ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN EDUCATION AND DIVERGING
PROSPECTS FOR URBAN YOUTH IN AN ENLARGED EUROPE

JULIA SZALAI, VERA MESSING AND MARIA NEMENYI

Ethnic and Social Differences in Education in a Comparative Perspective

ABOUT EDUMIGROM
Ethnic Differences in Education and Diverging Prospects for Urban Youth in an Enlarged Europe is a collaborative research project that aims to study how ethnic differences in education contribute to the diverging prospects of minority ethnic youth and their peers in urban settings. Through applying a cross-national comparative perspective, the project explores the overt and covert mechanisms in socio-economic, political, cultural, and gender relations that make ethnicity a substantive component of inequalities in social status and power. The project involves nine countries from old and new member states of the European Union: the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. EDUMIGROM began in March 2008 and will run through February 2011. The project is coordinated by the Center for Policy Studies at Central European University.

ABOUT THE PAPER
This study gives a comprehensive account of a cross-country comparative survey that was run in Spring 2009 among 14–17-year-old second-generation migrant and Roma students attending the finishing year of compulsory education in ethnically diverse communities in eight participating countries of the EDUMIGROM research project. By enquiring about earlier school results, liked and disliked subjects, positive and negative experiences with teachers and fellow students, plans for advancement, and the practices in interethnic relations in and outside the school, as well as by asking detailed questions about various aspects of self-perception, desires concerning one's longer-term future, and attitudes and feelings toward others in the neighbourhood and the larger community, the more than 5,000 questionnaires that emerged from the survey provide ample ground on which to explore how ethnic and social differences in schools and their immediate environments shape adolescents' daily experiences and career paths in education, and how these factors influence their social relations, the development of their identities, and their ideas about adult life. The focal aim of the research was to deepen our existing knowledge on how ethnicity – mostly in an interplay with a set of social, economic, gender, and cultural factors – shapes distinctions in the everyday working of schools, and how such distinctions gain justification in differently assessed school performances that, in turn, become the bases for departing advancements. At the same time, it was an equally important goal to reveal some less explored associations of how these distinctions leave their marks on interethnic contacts, identity development, aspirations, and strategies that, after all, conclude in diverging prospects for youths from different ethnic backgrounds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

This study gives a comprehensive account of a cross-country comparative survey that was run in Spring 2009 among 14–17-year-old second-generation migrant and Roma students attending the finishing year of compulsory education in ethnically diverse communities in eight participating countries of the EDUMIGROM research project. By enquiring about earlier school results, liked and disliked subjects, positive and negative experiences with teachers and fellow students, plans for advancement, and the practices in interethnic relations in and outside the school, as well as by asking detailed questions about various aspects of self-perception, desires concerning one's longer-term future, and attitudes and feelings toward others in the neighbourhood and the larger community, the more than 5,000 questionnaires that emerged from the survey provide ample ground on which to explore how ethnic and social differences in schools and their immediate environments shape adolescents' daily experiences and career paths in education, and how these factors influence their social relations, the development of their identities, and their ideas about adult life. The focal aim of the research was to deepen our existing knowledge on how ethnicity – mostly in an interplay with a set of social, economic, gender, and cultural factors – shapes distinctions in the everyday working of schools, and how such distinctions gain justification in differently assessed school performances that, in turn, become the bases for departing advancements. At the same time, it was an equally important goal to reveal some less explored associations of how these distinctions leave their marks on interethnic contacts, identity development, aspirations, and strategies that, after all, conclude in diverging prospects for youths from different ethnic backgrounds. By selecting schools in multiethnic working-class communities, the scope of anticipated differentiations by social status was reduced on purpose: the survey intended to explore how differences are shaped in education among young people from diverse ethnic backgrounds who live in each other's proximity and who, by and large, share similar conditions in socio-economic terms. However, the research revealed that strong currents of institutional selection are at play, accentuating the differences within the community by establishing a high degree of concordance between students' ethnic and social backgrounds. As a rule, young people from higher-status families from the majority study in better and more prestigious schools and classes than their peers from ethnic minority backgrounds whose relative social disadvantages are increased by often being confined to conditions that deprive them from acquiring even the basics of knowledge and skills that are necessary for later successful advancement in education and beyond. Whether selection by ethnicity is a spontaneously emerging outcome of "white flight", or it is caused by early tracking or the setting up of classes with different curricula, or whether it follows from a

deliberate school policy to segregate minority children into special units and classes, ethnic separation and segregation proved to impregnate all aspects of adolescents' lives. Discussions in this study show that, by being concentrated into less favourable settings and arrangements, young people from ethnic minority backgrounds attain poorer school results, have less opportunities to advance on the secondary and higher levels, and face greater risks of dropping out than either of those of their same-ethnic peers who have been fortunate enough to escape segregation, or – even more – than their peers from the majority. At the same time, the harmful implications of segregation also manifest themselves in frequent occurrences of discrimination and broadly perceived injustices both within the walls of the schools and outside of them. However, the picture is not this bleak in all in its aspects. Despite all negative experiences, the school is a friendly place in the eyes of the great majority of young people, without distinctions. They usually find friends among their classmates and engage in a variety of activities that involve peers from different ethnic and social backgrounds. Likewise, they find teachers whom they trust and who support them – although the trustfulness of ethnic minority students certainly increases in schools where the staff is mixed by ethnic belonging. A positive way of relating to school is also reflected in longer-term aspirations. Ethnic minority adolescents do not differ from their peers from the majority in their dedication to the studying that most of them consider the sole firm path toward a prospering adulthood. Despite great departures in their actual prospects, the majority of adolescents across the prevailing social and ethnic boundaries that otherwise divide them trust themselves as well as their families and communities to gain enough inspiration and strength for progression toward a future living that is better than now and to attain a social standing that is based on fair recognition and genuine inclusion. However, the degree of success does not depend only on their efforts. Our survey results point toward important variations in the sharpness of ethnic inequalities and marginalisation that at closer scrutiny reveal the significance of the prevailing welfare arrangements and the substantial impact of historically forged routines in interethnic cohabitation in how larger-scale social relations allow for ethnically "blind" integration or continue to reproduce "minoritisation" and exclusion along ethnic lines.

