustard (2006:124): “European authors such as Friedrichs (1998), R. Andersson (2001), Atkinson and Kintrea (2001), Ostendorf et al. (2001), Whitehead (2002), E. Andersson (2004) and Musterd (2002) can be called upon to illustrate the European position. Most of them do not deny the existence of neighbourhood effects, but many clarify that these effects are relatively minor or not fully understood”, and therefore, he underlined that: “There appears to be a great need for two further types of study, of which there have been few examples up to now. First, in-depth qualitative studies, which try to shed some light inside the black box of neighbourhood effect processes. Crucial questions in this type of research are: how actually does the socialization process evolve at the neighbourhood level? What is the impact of local peer groups on adolescent’s behaviour, values and norms? Are social networks of poor (unemployed) people still predominantly local and what is their role in escaping from poverty? A good example of this kind of study is the work by Blokland-Potters (2003) on social relations in a poverty-stricken neighbourhood in the city of Rotterdam, the Netherlands. The second type of research, the type we aim to contribute to, is large-scale longitudinal research”
Therefore, this paper is placed in a debate around how historical patterns of urban segregation have changed recently, increasing the material and symbolic distance between people living in different areas of the Metropolitan Area. However, although we will use empirical data in order to show the differences between social spaces\(^2\), the aim of this research it is to understand the relationship between socio-spatial inequalities, equal opportunities and the position of the subject in the urban community. In other words, how socio-spatial differences become a source of inequality would be the most difficult relation to be understood and explained in contemporary urban contexts. In that sense, we will use the educational segregation as an excuse to analyse these process.

Therefore, the following sections will be centred on how the Madrid Metropolitan area has been globalizing, in the context of being a European city, later showing which kind of spatial differences in social production have been produced and how. Then, we will revise the role of educative performance in relation to inequality, in order to finally analyse how spatial inequality and educative itineraries are being internalized by people characterised by living in some deprived areas, and having some social vulnerability which could lead them into social exclusion.

**Madrid in its context of globalizing as an European City**

Madrid is not as high in the global city hierarchy as other European cities are, mainly due to its lower internationalization and technological level, according to Euro Stat and National Statistical Offices data (2002). However, the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) has projected how the Madrid metropolitan area will have attraction and polarisation potential in 2030, in a trend scenario (ESPON 2007: 9) categorized as a European Engine city. These European projections are being built because there is concern about socio-spatial inequalities between European cities and their impact on the territorial cohesion of the European Union. In that sense, the European Spatial Strategy developed in 1999, pointed out the negative effect of the persistence of a high-connected area called “pentagon” when at the same time there was also a clearly spatial disconnection between other less developed areas or those placed in the periphery. In that sense, this main area was conceptualised as a flux space, since London, Paris, Milan, Munich and Hamburg are seen as a hyper-dense net of mobility and interconnections, while other urban areas are just seen as potential dynamic areas but still disconnected from Global and European scales. In order to reverse this situation, European governments decided to develop a strategy to create new polycentric areas in European territory in order to become into a more competitive region, mostly in opposition to United States, generating a more social and sustainable cohesion space inside

---

\(^2\) During the following sections, we will consider social space as the result of historically reification of social groups in physical space, however the already existence administrative and political divisions: districts, regional areas, and neighbourhoods as bounded areas will also be our spatial references.
European frontiers. Therefore, European regional policies are impelling regions, localities and cities to improve their infrastructures, capabilities and social capital, funding through INTERREG, URBAN, LEADER, and other small initiatives, especially those projects involving reinforcement a) transnational networks of cities, b) bottom-up perspectives, c) metropolitan and regional interconnected projects, as well as those c) concerned with urban regeneration and social cohesion.

However, European cities are also competing in the global arena, trying to reach a better place in the ranking of global cities, because it is generally accepted that the external insertion of each city by its own, could make a different in terms of economical growth, attractiveness for investments and touristic industry. In this dual competitive and cooperative context, Madrid has been transformed during the last decades, recovering first from deindustrialization stage of eighties, and later from the economical crisis of nineties. In fact, road and train infrastructures, metro lines, and neighbourhood building renovation have been developed with the effort of local and regional authorities, while at the same time the priority of beautifying the city has converted it into an international cultural reference, but also a well-known commercial and international conferences meeting place. In that sense, all the government parties and local and regional authorities are still fostering the city candidature to reach the celebration of the Olympic Games, trying to delete the image of security lack that old and new terrorism attacks have already left. Also, the relevance of urban cohesion is being taken into account, following the European advices, which connect urban cohesion with better levels of competitiveness.

However, it seems that old and new patterns of inequality, inside the metropolitan area, are still existing and reinforcing differential social space and increasing social distance among social groups\(^3\), which is nowadays related with social disparities but also with increasing generally closing attitudes towards migrants and symbolic differences. In that sense, the purpose of this essay is to show how although we could consider that vulnerability is less spatially concentrated in

---

\(^3\) This is also happening in global cities, inside and outside the pentagon. As, Kesteloot has already studied: “Most European cities will, according to their position in the European space (…) display a dominance of centre-periphery contrasts. North and south of the blue banana, including its south end with relatively late industrialisation, one finds still a significant presence of the upper and middle class in the inner cities. (…) In some cases, one could find rich and poor configurations both in centre and periphery. A good example is Naples, with still a pre-industrial environment in the inner city where rich and poor are fairly mixed, suburban developments for the upper class on the western hills along the coast and very problematic high-rise social housing estates in the north (Morlicchio 2001). In Scandinavian cities, strong egalitarian principles and the fully developed welfare state have kept socio-economic differentiation to a minimum and this translates into configurations more characterised by their epoch than by the social groups they house.” (2003: 13)
Madrid than other American or European global cities, there are also historical and new patterns of socio-spatial production which are showing the persistence of inequality in the Metropolitan area of Madrid, and an increasing pattern of social and political disconnection due to among other factors the absence of public efforts to release the perception of social distance and political disaffection among citizens. Let see briefly how through different times and spaces the production of social space in Madrid was consolidating.

**Historical Patterns of Segregation: inequality and spatial social production**

We have already pointed at how social production of space is clearly related to inequality of power relation, not only because of the capitalist system, but also because historically the city has been produced segmentally by policies or the absence of policies. Following those theoretical premises, we should think that the relationship, between inequality and the city, has not always been the same, neither at each time, nor at every place, and therefore following Kesteloot we also considered that “the mosaic, or the socio-spatial structure of the city results from historical processes. The period in which these environments are created and the organisation of the economy and the state of class struggle at the time are reflected in the type of housing, the material and institutional organisation for collective consumption and the spatial arrangement of the area” (2003: 4)

In that sense, Madrid was historically designed (XVIII to XIX) trying to keep the centre separate from the outskirts (arrabales), later although the development of the city was planned rationally, in fact, the “real” growth was spread among the outskirt where waves of rural migrants were established. Since the beginning of the XX century people started living in the margin of way out roads of the city, in the North (Tetuan), East North (Prosperidad) and Southeast (the beginning of Vallecas Bridge) (Bataller et al. 2004: 39). Since then, the concentric model of the growing city was changed and therefore, the city was overflowed due to a tentacle and an untidy spread, creating the metropolitan phenomenon (Serrano 2002: 460). In that sense, the historical spatial segregation between centre and periphery was being increased between an organized and compact city, concentriring most of the people (500.000 inhabitants) and a spontaneous and fragmented extra radial, without territorial connection. Part of this extra radial was incorporated into the city between 1947 and 1954\(^4\), while other settlements started to be considered as, and still are today, the metropolitan crown area (from 23 to 26 towns), although by then there were only 50.000 inhabitants. Soon, new municipal districts added to Madrid started to become the centre of

---

\(^4\) New Madrid districts were Aravaca, El Pardo, Fuencarral, Chamartín, Hortaleza, Canillas, Canillejas, Barajas, Vicálvaro, Vallecas, Villaverde, Carabanchel Alto y Bajo.
industrial activities, mainly Chamartín, Ventas, Villaverd, etc (Terán 1999:63), absorbing the migrant waves coming from rural areas nowadays, developing an urbanization that is peripheral yet dependent on the centre.

As Leal (2004: 2) has noticed the General Urban Plan in 1946, Plan Bidagor, planned the city with natural functioning order. In that sense, taking into account the natural resources and the type of inhabitants, the city was divided into three differential areas, the head of the city was the bourgeoisie and the middle classes area, while the feet of the city were those areas in which the working class used to live, considering a link between each group in each place. There was not only a difference between which people were living and would be living in each, but also there were differences in the buildings, in North-West of the city the stoned building and the green landscapes, were a different environment from the Southern districts, where brick buildings and dried terrains were common.

As classical studies are classified, the urban evolution of European Cities between the 70s and 90s followed three main steps: first, the urbanization and concentration of activities in urban space, starting at the beginning of the fifties; secondly, the suburbanization (decline of city centre and decentralization); and, lastly, desurbanization and deconcentration (dispersion of activities in the satellite towns reaching even rural areas: per urbanization) (Turok y Mykhenko 2007: 166). In Madrid, after the first stage of urbanization, two main phenomena were going to be central elements in the social production of space: the exponential increase of population and the new development and industrial policies.

The already existing rural-urban migrant wave was hugely increased, fostered by the National Development Plans (1964-1967 and 1968-1971), whose main objective was the economical growth without paying attention to the impact it could have on morphology and urban structure. In that sense, as Terán pointed out, there was no coordination between development policies and urban policies, which represents a strong charge for the city. The new development project started to change the city, increasing labourers from 351.000 in the sixties, to 539.000 in 1967, while the population grew exponentially during this decade. The problem of housing became the main urban issue as much as equipment and communication infrastructure and public services started to be a popular claiming, first in the peripheral neighbourhoods, but also later, in the municipalities of the metropolitan area. In that sense, spatial patterns of inequality were concentrating in some areas, in which migrants were concentrating in worse conditions of habitability and where land use was mainly planned for industrial uses.
For example, the social space of neighbourhoods such as Villaverde was produced in relation with demographic pressure of migrants coming from Andalucía, Extremadura, and closer provinces, insufficient infrastructure and habitability housing, and mainly with the concentration of industrial activities, especially automotive one (Fernández 2005). Therefore, when the industrial dismantling was placed during the seventies, the Villaverde district was, at the beginning of the eighties, once again distressed by the lost of high percentages of employment, reaching a 20% unemployment rate at the beginning of the eighties, 4 points over the Madrid rate (16.2). There, young people – desanimados- were at the point of not even looking for employment, becoming dramatically implicated with heroine consumption, petty shady deals, and burglaries (Denche y Alguacil 1986). In this context, industrial and working class neighbourhoods started to be nodes of politization, converting themselves into local actors, looking for radical change in their neighbourhoods, mainly crying out for the improvement of infrastructures, public services and equipment, but also asking for the solution of high density population due to the concentration of migrant populations” (Terán 1999: 107). The appearance of democratic local governments was the special context paying attention to citizen claims, first through social support but later through the first democratic spatial planning. In that moment, social urban movement was clearly reinforced becoming a political actor with almost 400 hundred urban associations (Terán 1999: 110). As a response, during the 90s a Neighbourhood Regeneration Plan was developed in Madrid, having a strong impact on the Villaverde and Usera districts, designed by the public administration and neighbourhood associations. Although, a new social movement emerged in 1997, the Movement for the Southern Dignity, involved in the designed of a new Action Plan, with the Autonomous Regional Government and the Municipal Government.

However since the beginning of the seventies, the economical crisis and the exhaustion of peripheral neighbourhoods, the migrant and working class population of the municipality was concentrated, led other areas to started becoming the new emergent population centres in the metropolitan area, increasing since 1965 by around one and half million inhabitants. New problems started in those areas, where little villages became urban centres some of them reaching 100,000 inhabitants, already by 1975. Nowadays, at least six of those southern cities have more than this: Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada, Getafe, Leganés y Móstoles, concentrating not only population but also industrial employment (Costa 2007: 10) although they were still clearly dependent on the City of Madrid. In that sense, from the seventies to the eighties the main urban policies were centred on improving communication infrastructures, trying to solve the disorganized growth of the capital and the metropolitan area, and trying to progress radial roads and rail networks, and also improving old interurban roads (Serrano 2002: 460)
Later, during the eighties, the economical reorganization based on deconcentration of industrial activity was produced, while at the same time new patters of spatialization started to be substituted. Therefore, old concentration of population in the first and second metropolitan crowns was progressively changed by a new pattern of urbanization: a peripherally and disperse model, known as periurbanism\(^5\) or deurbanization (Turok y Mykhenko 2007: 166). In fact, nowadays this process of urban sprawl is accompanied by a generalized new pattern of consumption and production. Even now, it is possible to find new business/science parks and new housing projects in closer provinces, such as Toledo, Avila and Guadalajara, all over the Henares Corridor where most industrial activity is being concentrated due to new fast communications (Costa 2007: mad10.htm).