INTRODUCTION

This study gives a comprehensive account of the major results of a cross-country comparative analysis of the data that emerged from a series of community-based surveys run in the spring of 2009 among 14-17-year-old youth in eight participating countries of the EDUMIGROM research project. The comparative approach provides an opportunity to explore some general trends that have arisen from the diversities that characterise the prevailing structures of social and interethnic relations in education and the communities-at-large, the institutional forms and daily practices of schooling, and the longer-term prospects of adolescents from different social and ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, the chosen perspective provides us with a chance to revisit some of the issues at the core of the project and helps to reveal the overarching similarities, as well as some important historical, cultural, and political differences, in the values, perceptions, attitudes, and aspirations among young people and their families from ethnic minorities and those who belong to the respective majorities in various European societies. These general inquiries follow a widely-shared experience of the societies in question: whether looking at opportunities in education or participation on the labour market, at income, wealth, or the general standard of living, people from ethnic minority backgrounds[1] tend to experience remarkable disadvantages in comparison to those from the majorities. The trends that seem to prevail everywhere suggest that ethnicity is a powerful dimension of social differentiation that often carries with it denigrating meanings in those arenas of social relations and fields of distribution that, at first glance, appear to be regulated by a set of principles and logics of rights, entitlements, and participation that are free from distinctions of culture and identity. The often hidden power that ethnicity exerts to shape social, economic, and cultural relations, and to mould attainable positions in the social hierarchy are manifested by a large set of facts. This study will contribute to the recognition of such deep divisions by showing the potency of a general rule in the area of schooling: even if students come from the same community, share similar conditions of everyday life, and use the same services and institutions, differences in ethnic belonging bring about significant departures in their circumstances and longer-term prospects. As a rule, young people from ethnic minority backgrounds tend to gain less, tend to advance less, and tend to suffer more limitations in their opportunities than their peers from the cohabitating majority.

---

[1] We are aware that in official language (administrative documents, government reports, statistics, etc.), the accurate wording is "minority ethnic". At the same time, in everyday parlance, members of the groups in question are referred to as "ethnic minority" people. For better legibility, we use the latter format in this study, and turn to the administrative terminology only in reference to official sources and in certain table headings.

While these trends seem to generally prevail, they are far from being self-evident. First, those in the focus of our study are not newcomers in the societies where they live: apart from a tiny layer of new immigrants, the students who were approached by this survey come from families that have been settled for at least one generation and are deeply embedded in their respective home countries by now. Here, embeddedness means equal citizens' rights in the first place: if taken from a formal perspective, there are no reasons for enjoying any less from the provisions of the given welfare states, provided most of these provisions are granted on the basis of citizenship. In this context, it is important to ask questions about the processes that make the content of citizenship differentiated and that build on ethnicity as a strong factor in this regard. Compulsory education, as one of the most powerful arenas of principally equal entitlements and obligations, offers a window to gain insight into the forces at play in such differentiations.

Second, there are remarkable historical differences among the minority ethnic groups that we studied: as much in the context of their group-specific relationships as in the forms of togetherness with the respective majorities. In the vast literature about the diverse flows of immigration that differ in their historical, cultural, political, and economic origins, one would assume that *post-colonial migrants* experienced with the institutional settings that were once shaped by the one-time colonisers would adapt relatively easily to their new home country and their disadvantages would fade over time and generations. Regarding the situation of minority ethnic groups in countries where the processes of *economic migration* have induced a high degree of ethnic diversity in recent decades, one would work with different expectations. On the one hand, relatively low efforts to become integrated into the mainstream matched with quick advancement in material terms can be hypothesised to characterise the conditions of people from minority ethnic backgrounds. On the other hand, the fragile routines of interethnic mixing and cohabitation, coupled with expectations on the part of large groups of the majority toward a quick return of the "newcomers" to their country of origin, would probably wield a relatively high degree of mutual estrangement between the minorities and the majority. Finally, one would expect to see the blended impacts of "socialist" heritage and *post-socialist transformation* in the case of Central Europe's largest "visible" minority: the Roma. Being aware of their long-standing marginalisation and sharp residential segregation while a massive rise in participation in education and employment during the last phase of socialism were not powerful enough to change, and acknowledging also the new trends of heated interethnic rivalry, the diffusing of "anti-Gypsy" sentiments, and the widespread attempts at social exclusion on ethnic grounds during the past two decades of post-socialist transformation, one would anticipate a rather strained state of interethnic relations in and around schooling, along with the simultaneous

efforts of Roma communities to attain socio-political representation for assuring their recognition and inclusionary citizens' rights.