Mainly, this urban sprawl was possible because of great investments in infrastructures developed during the nineties that are still increasing. The increase of orbital roads of distribution and the creation of double routes in almost all radial axes favoured the change of land uses and economic activities, consolidating urban settlement over radial roads, orbital roads and intersections, and planning new urbanization areas for residential use (PRET 1997), as has happened in Montecarmelo, Sanchinarro, Carabanchel, Valdebernardo, Boadilla del Monte, Las Rozas business park (intersection between M-50 and La Coruña highway), Southern Lineal Park around M-50 (Arroyo Culebro) (Serrano 2002: 461). Some of them can be considered almost Edge Cities, especially Boadilla del Monte and Las Rozas, in the west of the metropolitan area, but also Tres Cantos and Alcobendas, in the north, where national and international enterprises are being located. In that sense, it is important to point out, according to Ocaña, that the periphery is not homogenous anymore, as it used to be during the fordist stage. There are some factors giving different economic and symbolic value to each area of the periphery, in that sense middle and high classes are now located in a new periphery far (symbolic and materialistic) from those suburban areas and peripheral municipalities, which from the beginning (the 60’s and 70s) were the places where the working-class and migrant populations started to live, and where international migration is concentrated in the highest percentages, since the beginning of the XXI century, as we will later see.

In conclusion, the physical space of the city and the metropolitan area has been rebuilt according to different stages of the economical phases, through infrastructure policies and planning (or it absence), but also due to social structure changes, which throughout time have been naturalized. As Bourdieu (1999) suggested, social space is developed in physical space, being reified through

---

\(^5\) “This strong dynamism of the per urbanism in Madrid is related to two main factors: the characteristics of the housing market and the quality, cheaper and more easily paid housing, in the areas close to main roads (north-N1 and south-N5). In those areas housing market is designed for low income families unable to pay for a house in the metropolitan region” (Estébanez, J. 1990, quoted in Pozo 1998: 308-309)
an unequal distribution of goods and services, as well as the dissimilar location of individual and collective agents in a manner that more or less allow for appropriation of those goods and services, often through symbolic violence. According to the French author, different social relation systems, social fields in his terms, are sediments in physical space, overlapping themselves, creating not only the *habitus*\(^6\) in each space, but also, the networks of social relations, in which they are going to live and feel, who they are, what they could pursue and how they could live with others (Bourdieu 1999:122). Although, social fields are difficult to analyse through quantitative data, we will consider, as a first step, the need to show how the economic and social field is being overlapped in social spaces, when a homogeneous population with a similar income average, level of cultural background and employments are bounded as social spaces.

Social fields and its spatial concentration in Madrid

As we can observe on the map, mainly due to the historical patterns in the late eighties, differences between the centre and the north of Madrid City and the South and West districts were very significant. There were no significant differences between percentages of population, although slightly more population was located in the light blue area (Southern districts (55%). However, the differences started with the type of employment. Clearly, manual workers were concentrated mostly in the South and East districts (65%) while occupation in service sectors was highly representative in the Centre and North districts (82%), as well as persons with superior education,

---

\(^6\) We use this term as Mills suggests it to be most appropriate, so as not to understand it as a determinant as other authors have interpreted it for the agency, so according to her: “The term characterises the recurring patterns of social class outlook – the beliefs, values, conduct, speech, dress and manners – that are inculcated by everyday experiences within the family, the peer group and the school. Implying habit, or unthinking-ness in actions, the *habitus* operates below the level of calculation and consciousness, underlying and conditioning and orienting practices by providing individuals with a sense of how to act and respond in the course of their daily lives ‘without consciously obeying rules explicitly posed as such’ (Bourdieu 1990a, 76). That is, the *habitus* disposes actors to do certain things, orienting their actions and inclinations, without strictly determining them” (Mills 2008: 80)
and other indicators of well being such as sports installations and secondary schools. If we would pay attention to the metropolitan area, we could find a similar pattern; there was a higher concentration of industrial activity in the southern and western municipalities of the first metropolitan crown, where low salaries and GDP per capita were also concentrated.

Since then, not only economical but also social and cultural differences between areas were significant after a period of economical crisis, but two decades later we could ask ourselves if this pattern of segregation, understood as the different concentration of socio-economic homogenous population in different areas of the city, is still as significant as it used to be. Unfortunately, recently, official urban diagnoses in Madrid City and those related with territorial imbalance are showing how a differential concentration of population with worse economical and social conditions it is still important. In fact Leal (2004) one of the most well known urban sociologists has pointed out that the segregation index\(^7\) in Madrid is one of the highest of the European cities, mainly based on housing market behaviour.

But, what it is even more relevant is how the historical pattern of socio-spatial segregation has been reproduced over the past decade, after a period of higher convergence during the eighties and the early nineties (Leal 2007:24), measured with the increased average income deviation between census sections in the Madrid Community. In that sense, using the \textit{Sigma Index}\(^8\), in Madrid City, it is possible to observe a tendency of territorial imbalance growth, taking into account the GDP per capita (Barómetro Económico 2004: 7), although latest data included are related to 2000.

If we try to find a pattern of localization of district Incomes data in 2000, we could classify them into different categories, following an official report published by the Madrid Council, titled \textit{Territorial Imbalance in Madrid municipality}.

\footnote{An index which shows the spatial separation of a subpopulation from the rest of the total inhabitants of a municipality (Musterd 2000, quoted from Torner 2002: 21).}

\footnote{Sigma index measured the dispersion of values of each district in relation to the municipal average.}
Low Income Districts (75% lower of the average): Puente de Vallecas, Usera, Villaverde and Vicalvaro.

Medium-Low Income Districts (between 75% and 95% of the average): Carabanchel, Villa de Vallecas, San Blas, Latina and Moratalaz.

Medium Districts (between 95% and 105% of the average) Centro, Arganzuela, Tetuán and Ciudad Lineal.

Medium-High Districts (between 105% and 125% of the average) Hortaleza, Barajas and Fuencarral-El Pardo.

High Districts (over 125% of the average) Retiro, Chamberí, Moncloa-Aravaca, Salamanca and Chamartín.

The central almond of Madrid City and the West Districts are those where the highest levels of richness is still concentrated, in opposition of what is happening in the rest of the area, the strong contrast between the north and the south being noticeable (OBS 2004: 6: 1ª.2). This pattern of difference can be observed even more clearly if we pay attention to the neighbourhoods as we can see in the next figure.

![Table showing income levels in different districts of Madrid](image)

Also, differences inside neighbourhoods are generally less important, even imperceptible in the peripheral districts, than in those better equipped (OBECO 2006: 3 /7). Moreover, if we follow the income per capita average increase, then we could observe how those historically located in a better position are growing in a higher proportion that those with less income average. So, following this report, the concentration of wealth had been constant over the past decades, with just small changes “the most well off social groups are living in the Castellana band, in the central neighbourhoods of Retiro, Salamanca, Chamartín and Chamberí. But some new residential
enclaves must be added to this old prosperous area in the business centre of the city and the traditional neighbourhoods of XX century enlargement. These are more peripheral areas in Moncloa- Aravaca (Valdemarín, El Plantio), Fuencarral- El Pardo (Fuentelarreina, Mirasierra), Hortaleza (Piovera, Palomas) and Ciudad Lineal (Atalaya)” (OBS 2006: 6: 1ª.2). In that sense, coming back to the housing market system, it is also important to underline how in a city where most of the homes are owned properties, the increase of housing prices had been more relevant in wealthy neighbourhoods, also converting the housing market into a mechanism for producing inequalities⁹ (Leal 2004: 16).

In addition, districts with a low income average have been those receiving mostly the arrival of new migrant neighbours since 2001, and although we have not got enough quantitative data to see the increase of polarization between neighbourhoods over the past years it is important to reflect briefly on the appearance of a constant and vertiginous increase of migration. This recent process in Spain is not so relevant in absolute terms, but the fact that it has become a relevant issue due to its concentration in big cities, in tourist areas and in some Mediterranean towns, is what converts this phenomenon into a significant social, political and spatial change (Ocaña 2005:22). In that sense, the Madrid Region is a major case, because together with the highest increase of GDP (around 8 %), the most significant in all Spanish Regions since 2001, it is also the one receiving the highest percentage of foreign people (Bruquetes et al. 2005: 65).

According to data from the list of inhabitants of Madrid City (2007), the amount of immigrants has increased from 286.440 in January 2002, to 550.804 in January 2007, equalling in absolute terms 13.980 new inhabitants during last year. A relevant amount of the population had come from countries recently joining the European Union, like Poland (11.52%) and Rumania (20.36%). Also in relation to the most recent data, (1 January 2007), the higher percentage of population according to nationality is the Ecuadorian collective, followed by people coming from Rumania (8.5%) and Colombia (7.7%), the percentage of Moroccans (5%) and Chinese (4.4%) being lower. According to Bruquetas et. al. (2005), the distribution pattern is not open to chance, since a “clear concentration of migrants in some areas of some districts in Madrid City exists: in old centred districts such as Lavapiés, Barrio de Sol, (Fuencarral-Hortaleza), Tetuán (Cuatro Caminos-Tetuán), Arganzuela (Paseo de las Delicias-Legazpi), Usera (Marcelo Usera-Almendrales, Zofío) and Puente de Vallecas (Puente de Vallecas), but also in the old industrial peripheral districts such as in Carabanchel, Ciudad Lineal, Latina or Villaverde, where the concentration is less relevant or disperse” (2005: 69). In that sense, what is relevant, is not the percentage of people located in those

⁹ The author considered that the increase of unequal value of patrimonial capital is based in the differential change of housing values, what it could neutralised other public efforts to reduce inequalities among citizens (Leal 2004: 16)
specific areas, but the difference with other areas, so still following Bruquetas at al., it is important to notice that only 291 district sections with a high density of migrants, represents just 12.4% of the total municipal sections, one-third of the total of immigrants registered in Madrid.

In relation with the density of the immigrant population, desegregated in districts and neighbourhoods in 2003, the highest density in relation with total population was in the Centre District (26.22%) being Sol (32.4 %) and Embajadores (32.4%) where the most density is located. After that, in Tetuan, and Villaverde (14%), with one neighbourhood with a strong concentration (San Cristóbal, 26.58%), and on the contrary Fuencarral-El Pardo (7.9%) and El Pardo represent just 1%. This territorial distribution is mainly caused by the housing market, rental home availability, and also because of territorial and social networks of country families, that create significant concentrations by nationalities “(Ecuadorians in Pueblo Nuevo-Quintana, or in Delicias-Legazpi), Colombians and Chinese in (Usera, Almendrales, Zofio), Dominicans in (Cuatro Caminos-Tetuán), Moroccans in San Cristóbal, etc. (Bruquetas et al. 2005: 69). The following maps show us how immigrant citizens are living in almost all municipalities and districts, although there are higher density levels as we have already noticed.
Without a doubt this pattern of immigrant territorial distribution over the past decade, joined with historical concentration of less advantage social conditions in Southern and Eastern districts in Madrid, and Southern and Eastern municipalities of the first and second metropolitan crown, has increased the social distance between them and the others. While at the same time, some neighbourhoods in the central district, especially old town neighbourhoods, are suffering economical and social degradation as much as in other European and Latin-American cities. Neighbourhoods such as Lavapiés, Gran Vía and Embajadores are suffering a process of tugurization and degradation, although Regeneration Policies impulsed by the City council were and still are trying to change this pattern. In that sense, higher percentages of migrant and elderly population are living in those areas, mostly in rental houses due to the low prices and stigmatization.

In that sense, the Council has divided the City areas in which low income population is concentrated (2005) into two big groups:

**a) Levels of low income average inside the City Almond (called depressions or deprived areas) and high density of migrant population.**

1. Tetuán District: (specifically Valdeacederas and Berruguete neighbourhood), that can be considered as an economical periphery, segregated inside the city.
2. Central District, in which after recovering some neighbourhoods such as Justicia and University, attention is paid mainly to the most vulnerable areas, Embajadores and Lavapiés.
b) Levels of low income average in the periphery of the municipality, where there is also a high concentration of migrant population. This is mainly an arch along the Southern districts, in neighbourhoods such as Usera (Orcasur y Orcasitas), Puente de Vallecas (Entrevías), Vicálvaro (San Cristóbal) and Villaverde.