As we will see, these different histories and constellations bring up important deviations, and one certainly should not neglect them when scrutinising the state of the involved socio-ethnic groups. At the same time, it is important to underline that the influences of the departing histories of migration and traditional interethnic cohabitation do not work out as clearly as the hypotheses might suggest. Here it seems that the structural arrangements of power and the prevailing distinctions by group-belonging largely override the diverse histories and keep minorities, in general, at the lower end of the hierarchies – whether looking at the distribution of career opportunities, material well-being, or participation in politics and policymaking. Nevertheless, the three traditions of post-colonial and economic migration and post-socialist transformation importantly *colour* the picture: despite often similar trends of ethnically-informed selection in schooling, opportunities for becoming citizens in the full sense of the term seem to show a great variance with significant relative advantages for children of "old" migrants in countries with century-long experiences of migration and the drastic exclusion of the most deprived Roma groups in Central Europe.

Third, the minority ethnic groups in the focus of our study are not homogenous at all. As it will be shown, they are deeply structured along the lines of social standing and material conditions, and there are also internal divisions concerning their attempts to strive at shaping how they cohabit with the majority. In light of these differences within their own communities, it remains important to address the factors and forces that are at play in shifting these internal partitions into the background by underscoring a more pronounced division with more socio-political importance for the working of society-at-large: the distinctions that largely homogenise minority ethnic belonging in contrast to the majority. Against the kaleidoscopic arrangements of advantages and disadvantages, it is then of key importance to find out why and how does ethnicity come so much to the forefront of social differentiation in and around education that turns out to be more powerful than relations of power and knowledge that are otherwise known as the key structuring features of modern society.

Schools offer us a useful window to look at the puzzling potency of ethnic divides. First, this window allows us to follow how ethnicity is converted into a base for creating systemic selection. Although there are substantial differences among the investigated school systems as to the institutionalised manner by which students are kept together under the umbrella of comprehensive instruction or tracked from an early age, selection according to ethnicity seems

to imbue all of them. As we will find out, the quality and content of teaching substantially differ among schools according to their ethnic composition, and this difference leaves its imprint on performance, advancement, and future aspirations.

Second, the window that schools open to investigate ethnicity as a powerful dimension of social, economic, and institutional structuring allows us to gain an insight into how ethnic-belonging shapes the ground of institutionalised departures in education by assigning differential contents to otherwise alike building blocks of knowledge and skills, thus contributing to the legitimisation of taking ethnicity as a meaningful base for future deep social divides. As we will see, the struggling of schools with language and cultural differences leads to a hierarchical ordering of what is to be considered truly "important" for society. This way schools, as significant transmitters of cultural values, prepare the soil for differential advancement and convert these values to unified scales of performance as if it was produced from the same sources and with the same techniques.

Third, schools, as institutions of shared experience, provide us the opportunity to gain an insight into the formation of interethnic relations at a rather early stage. Through the lens of the day-to-day working of educational institutions, we can follow the process in its making: we can see how efforts at mixing or inclinations for ethnic enclosure countervail or reinforce the departures that schools designate by differentially acknowledged performance, and thereby underline or, for that matter, weaken the aforementioned legitimising functions of education in forging social distinctions.

At the same time, we also have to be aware of the limitations that focusing on schools imply. First, we may lose sight of those who dropped out of education prior to concluding the primary level of compulsory schooling. It is well known that compulsory education does not work perfectly: important groups do not gain access to or leave behind schooling at a very early age. These groups of children are mainly from minority ethnic backgrounds and belong to the poorest segments of their community. Hence, we have to keep in mind that those students incorporated into our study belong to the relatively well-settled, well-performing, and well-integrated parts of their respective societies. Thus, we do not have information about children of undocumented migrants or drastically-excluded groups of some Roma communities. Second, the chosen age-limits also have some restrictive implications. Our survey does not speak about ultimate differences but tendencies that point toward them. Keeping that in mind, a lot depends on efforts of the various welfare states to reach out to marginalised youth and try to raise their educational attainment and qualification by targeted programs, and we have to interpret our

results as probabilities: differences experienced in performance and advancement point toward certain departures; however, these departures might be lessened in importance and consequence by those corrective measures that fall outside the "normal" school system, and thus also fall outside our view.

The ways the schools were selected country-by-country increase the explanatory power of our study, while also putting limitations on the level of generalisations.

It was an important presumption of our study that schools are shaped by the communities where they are embedded. First, the composition of the community matters: since most children at a compulsory age of schooling actually attend one or another educational institution, the profiles of these institutions and the differences among them speak in a meaningful way about cohesion/separation within the community and also about how these fundamental characteristics of interethnic cohabitation become institutionalised. Second, the construction of the survey gave us the opportunity to learn about the institutional means of fixing differences, thereby making them the strong foundations of the above-indicated legitimising process that converts these differences into "measurable" and straightforward "comparable" performance and attaches differential ways of advancement and educational careers to them. At the same time, the chosen communities where the fieldwork took place do not represent the societies-at-large. Therefore, one has to be very careful in drawing and phrasing conclusions. We cannot speak about "the" French or "the" Czech schools, even less about French or Czech societies as such. Instead, our results refer to multiethnic communities where, due to their significant presence, minority ethnic groups have a decisive contribution in shaping the conditions and relations of daily life and where their attendance also significantly influences the life of the local institutions –in the first place, schools. What follows from this is a remarkable variation in the actual socio-economic composition among the country-specific constituents of our comparative sample, which is then further accentuated by inter- and intra-school selections much in line with the prevailing patterns in the given country. These multi-layered processes of differentiation and selection have to be kept in mind in reading all the results of the study that are framed by the structures that historical and contemporary processes of interethnic relations have produced in the formation of urban communities.