In the Metropolitan Area, regarding GDP per capita, there is a group of municipalities clearly over the average, being located in different spatial concentrations. First, there is a group of municipalities with the 67% of total GDP of the Region, and the 72% of services, in which there is Madrid City, and the biggest Western municipalities of the region (Boadilla, Pozuelo and Las Rozas), specialized in services against the interest of industrial production. Secondly, there is another subgroup, in which Alcobendas, San Sebastián de los Reyes and Tres Cantos municipalities are located, with GDP concentrated in service sector, but also in industrial activities. Far from this group, 98 municipalities produce the 23% of regional GDP. Most of them are small, although eight of them are significant such as Alcalá de Henares, Coslada and Torrejón de Ardoz in the East, and Alcorcón, Fuenlabrada, Getafe, Leganés, and Móstoles in the South. In those municipalities the economical activity is still mostly industrial, although they are also considered “dormitory towns”. This is also correlated with income data. So, according to income average, the lower income (per capita) is concentrated in the Eastern Metropolitan Area (9.984) and in the Southern Metropolitan area (9.134) while in the Western (16 903) and Northern area (14.198) the highest levels of income are concentrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones NUTS-4</th>
<th>Total (miles de euros)</th>
<th>Per capita (euros)</th>
<th>% sobre media de Madrid</th>
<th>% sobre media de España</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPIO DE MADRID</td>
<td>37.682.889</td>
<td>12.905</td>
<td>107,0</td>
<td>127,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTE METROPOLITANO</td>
<td>3.454.367</td>
<td>14.198</td>
<td>117,8</td>
<td>139,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTE METROPOLITANO</td>
<td>4.699.203</td>
<td>9.984</td>
<td>82,8</td>
<td>98,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUR METROPOLITANO</td>
<td>9.583.547</td>
<td>9.134</td>
<td>75,8</td>
<td>90,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTE METROPOLITANO</td>
<td>5.350.430</td>
<td>16.903</td>
<td>140,2</td>
<td>166,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA NORTE</td>
<td>227.751</td>
<td>9.517</td>
<td>78,9</td>
<td>93,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORDESTE COMUNIDAD</td>
<td>296.748</td>
<td>10.436</td>
<td>86,6</td>
<td>102,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUDOESTE COMUNIDAD</td>
<td>546.724</td>
<td>8.835</td>
<td>73,3</td>
<td>87,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUDOSTE COMUNIDAD</td>
<td>537.447</td>
<td>9.871</td>
<td>81,9</td>
<td>97,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA SUR</td>
<td>109.569</td>
<td>8.400</td>
<td>66,7</td>
<td>82,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA CENTRAL</td>
<td>1.196.837</td>
<td>12.220</td>
<td>101,4</td>
<td>120,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, if we pay attention to the differential location of population in relation to its income we find a clear correlation between social space, which has been slightly deeper over the past decade despite the appearance of new areas of high class residential and new areas of development in the north and west periphery. However Southern districts and municipalities of the first
metropolitan crown as well as some Eastern ones are being consolidated as places where a low income average is concentrated, and also as those which are attracting mainly the higher percentages of immigrant citizens, due to the low prices of housing and the greater rental availability compared with other more scarce areas (Leal 2007).

In summary we could say that pattern of socio-spatial segmentation has been consolidated in Madrid, understanding segmentation as the concentration of social homogenous groups in function of its dissimilar position in the socio-economical system. But also, we could affirm that there are higher income and GDP per capita growths in those areas where people with highest income rates live. In that sense, we could also talk about an increasing polarization, which is defined by Katzman as the “increase in homogenous social composition of neighbourhoods as well as the increase of the heterogeneity between them” (Kaztman et al., 2003, p. 16). Analysing those different socially produced physical spaces, we have already shown how it is possible to find homogenous population characteristics bound in some areas, inside the city and the metropolitan areas. The relation between income and residence is clear, due to the liberal housing market and differential income relation. In that sense, it could be worthwhile to pay close attention to how current social fields sedimentations are expressed in urban spaces, taking into account also how inequality is being articulated and reproduced. Since, as Bourdieu noticed: “it is undoubted how insensible incorporation in the social order structure is produced mainly through long time experience, in constant repetitions of spatial distances in which social distances are reified” (1999: 121). However, there is a theoretical and empirical problem: once we have noticed that urban social space has been produced in a complex process of differential distribution of goods, services, and individual and local agents, the problem arises when we need to show if there is a difference between living in one area or neighbourhood or another, which we have already pointed out: when do social space differences become sources of inequality?

Therefore, we should try to describe how other social fields, specifically social and cultural capital are related or not to social homogenous compositions of neighbourhoods and districts in the Metropolitan Area, since those elements also have a relevant intervention in social production of those places and people, *habitus*, and not only the difference of income and GDP per capita. Therefore, in the next section, we will pay attention mainly to educative and cultural levels, specifically in those areas already considered as disadvantaged areas in Madrid City and its metropolitan area, those in which there is a concentration of low levels of income, where space has been historically produced in a chaotic way due to a high density of population, industrial development, and dependency of other areas (central districts or capital).
Educative and cultural social fields

Before beginning this section, we will try to answer why it should be important to analyse the spatial reification of the social and cultural backgrounds in the most disadvantaged areas of the city in comparison with other areas of the Metropolitan Area. Our main premises are the following: first, because if we have found a strong segmented social space related to differential incomes, historically different land uses designs, and infrastructure policies fostering new areas of economical emersion, we should keep analysing what the relation between those differential social spaces and education performance is, as well as the relationship between family cultural background and children’s educative behaviour in each of them, and last, but not least, how we can understand the effects of the neighbourhood on the concentration of educative and cultural vulnerabilities.

In that sense, despite Spain’s high degree of equity, compared with other countries such as France, Germany or Belgium, it is, “one of the countries, which shows a significant relation between the students’ social, economic and cultural background and their educational performance”(Ferrer et al. 2006: 566). This relation, following the results of 2000 PISA report, following Ferrer et al (2006), is correlated with the “the occupational status of the parents”, secondly, “family cultural capital has a pronounced effect on students’ performance”, and, also thirdly, “the educational standard of the parents is also related to the educative level achieved by young students”. The correlation coefficient between parents’ years of study and those of sons and daughters is significant in Spain, as Comi has noticed (2003, quoted Calero 2005) from a study based on the ECHP, pointing out that Spain is among the countries of the European Union with the least educational mobility together with Ireland, Italy and Portugal. However, the coefficients correlation between years of education of the sons/daughters and years of education of father/mother is heterogeneous in relation to each Autonomous Community, for example while the national average is 0.43, in Navarre it is notably lower at 0.20, in Extremadura and Asturias, two disadvantaged communities, the correlation is 0.51, and in Madrid it rises to 0.64, the most significant one (Calero 2005, based from ECHP 2000). So, Madrid City is where there is less opportunity to achieve a higher level of education than one’s progenitors, which is also linked not only to social mobility, but also to the reproduction of social and cultural capital.

Another relevant point of differential educative strength is the number of early school leavers. By one hand, in Spain, the access to compulsory secondary education (56,9%) is lower than in other European counties, what Calero (2005) analysed as the main cause of the bottleneck in the Spanish education system and a source of inequity. By other hand, Marchesi (2003) has shown how in a low socio-cultural context, the number of students who do not finish their compulsory studies is
higher than in any other contexts. Also, if we look at early school leavers, it is important to notice that although the data has been decreasing since 1992 to 2002, it is still one of the highest percentages compared to other European countries, just under Portugal, and far from Denmark’s 8.4% of, or Finland’s 9.9%, differing according to student gender, 35.4% of males are early school leavers, while only 22.3% of females are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UE-25</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE-15</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (1)</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg (1)</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) An “early school leaver” is defined as a person (18 to 24-year-old) who has not completed upper secondary education and is not in education, or in a work-study programme for the last four weeks.

(1) The important differences between years may be caused by the small size of the sample.