In sum, this comparative study aims to reveal how ethnicity influences life at school in communities where ethnic diversity is an important feature of everyday relations. It is aimed to show how social differences, often appearing as ethnic deviations due to cultural attributes, influence the structuring of institutions of compulsory education, and how these structures

contribute to make ethnicity a significant dimension for the distribution of opportunities and actual prospects for urban youth. By the way of comparisons, it is intended to show how different degrees of inclusion in interethnic relations impact the advancement of minority ethnic youth, and also to reveal the marks of these relations on how ethnic minority adolescents see themselves, frame their identity, and figure out their paths toward adult life. With this broadening of the scope of the discussion, it is our aim to provide an insight into how ethnic differentiations are reproduced, partly by institutional distinctions along ethnic lines and partly by the recognition of these distinctions as they become built-in elements of the ways of thinking and acting of those affected. In this sense, our study hopes to make a new contribution to the understanding of ethnicity as a significant, perhaps increasingly significant, dimension of social stratification in contemporary European societies.

The discussion is built up in line with our survey: the major chapters will be organised according to the key topics of the comparative questionnaire.

The first chapter intends to make the reader acquainted with the major demographic and socio-economic characteristics of our comparative sample. Wherever macro-level statistics are available, the sample and its country-specific constituents will be compared to the societies-at-large. This way we will be able to situate our communities on a larger map and see how far advantages and disadvantages as experienced in schools are the derivatives of prevailing social inequalities outside school, and/or how far are they actually the products of the working of the educational institutions.

The second chapter discusses performance as the core aspects of life at school. It will look at how different ethno-social compositions affect individual attainments, and will explore how voluntary ethnic separation and involuntary segregation among and within schools influence variations in the measurable results of students, and how the emerging differences in acknowledged performance induce, in turn, significant departures in subsequent educational careers. The widely experienced intersectionalities of class, gender, and ethnicity in shaping performance will be scrutinised in the context of varying ethno-social arrangements.

By a close inquiry into patterns of advancement, the third chapter aims to explore how and when ethnicity gains importance above other distinctions in navigating students toward adulthood. The discussion will also attempt to reveal how early departures in adolescent pathways influence their future opportunities at the envisioned entrance-points to the world of labour. Students' varying choices on advancement will be revisited, partly as ethnically informed differences in their prior performance, and partly as institutionalised routes of

departure that are considered in their social "reading" as the foundations and also legitimisations of ethnically informed social inequalities in adulthood.

The fourth chapter will look at life in school from a different angle. It will put into focus various relations in and around school, and explore how ethnic distinctions inform these relations or may conclude in balanced interethnic relations or diversions toward separation and enclosure. In this context, teachers' views on ethnicity and their efforts to implement policies that are driven by different notions of ethnicity will be revisited through their students' assessments. We will follow how they assess their teachers' efforts, whether they experience injustices or open discrimination on their part, and how they evaluate the role that teachers play in shaping their future careers. Similarly, peer-relations, a constituent of key importance in the everyday life of schools, will be looked at as to their overt and covert ethnic contents. The frequency and the substance of interethnic encounters will be analysed from the perspectives of both majority and minority ethnic students, and the differences in these perspectives will also be explored against the prevailing structures of schools that provide opportunities for healthy mixing or, for that matter, strengthen tendencies toward separation and mutual exclusion on ethnic grounds. By looking at harshly selective structures as the embodiments of institutional discrimination, cognitive reflections on interpersonal and institutional discrimination will be scrutinised as acknowledgments for and rationalisations of ethnic discrimination as a "natural" fact of life.

The fifth chapter will pull together the threads of the preceding discussions by looking at the multifactor process of identity formation. Taking into account that adolescent identities represent a transient phase between rather non-reflexive concepts of the self in childhood and carefully maintained crystallisations in adulthood, the discussion pulls into focus the role of the schools in shaping the cognisance of the self. The importance of ethnicity in this process will be weighed against those of gender and social background, and how varied institutional arrangements in favour of interethnic mixing/ethnic separation leave their mark on adolescents' self-perception, feels of inclusion, and self-respect will be also scrutinised. Knowing that identity-formation may be deeply informed by religious and cultural differences, efforts will be made to reveal how the departing histories of the investigated ethnic communities influence the prevailing patterns of feelings of belonging, togetherness, and "otherness". In the second part of the fifth chapter, adolescent identities will be looked at in relation to visions of adult life. Desires for attainable social positions, partner-relations, future family life, and the broader socio-geographic environment will be "read" partly as imprints of valued/devalued identities, and partly as signals of accepting/refusing assigned positions in the greater society. Fears as

their counterpoints will be looked at as voiceless, telling signs of suffering and discrimination that might inform us about the internalised limitations on aspirations, and that might signal early ruptures in self-reliance and feelings of being secure and accepted.

Besides summarising the main findings of our comparative explorations, the closing chapter will make an attempt to draw a few conclusions, with relevance for considerations in policymaking that aims at improving the state of ethnic minorities, be they from "immigrant" or Roma backgrounds, and puts into the focus values of social inclusion. In this discussion, we hope to contribute to the refinement of the widely shared picture about minority ethnic groups that portrays them as disadvantaged en masse in comparison to the majorities. While our findings certainly do not challenge such an overall assessment, they significantly qualify them. First, the degrees of disadvantages vary to a large extent among communities and countries. It is our aim to show that the historically-shaped and diverse arrangements that our research embraces matter to a large extent in this regard. Second, our study sheds light on the importance of educational structures. It will be the task of the concluding chapter to show that relatively inclusive arrangements versus deeply selective ones leave their mark on all aspects of adolescent life: not only do they influence performance and advancement, but they also deeply engrain the patterns of interethnic relations and the involved experiences about the "Other", while they simultaneously inform in a decisive manner how members of various ethnic groups see themselves and the opportunities that are open for their members in adulthood.