However, it is important to notice how the Spanish Education System has been transformed profoundly over the past decades and therefore the data have been changing. First, Spain developed a relevant effort to promote Universal Education much later than other closer countries, especially after the democratization of the country, while other welfare policies were implemented (Calero 2005, Fernández Enguita 2006). In that sense, the extension of a compulsory level of education (from 14 years to 16 in 1990) and the spread of post-compulsory education supply were developed in the nineties. However, the public sector is still clearly not leading education in Spain compared to other countries, and therefore private school systems are still the first choice for a high percentage of students, because the right to chose freely between private, private with prices subsidized with public funding, and public schools is being formally accepted, although it is correlated with income possibilities (Fernández Enguita 2006).

On the other hand, the process of decentralization undergone since the eighties has meant that apart from basic regulatory powers, the execution of the public expenditure on education, developing programs and promoting a more or less public initiative is a competency of the Autonomous Region (Calero 2005: 7). In that sense, we can find strong disparities in public funding in education levels. For example, taking into account 2002 Data, we found that the Madrid Region
was dedicating just 1.87 % of the total GDP to non-university education, while other less economical vigorous regions such as Castile La Mancha (4.33%) and Extremadura (5.53%) were dedicating significantly more general expenditure. Also, differences in public expenditure per student on non-university education can be found, since while in the Basque Country and Navarre more than four thousand euros per student were dedicated, in Galicia almost over three thousand and five hundred euros and the Madrid Autonomous Region was only dedicating two thousand and five hundred euros, the lowest rate along with Andalusia.

With regional and intraregional data in Madrid, on the following table showing the percentage of the population with studies below secondary school (compulsory), we can see how even if the percentage has been reduced in the past years, the highest percentage is still in the Southern districts (52%), and Southern Municipalities (63.25 %), compared to the Centre/Western areas (32.8%). And, there are also strong differences between people with advanced education in relation with the districts and municipalities of the Region, and how it has changed or not over the past years. For example, since in the Centre-West districts of the City, the increase of population with higher education has been 3.4 points, during the last four academic years, in the Southern districts it has only increased by 0.8, while in the Southern municipalities, although the increase has been more relevant, 1.7, it is still the area in which the percentage of people with university education is lower 18%, dramatically dissimilar to the 53.2% of the Western municipalities of the Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male and Female</th>
<th>Thousand os persons</th>
<th>Total M. C.</th>
<th>Madrid City</th>
<th>Resto de municipios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre / West</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt;2° ciclo secundaria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,353,3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,330.0</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,380.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,462.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,471.9</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enseñanza superior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,133.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,229.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,274.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,268.5</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,357.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another classification can also help us to understand how differential patterns of education are distributed in the space of the Metropolitan region. As we have already pointed out, in Spain there is a strong historical presence of private school, mainly but not only led by Catholic religious orientation, and there is a mixed stage of subsidized education supply. Fernández Enguita (2006) has shown us how the most important segregation in Madrid’s Educative System is the division between State and Private education. Throughout the country, there is an important pattern of not choosing public schools among urban families with higher income, better employments and cultural position, which is clearly in the cities of Madrid and Barcelona. In his words: “High and medium social classes running from public education, while it has to support increasingly the integration of most problematic pupils” (2006:6). But also, it is important to notice that private schools are located in the Centre Districts or in the wealthy periphery (west and north) so most of the pupils attending private schools used private transportation to commute to their schools, while just 7% of the public school attendants did so. In that sense, there is a strong correlation between the place of residence and the location of the school more so in public education, than in relation to private education. It is also important to say that one of the most important references for being placed in a public or subsidized school is the proximity of the residence. However, the following table could help us again to also understand which are the lesson patterns in the most populated municipalities of the metropolitan area in relation with income average and type of education public / private / or subsidized private.
Tablas 9
Distribución de alumnos y unidades enseñanza obligatoria en los 30 municipios más pobla-
dos de la Comunidad de Madrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITERAL</th>
<th>Pobl. 02</th>
<th>RD100</th>
<th>AEP</th>
<th>AIE</th>
<th>UEPP</th>
<th>UEPS</th>
<th>UEEP</th>
<th>UESE</th>
<th>UPEP</th>
<th>UEPE</th>
<th>USES</th>
<th>UEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pozuelo de Alarcón</td>
<td>5527152</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozas de Madrid (Las)</td>
<td>62527</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majadahonda</td>
<td>52864</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boadilla del Monte</td>
<td>27145</td>
<td>148.2</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrelodones</td>
<td>15916</td>
<td>148.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tres Cantos</td>
<td>37848</td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcobendas</td>
<td>95104</td>
<td>129.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villaviciosa de Odón</td>
<td>21461</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aílante</td>
<td>16011</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galapagar</td>
<td>24927</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>3016758</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivas-Vaciamadrid</td>
<td>35660</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Sebastián de los RR.</td>
<td>60323</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colmenar Viejo</td>
<td>35664</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collado Villalba</td>
<td>46885</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcalá de Henares</td>
<td>170402</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorcón</td>
<td>149594</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coslada</td>
<td>75982</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aranjuez</td>
<td>49728</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinto</td>
<td>31737</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando de Henares</td>
<td>39658</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdemorro</td>
<td>34163</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getafe</td>
<td>153888</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torregón de Ardoz</td>
<td>101056</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arganda</td>
<td>33945</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móstoles</td>
<td>199819</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mejorada del Campo</td>
<td>17560</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leganés</td>
<td>174436</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuenlabrada</td>
<td>179735</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parla</td>
<td>60545</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the regional average, 46.1% of primary school pupils are studying in a private school (including subsidized ones), while a lower percentage are in secondary school, 43.2%. However, in Madrid City, with an income average slightly over the regional one, the percentage of pupils studying in a private school is 66% in primary schools, and 64% in secondary schools. Also, we can also find strong dissimilarities if we look at the more disadvantaged municipalities in the Southern Metropolis, for example, in Parla, with an income average 40 points below the regional average, the percentage of pupils attending private schools is only 6.8% in primary and 5.2% in secondary, almost all the schools of the public sector being 89.5% in primary and 91.1% in secondary. While in the wealthiest municipality of the region, Pozuelo de Alarcón (RD100: 172), where 85% of primary students are studying in private schools, 18% of the total number of primary schools are private, and 67% are subsidized. The same happened in Boadilla del Monte (RD100: 148) where 76.9% of pupils in primary attend private schools, and even a higher percentage of students study in secondary private schools, the units of private schools being 76% in primary school and 78% at the secondary level. So, it should also be noticed that there is also a correlation between the number of pupils attending private or public schools and the supply, in all cases of income average. For example, also in wealthy municipalities (well over the income average) located in the Western
region, the municipalities in which a high percentage of pupils are attending private school (including subsidized) is clearly correlated with the number of private schools and not only with the income level. For example in Majadahonda (RD100: 150) the number of pupils attending primary level in private schools is considerably less than in previous wealthy cases, just 36.7%, being even less at the secondary level, 30.7%, and the main difference is the stronger public supply than in other wealthy municipalities 56% in primary and 63% in secondary. Also, in Southern and Eastern municipalities, with a similar income average, the amount of pupils attending will be different depending on the private supply.