These broadened discussions about the role of ethnicity in schooling hopefully provide insightful contributions to two large-scale debates with immediate relevance for policymaking. On the one hand, they might enrich our knowledge about how education prepares students for later social positions by converting ethnicity into a powerful factor of differentiation and thus twisting cultural diversities into differential positions on a hierarchy built around the measurable aspects of knowledge, skills, and preparedness. By pointing out the complexity of interests, factors, and self-governed processes in the background, we hope to provide a deeper understanding of the close relationships between family background and performance and better see the limitations that policies confined merely to teaching methods (but leaving aside the structural aspects at play) entail with regard to genuinely reducing inequalities in education. On the other hand, our study hopes to give new insights into the everyday life of young people in ethnically diverse communities. This way, issues of multiculturalism and social inclusion do not remain confined to the narrow discussions about institutional arrangements and teaching methods, but can be addressed in the context of relations of interethnic cohabitation in their communities-at-large. In this broadened context, social inclusion can be framed as an important

aspect of citizens' rights, and the formation of these rights comes to the forefront, in turn, as a matter of intercultural learning and as a case for making mutual experiences a foundation of daily life.

With these implications, we hope to contribute to a resurgence in the debate on multiculturalism and will attempt to show that, beyond institutional arrangements and regulations, it is the drawing of the wider relations in the community into the working of the schools that can point toward meaningfully informing interethnic relations at schools and that can thus become the foundations of new approaches in instruction and assessment more in favour of cultures outside the mainstream than before.

I. COMMUNITIES AND SCHOOLS IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE:
ABOUT THE INTEGRATED SAMPLE

By applying a comparative perspective, this first chapter aims to look at the major demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the communities and their schools that hosted the questionnaire-based surveys among students in the eight participating countries of the EDUMIGROM research project. The discussions that follow will be based on the analysis of the data of the comparative sample that was put together – after clearing, harmonising, and properly preparing the variables for cross-country processing – by merging the individual datasets that were set up by the national teams.

The creation of such a sample requires justification. After all, one might ask: does it make sense to speak in general terms about people from "majority" or "minority" ethnic backgrounds if one knows that these concepts comprise groups that, if looked at in their national context, remarkably differ by their history, culture, status, and living conditions? In addition to the conceptual considerations, important methodological questions also come to mind. Since the country-based samples emerged upon selecting certain communities, and within them, certain schools that embody, in a nutshell, specific majority/minority relations prevailing within the context of the given nation-states, can one owe any particular meaning to a cross-country comparative sample that unites such locally-bound relations? The answer to these questions is certainly not self-evident.

The conceptual design of the study seems to be justified by widespread experiences. After all, it is both earlier research and the major lessons of our national surveys that provide strong arguments for considering the divisions by ethnicity a pronounced feature of European societies-at-large. Repeated cross-national studies on school performance and educational advancement run in the 35 OECD countries have demonstrated that, despite important differences in the educational systems, the established ways of instruction, and the socio-economic environment of schooling, massive disadvantages for minorities from immigrant and Roma backgrounds prevail (OECD 2006, 2008, and 2009). The authoritative results of these studies also were unanimously confirmed by the in-depth investigations on the school experiences, interethnic relations, identity formations, and future aspirations of our nine community-based surveys (Fučík *et al.* 2010, Thomsen, Moldenhawer, and Kallehave 2010, Felozuis *et al.* 2010, Messing, Neményi, and Szalai 2010, Kusá *et al.* 2010, Swann and Law 2010, Magyari and Vincze 2009, Ohliner 2009).

In other words, ethnic differentiation seems to cause deep and lasting divides in European societies that bring otherwise differing "majorities" into similar situations in their relationship with the equally and similarly forged disadvantaged situations of "ethnic minorities". The enduring prevalence of this significant divide by ethnicity provides the justification for the abstract concepts of "majority" and "ethnic minority" that embody important power relations behind the unequal distribution of knowledge, opportunities, status, and livelihood.

The answer to the question on methodology seems less straightforward. The cross-country sample certainly should not be regarded as statistically representative in any sense of the term. However, it carries rather strong implications from a qualitative perspective. It demonstrates variations in the state of inclusionary relations, points to largely concealed mechanisms and patterns of marginalisation and exclusion, and makes it possible to go beyond the varying degrees of ethnic inequalities by comparing their varied manifestations in communities of cohabitating majorities and minorities. Assuming that the selection of communities and schools was meaningful enough to bring forward the prevailing forms and major traits of interethnic cohabitation in each of the eight countries, the analyses on the basis of our comparative sample that emerged from information about these distinctive communities should reveal significant associations, indeed. This sample allows a peek at the differences by the historic formations of socio-ethnic relations, and it also renders certain lessons about the affects of differences in schooling on how these relations open up or restrict convergence in the short- and longer-term prospects for majority and ethnic minority youths. In more concrete terms, by also revealing the overarching common features of the approached diverse "ethnic minority" communities as the factors that produce apparent differences in their economic and social standing and relations to the majorities that they cohabitate with, it is hoped to provide a suitable contextualisation of the relative nature and the historically-informed character of the disadvantages that adolescents from "ethnic minority" backgrounds experience in educational advancement and career opportunities in comparison to their peers from the majority. As will be demonstrated, these disadvantages are grounded in established structures in and outside education while also working toward the continuous reproduction of exactly these structures. At the same time, the disadvantageous positions of youth from ethnic minority background in school highly influence larger-scale interethnic relations, and also leave their marks on identity development and aspirations for a longer-term future. Hence, it is of utmost importance to sort out those factors that convert "ethnicity" into ascribed (low) social positions or, contrarily, open new paths toward social inclusion by stripping the notion of "ethnicity" from its demeaning contents.

Before entering the details, the major traits of the comparative sample have to be introduced. As indicated above, this sample unites the data of eight independent studies that focused on majority/minority relations in schools in selected ethnically diverse communities. Though the country-level samples were constructed along identical lines, the implementation of the survey concluded in rather important differences with regard to the ultimate compositions.

In the first step, in each country, one to three urban sites were chosen where minority populations made up a substantial proportion of the local community.

Of course, "substantial" has different meanings country by country.

First, assessments on what should be considered as "substantial" depend on the proportion of the selected minorities in the given society-at-large. Thus, in the Czech Republic, where the overall proportion of Roma is about three per cent, sites with a five to seven per cent Roma population count as a "substantial presence". However, in France the same ratio would be considered rather low for people from immigrant backgrounds who are estimated to make up close to 10 per cent of contemporary French society.

Second, a lot depends on the historically-shaped composition of the urban communities. For example, Roma tend to live mostly in rural settings in Central Europe, and thus a relatively low ratio of Roma might count as "high" in urban conditions: hence, it is not by chance that people from a majority background represent by far the dominant group in the country-specific samples of all the four Central European countries – despite the fact that, in each case, the selected sites were all relatively densely populated by Roma.

Third, and yet again in reflections on the historical long dureé, how people reside does make a difference. In communities characterised by sharp ethno-social segregation, the "site" might mean densely populated minority communities: this was the case, for example, in Germany where two large ethnic communities in Berlin were chosen for hosting the greater part of the survey. At the opposite end of the scale, the two selected urban communities as entities represent a high degree of interethnic cohabitation in Hungary – where separation appears in less visible forms but greatly affects the composition and the overall quality of the schools that provide compulsory education.

The actual selection of the communities followed a careful consideration of a number of quantitative and qualitative aspects. The main guiding principle was to attain a fair representation of ethnic diversity in its impacts on patterns of residential relations and the quality of communication and contacts among people from different ethnic backgrounds. At the

same time, the communities had to be large enough to provide different options for schooling and, especially, to have an ample group of young people of school-age whom this survey intended to investigate. Along these lines, established multiethnic urban communities with a shared history of generations of ethnic minorities and the local majority were selected in each of the participating countries. Due to the prevailing differences in the socio-geographic distributions, it was well identifiable multiethnic residential segments in large cities in the West, while smaller towns with sizeable Roma populations and their (sometimes rural) multiethnic surroundings in Central Europe that ultimately hosted the research.[2]

In the second step, the local schools were contacted to gain their consent and cooperation. The survey was designed to enquire among students either in the concluding phases of primary education or in the starting year of secondary education (the selection of the actual types of schools was largely dependent on the school system of the country). The choice of this second level further influenced the composition of the country-specific samples. By and large, in larger urban settings with delimitations that circumscribed the chosen communities in which ethnic minority groups had a substantial weight, students from minority backgrounds made up a decisive part of the student body also of the selected schools. However, this was also a cause for country-specific differences. There are countries where students are mostly confined to the local units (e.g., in France), and it is rather exceptional to leave the given school district. In other countries, families exert a high degree of freedom in searching for the school that they consider the most appropriate for their children, and the ultimate ethnic composition of the local educational institutions is shaped as an outcome of such intense moves (e.g., in Hungary). Yet in other cases, minority ethnic schools are set up on purpose: it is people's choice whether they want their children to attend "ordinary" schools or ones that are ruled by their own people and culture (e.g., in Denmark). These differences are strongly influenced by historical and cultural factors, and the actual structure of the school system reflects, on the one hand, the patterns that have evolved over time, while on the other hand, it works in itself as a basis for providing institutional arrangements for the embodiment of ethnic and cultural differences.

Taking into account all the above, it is justified to ask: are there certain overarching characteristics that comprise the experienced diversities? In other words, can one provide certain characterisations that are accurate and meaningful enough to address the combined populations that the comparative sample represents?

---

[2] Since we assured all our interviewees and also the participating schools and other institutions that we would maintain their anonymity, we will not disclose the names of the locations of the research. Instead, we will refer to them by the pseudonyms that have been introduced in earlier publications (see e.g. the Survey Reports), and that still indicate one or another important characteristics of them.

In broad terms it can be said that our "unusual" sample represents the teenage population of ethnically diverse communities in selected schools that are qualified by the presence (if not domination) of ethnic minority students who end up there after being navigated through various routes of selection. In other words, this qualitatively constructed sample opens a window to ethnic selection in education from two perspectives. First, it renders information on how conditions in school and schooling become institutionalised upon ethnic selection. Second, it makes it possible to reveal how ethnic differentiation in schooling forges departing opportunities and how it becomes an important factor in young people's self-perception and views about the "Other". In brief, this is a sample built up on the ground of acknowledged large-scale ethnic selections in our educational systems, and that renders new insights into certain personal and group-level consequences of such selections.