Alcorcón (South Municipality, RD100: 82.6) has 42% of pupils attending private primary schools, and 36% in private secondary schools being 56% of the school units private or subsidized in primary level, and 48.8% in secondary. However, in Coslada (Eastern municipality, RD100: 81.8) 6.2% of pupils attend private schools in primary and 4.8% in secondary, while the private and subsidized primary supply is significantly less 10.2%, and even less in secondary, 4.8%. In that sense, obviously the supply makes a difference in the type of education chosen, and not only the income average, although in wealthy areas the private supply is mostly exceeded by the attendance, since they receive students from other areas but also because there is not enough public supply as there was in Pozuelo, Boadilla, Villaviciosa and Madrid City, where subsidised and private schools are incrementing their pupils. In that sense, during the last years, the increase of public and private supply in the Madrid Autonomous Community has been imbalanced.

According to the total number of pupils in public and private (including subsidized), although in all regions the number of public pupil attendance has increased except in Madrid City, there has been a positive balance between the increase of pupils in private school compared to public school in the most wealthy regions: 3.274 pupils in the Western region, 3.956 in the Northern Region, increasing two points in the relation (48% of pupils in Western area attended private school in 2005). In Madrid City, the percentage of pupils attending private school is 59%, an increased of 14.059, while there has been a decrease of 191 pupils studying in public schools last year 2005-2006. While in the Southern Region the increase of pupils attending public schools is 8.739, although the percentage of pupils attending private school has also increased, the relation is still favoured for pupils studying in public schools (76%).
Therefore, it would be interesting if we could also note how the distribution of public and private supply is placed inside the municipalities, in order to see if there is a concentration of private offers in the most advantaged areas or if it is equally distributed. But also, if there is a source of inequality, being a pupil in a public or private school, and if there is a difference between the region in which one lives. In that sense, we will pay attention to educational failure in relation with private/state and areas in Madrid City and the Metropolitan Region.

Can we talk about educational segregation?

The key question we could raise about inequality (social segregation) and not only differences is the following: Could it be said that there are better possibilities of learning in relation to the kind of school one attends and the neighbourhood-region in which one lives?

The first difficulty is to measure success or failure in the education system. On one hand we could first take a look at the number of pupils who reached the educational grade level according to the
age designated as the compulsory education level\textsuperscript{10}, but we could also think about the number of students who keep studying after the compulsory stage in order to complete the education necessary to access university or other more professional oriented education.

In order to do this, we will follow the report elaborated by the official inspection office in the Madrid Autonomous Community (Toro 2007), because we do not have the intra municipal data, which would allow us a more precise analysis. In that sense, we found that the Eastern Region (72.6\%) has the lowest percentage of students achieving the stipulated compulsory educational grade level, followed by the southern pupils’ score (73.6 \%). On the contrary, better percentages are reached by Western and Northern areas, and in Madrid City (80.2\%)

According to the latest available results (Toro 2007: 78), also relevant, is the low number of pupils reaching the level without failing one or two subjects. In that sense, again pupils of the Western Area schools had a better performance, with 52.9\%, the Southern and Eastern areas being the ones with worse results: only 37\% of pupils get the Grade without failing any subjects. It could be interesting to go more in depth into these results, combining them with state and private division, but unfortunately, we have not found these Official Data.

\textsuperscript{10} When pupils do not pass fourth level, they do not get ESO Grade, and are out of the official academic itinerary educative system, which means a reduction of possibilities of better insertion into the employment market. However, a number of students abandoned school before being tested in this level, when they reached the age of 16, so perhaps the number of pupils not reaching ESO is more than those who failed at the last moment, in the fourth level (Bernalte et al.)
However, if we pay attention to some internal evaluations, we also found slightly significant variations. For example, one maths evaluation in the Madrid Autonomous region, in the 2002-2003 academic year, in the 6th year of primary, showed us how in Madrid Capital there is a difference between the correct answer percentage obtained in relation with the type of the school (public/private) and the area, 5.46 points of difference in Southern regional schools, 11.49 points in West metropolitan area, and just a 4.66 points in Madrid City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>Centro</th>
<th>Público</th>
<th>Privado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madrid - Capital</td>
<td>45,84</td>
<td>52,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid – Norte</td>
<td>49,66</td>
<td>58,03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid – Sur</td>
<td>48,04</td>
<td>51,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid – Este</td>
<td>50,48</td>
<td>49,59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid - Oeste</td>
<td>47,04</td>
<td>58,53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (De Prada 2004)
However, we should also pay attention to new different mechanisms, recently created to deal with educational difficulties at the end of the compulsory education age. In that sense, first, a pupil older than or close to 16 years old is able to get into Curriculum Diversification (Toro 2007: 62) for one or two academic years, since 1997, if he or she has had learning difficulties in previous years or the Orientation Department can predict that there will be high probability of failure if kept within the ordinary curriculum, always with the Educative Inspection Approval, and with parent and pupil allegations. This is a special class in which the pupil can receive better attention in order to get the minimum level necessary to obtain the Compulsory Education Grade, called ESO.

However, according to the type of school, it is significant how the number of groups in public schools is 280 (two years program) and 194 (one year), while there is just 96 (two year) and 15 (one year) groups in private schools, and the effectiveness is similar in both types of schools, around 75%.

However, the differential point is not only centred on the number of groups, but also in its distributions among areas. In that sense, the regional average of pupils attending Diversification Curriculum (DC) classes represents 7.23 %, although most of them are attending public schools 10.44% of the total of public attendance, while just 3.5% of the total in private school. When we read the statistics across the region in which the school is located, then the percentages again change severely. In the Western area, the percentage of pupils in this kind of classes represents 5.06%, but almost all of them are located in public schools, representing 8% of the total of scholars, while only 0.68% of students are in those classes in private schools. However, in the Southern schools, the number of pupils attending DC in even the public sector is over represented 11.5%, while the private being half that at 5.5%, it is the area with more students in private school in DC classes. So it seems that students with learning problems are more concentrated in DC
groups in one region than another, and also in public schools, because there is not a balanced supply of those kind of reinforce programs.