It is important to underline that the constructed sample of the survey does not speak about interethnic relations in general. Due to its specific focus, it brings up, instead, the varied formations and relations of ethnic mixing (or, in contrast, of ethnic profiling) in schools – and this was the focal issue to explore in the EDUMIGROM research project. Majorities in these schools are not majorities-at-large; instead these are majorities in the proximity of ethnic minority people. Thus, we can say that – by its grip in schools that are affiliated with communities having high proportions of minority ethnic people – the sample is suitable for revealing the conditions and relations of daily life of families with school-age children from different ethnic and social backgrounds. It has to be emphasised that this way our study brings up just a segment – though a very important segment – of ethnically diverse communities: it reflects on the life of young and middle-aged families with school-age children. This limitation has to be observed in any discussions that aim to address certain general features of the involved neighbourhoods, their people, and their institutions.

The selected communities through a comparative lens

In the light of the above, perhaps it does not come as a surprise that the ethnic compositions of the investigated communities show great variations in a number of important aspects. First, one has to take into account the historical differences. In each country, selection was driven by certain shared considerations. In line with the established common principles, due to their size and their historical role in shaping the currently prevailing patterns of interethnic relations, the minority ethnic groups put into the focus of the local studies enjoyed substantial visibility

perceptibility in all our countries. Although it was a generally agreed upon aim to choose from among "visible" groups who have been living in the given country for at least one generation, even these specifications turned out to be broad enough to arrive at some 25 different ethnic groups in the overall sample. What is more, ethnic borders proved to be rather soft: people with mixed ethnic backgrounds represent substantial proportions. They make up 13 per cent among the parents, and no less than 22 per cent among the students belonging to such groups. The latter proportion indicates how migrants and Roma find their ways toward being included: mixed marriages among the parents are an important way toward this end (the benevolent effects are manifested in relatively better socio-economic status – as we will demonstrate below).

Second, the composition of the communities is greatly influenced by how ethnic minorities and majorities live together in the given country. Although a certain degree of residential segregation characterises all the involved communities, its extent and depth differ to a substantial degree. By looking at the neighbourhoods where the interviewed students come from, one notices a great range of diversities, indeed. Some of them are genuine ethnic enclaves, while others represent a high degree of ethnic mixing. On the whole, it is mostly the "new" EU member states where residential segregation turns out to be exceptionally intense: while the proportion of those coming from closed (either majority- or minority-dominated) neighbourhoods is between 40 and 49 per cent in the "old" member-states (with Hungary joining into this group), it jumps above 60 per cent in the Czech Republic, Romania, and Slovakia.

Third, it is the positioning of the selected schools in the community that influences the picture of the socio-ethnic relations hidden in the background. For the most part, the schools were local units, and in this sense it is justifiable to think that they bring up a fair representation of families with children in their neighbourhood.[3] However, in some cases, a school with outstandingly high proportions of minority ethnic students was selected on purpose – either because, yet again for historical reasons, such schools are customarily incorporated institutions in the given country (this was the case with two Muslim schools in Denmark, or with the selected vocational streams in France); or because certain institutions – though originally set up with other intentions – bring up country-specific features of educating ethnic minority children (e.g., the Basic Special Schools in the Czech Republic or in Slovakia where Roma students appear in unusually high concentrations). Since these "minority schools" are attended by broad

---

[3] Reports from the schools testify to this statement. On the average, the proportion of students attending a school outside the institution's catchment area varied between 7 and 33 per cent, which means that even schools with special programmes attract mostly students in their immediate neighbourhood. This is true even for the outstanding case of North City in the United Kingdom, where the compositions of the three schools picked for the survey reflect a rather high degree of boundary-crossing movements across catchment areas; still, "outsiders" constitute a minority with an only 40 per cent representation among the attendees.

circles of ethnic minority students in the locality, their student-bodies rather poorly reflect the features of the immediate community where they are situated. However, the relatively low number of these institutions with a low proportion of students in the sample as a whole does not substantially skew the overall composition – which we will consider as by and large representative of the child-rearing segment of the chosen communities.

With all the above differentiating factors in mind, a few common denominators had to be established to characterise our sites by their ethnic divides. In accordance with the focal questions of this study, it was of key importance to see the position of the chosen minority ethnic groups at high risk of being "othered", and follow the lives, interethnic relations, school career, and future outlook of students from such backgrounds in comparison to groups that hypothetically face smaller degrees of endangerment. This consideration has led us to set up three categories with regard to minority background. In the discussions that follow, we distinguish among students who belong to the majority, children from those groups whose other than "white European" background can be seen at first glance – calling them "visible" minorities – and youth of "other" migrant backgrounds who "visibly" do not appear as strangers but whom the majority still seems to keep at a distance for not belonging to them in full.[4] These three categories are present in all our countries, though the actual proportions naturally differ for all the reasons that have been discussed so far. In sum, 59 per cent of the surveyed students come from families where parents and children all belong to the country's "ethnic majority" ; families where both students and parents are from "visible" minority background represent 28 per cent, while the remaining 13 per cent come either from "mixed" backgrounds or from families of "non-visible" minorities. The highest proportions of "visible" minorities turned out to be present in the Danish and French samples (61 and 58 per cent, respectively) where – as it was pointed out above – the very specificities of the school system have led to the "aggrandisement" of the picture of ethnic minority students and families; at the other end, the lowest proportion of such people is shown in the Czech Republic (13 per cent in both cases), where this is largely due to the relatively low ratio of Roma in the urban population.