On the other hand, those students which have not reach the ESO Grade and have decided to leave school, can chose to get into a Social Guarantee Program (GS), in order to get a basic professionally oriented education that allows pupils to enter the working world or keep studying in a secondary itinerary. Those programs are mostly oriented to young people without a basic Grade, that need urgent employment insertion, due to lower economical resources, margination or social exclusion vulnerability or for people with disabilities (Toro 2007: 120) At that point, we also found dissimilarities between public and private attention to these students, and the regional subdivision. There are 3,995 pupils in this GS program, in the 2004-2005 academic year, and 68.4% of them are studying in public schools, mostly located in Madrid City (953), and the Southern Area (921), being less concentrated in the Western Area (230) and Northern area (162). In private schools 31% of the total is distributed, especially concentrated in Madrid City and the Southern Area. One of the main consequences we can extract is the higher effort that public schools are making to develop these programmes, and also, that young Eastern students with educational challenges to reaching the ESO Grade (18.4 %) must go to other areas to try to keep studying since the offer in this area is insufficient.

Also, if we look at the number of pupils in secondary not compulsory education levels, we could also observe important differences. Students are able to choose between continuing their studies in a Secondary School academic itinerary or start a professionally oriented education, Professional Education, similar to Trade School in other countries. In the Academic itinerary, 57.6% of pupils registered in public schools in the entire region, while the percentage in Madrid City was significantly lower, where just 37.7% of students are in the public sector, while in the southern region only 21% of students are registered in a private school.

Also according to this state/private division and the performance at this level there are significant results, the highest success rate percentage is concentrated in 2005-2006 in the Social Sciences and Humanities itinerary in those pupils attending private schools (87.5%), while there was a considerably lower percentage of pupils in public school passing without failing any subjects (67.4%). Almost the same proportion can be found in other itineraries, the difference being greater in the Natural Sciences and Health itinerary where the success rate is 91% in private school, while only 74% in public schools. If we cross those results with the location we could also say that in the

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nivel</th>
<th>Enseñanza</th>
<th>M-1</th>
<th>M-2</th>
<th>M-3</th>
<th>M-4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>COMUNIDAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6º SOCIAL</td>
<td>Público</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privado</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, if we look at the number of pupils in secondary not compulsory education levels, we could also observe important differences. Students are able to choose between continuing their studies in a Secondary School academic itinerary or start a professionally oriented education, Professional Education, similar to Trade School in other countries. In the Academic itinerary, 57.6% of pupils registered in public schools in the entire region, while the percentage in Madrid City was significantly lower, where just 37.7% of students are in the public sector, while in the southern region only 21% of students are registered in a private school.

Also according to this state/private division and the performance at this level there are significant results, the highest success rate percentage is concentrated in 2005-2006 in the Social Sciences and Humanities itinerary in those pupils attending private schools (87.5%), while there was a considerably lower percentage of pupils in public school passing without failing any subjects (67.4%). Almost the same proportion can be found in other itineraries, the difference being greater in the Natural Sciences and Health itinerary where the success rate is 91% in private school, while only 74% in public schools. If we cross those results with the location we could also say that in the
second course of Secondary School the worst percentage of pupils not achieving the Grade, are those located in the Southern (33.4%) and Eastern (35.6%) municipalities, while in the Western Schools the percentage is 22.9% (Toro 2007:164)

In conclusion, we could say public / private school system, and educative regional areas are elements that are clearly related with the level of performance of pupils in the Madrid Education System. Eastern and Southern municipalities, in particular, are the ones with the worst results, mostly in pupils attending public schools, and especially if we consider the number of students in Social Guarantee Programs and pupils in the Diversification Curriculum.

All those data and conclusions lead us a huge road to keep searching through qualitative research methods to discover how these results are creating more or less social disconnection. In fact, there is another relevant element about which we should also pay attention since higher percentages of migrants leaving in those more disadvantages areas are attending mainly public schools, being inserted in an already dichotomised education system. In that sense, in secondary school in the region, the proportion among foreign students is unbalanced, since pupils from non-European countries are concentrated in public schools, and especially in those disadvantages neighbourhood: i.e. in San Blas, Barajas, Moratalaz, Villaverde and Tetuán in 2005-2006 academic year there were no students in private schools, being the average of 14.5% of foreign pupils attending schools in the region. In the subsidized schools the average of foreign students is just 9.8%, again below the average, while in public schools the percentage is 24.9%. In the some districts of Madrid City, as Tetuán, the percentage is 53.4% in public schools, and 50.6% in the central district. (Poveda et al. 2007)

The unequal educative tendencies have been already analysed as problems to be solved by the authorities with competencies in the matter, on one hand the Ministry of Education, and on other, by the Education Council of Madrid Regional Community. In fact, several policies have been developed, characterised mostly to attend those more public “problematic” schools. In that sense, in all the country a new cooperation policy was launched by the Ministry or Education, called PROA, since 2005-2006 academic year, with three main areas of intervention, Academic accompanied Program in primary, and secondary, and Help and Reinforcement, in those Schools enrolled in the Program. In Madrid, during the current academic year, 111 schools are using those funds in Primary level, and 78 in Secondary Accompanied Program and 37, in Help and Reinforcement.

Also, a new program for prioritising schools has been specifically developed in Madrid Regional Community in order to improve the low performance of pupils inserted in public located in
disadvantages areas, trying to follow English and French initiates launched in the eighties. However, in this case, the attention is paid just to schools which are asked for it, and there is still a soft coordination among them and the regional community, and there is not coordination with other social services in the neighbourhood they are located in, as it is usually planned in France or Belgium cases (Alegre & Subirats 2007: 43), it should be relevant to check if the fear of social stigmatization of those areas is one of the reason of this soft policy.

Furthermore, lately, recent public efforts have been done to try to solve educative problems associated with arriving migrants in public schools and other problematic situation in schools, with high percentages of vulnerable pupils. First, regional policies to improve the integration of migrant pupils, as links classes, reinforce teacher’s formation, translators and intercultural programs, but also other programs have been launched by the Ministry of Education and Culture. By one hand, in November 2007, two new programmes were signed among the Ministry and the Autonomous Communities, one of them, with the aim of improving the academic performance of pupils, funded with 25 millions of euros, and another one, centred on the fight against the early school leavers, with 11.2 millions of euros, both of them should be also be funded by regional authorities with another 60%.

In fact, it is still soon to evaluate those public policies to balance the educative segregation, although it could be said that most of them are concentrated to change low percentages of academic performance as much as to improve the social conditions of schools, and learning environment, however I could say there is no attention to plan a real coherent and general policy to intervene in those questions more related with the educative segregation as source of inequality. One way could be to coordinate zone policies as it has been already plan in some Autonomous Communities, in order to reduce the disconnection among social spaces, the social homogeneity in schools and neighbourhoods and to avoid the low income average students and family’s concentration. As West (2006) suggested, one way could be to exercise public control of the choice of school, not only in public schools but also in private ones, since, the experiences of carrying pupils from one part to the another of the city have not been successful, in those cases where it has been implemented. We hope our research will be able to point out through our field work more interesting results in relation to those preliminary advances.
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