While they are diverse by ethnic affiliation, "visible" minorities in the focus of our study have a few important characteristics in common. First of all, they are all settled minorities, in the

---

[4] It is worth indicating here that the group of "other" minorities comprises students from "mixed" (majority/minority background) and those from "immigrant background", whose families have left behind another European country or have rather recently arrived from one of the overseas developed countries (United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc.). It has to be noted that Eastern Europeans make up half of the group, followed by immigrants from the "developed West" (from overseas or Western European descent) with a share of 35 per cent, while students with "mixed" identities represent 15 per cent of the group. In the light of this distribution, we can probably justifiably use the category of "white immigrants" to denote this group.

sense that their family histories point far back into the past. Eighty-seven per cent of the respondents belonging to this group were born in the country where they currently live. In other words, they are of immigrant background but cannot be considered migrants any more – we call them "second generation migrants,"[5] though in a more accurate phrasing, we should name them "at least second generation migrants". Such a phrasing would be all the more appropriate because in no less than 73 per cent of the cases, both of the parents of students from "visible" ethnic background were themselves born in the country where the family currently lives, and the corresponding ratio – 67 per cent – is not substantially lower in the case of "other" minorities either. In this context, it should be mentioned that there is a great divide between the "new" and the "old" member states in our sample. In the case of Roma in the former group, being settled in the country dates back for centuries; hence, the parents were also born there. The picture is different in the "old" member states (all with recent histories of intense cross-border migration), where only some 8–45 per cent of the parents were themselves second generation immigrants, while the majority of them arrived relatively late (mostly in adulthood). However, even is these cases, the family's history in their new home country dates back at least 15–25 years – a substantial period for adapting and integrating. Hence, it makes sense to state that the picture that will be introduced next can be considered as a measure of social inclusion: differences in attained positions and living conditions in comparison to the cohabitating majorities show how far minority ethnic people can go by overcoming the temporary but natural obstacles of resettlement.

Families and children

A quick look at some basic demographic characteristics of the investigated communities reveals a few rather important peculiarities: country by country, it is families with high numbers of children that determine the profile of the local society. True, it is minority groups in the first place that carry this characteristic.[6] However, as it is clear from Table 1.1, local majorities also live in relatively large households, indicated by the fact that the proportions of families with three or more children is higher among them than on average in the respective countries.

---

[5] It is interesting to note that the proportion of "newcomers" is somewhat higher among young people from "other minority" background: nearly every fifth student among them was born in a country different from where they live now. Upon closer scrutiny, it becomes clear that this difference is largely due to the recent and intense migration of Eastern Europeans to the West.

[6] Romania is an exception in this regard. This is mainly due to the fact that Roma students attending the concluding years of primary education come mainly from the upward-striving and relatively well-off segments of the minority community (those from poorer backgrounds dropped out in earlier years) where one way for upward mobility has been to deliberately limit the number of births.

Table 1.1

Proportion of households with three or more children
among all child-rearing households

Country	Proportion (%) of households with three or more children among all child-rearing households			
	National average	Average	Majority	Minorities
		in the investigated communities		
Czech Republic	8.7	25.1	16.4	49.2
Denmark	17.3	54.2	24.5	68.9
France	16.7	53.7	35.4	58.7
Germany	11.8	43.3	32.2	51.2
Hungary	14.6	29.3	23.4	51.2
Romania	10.9	30.1	32.3	22.4
Slovakia	14.8	25.6	20.5	37.0
United Kingdom	16.7	37.5	27.9	56.7

Sources: OECD Family Database 2009, except for Denmark, where the data come from the *National Statistical Database 2010.*

   While the numbers of children are outstandingly high, the household formations seem to follow the mainstream: it is two parents with children that primarily dominate the scene. In each country, this is the type of family in which close to two-thirds of the respondents live. Interestingly enough, intra-country differences among the three large groups reveal an even stronger prevalence of this pattern among "visible minority" families than in their counterparts in the majority. It seems that the burdens and challenges of accommodating amidst the new circumstances require stronger family bondages and support than for majority members: in each country, single-parent families are much below the share of the respective rates among the majority. It is worth noting, however, that this latter formation is rather frequent among other migrant groups: many of them are refugees, asylum-seekers, or economic migrants who have not

yet succeeded to re-unite the family; hence, it is often the task of the only parent to cope with the new situation.

Another interesting and stable feature is the low occurrence of extended families and other formations: regardless of the cultural traditions that one might assume to differ greatly by ethnicity, the frequency of this formation is around 22–27 per cent in all ethnic groups – the local majorities included. It seems that adaptation to the new conditions probably starts with "modernising" the form of family cohabitation. Irrespective of their roots and origins, these urban groups all have left behind other patterns than that of the nuclear family.[7] Unfortunately, we do not know the age-structure of the families, neither is there information about the age of the parents. However, an indirect indicator might be the high proportion of those households in the sample where all the children live at home: it is only in 28 per cent of the cases that some of the siblings of our respondents have already left. This fact seems to signal that, for the most part, parents might be relatively young. As for separations, there are two exceptions to the general rule: the first relates to Roma families, where the respective ratio is 34 per cent. This figure is the indication of a well-known phenomenon: the very early start of – forced – adulthood in the affected communities that frequently concludes in teenage separation from the parental house. The second departure is demonstrated by the relatively small families (one to two children) of those immigrants who arrived rather recently – in adulthood – and whose elder child already lives apart in 49 per cent of the cases. This latter case suggests that, perhaps due to the many years devoted to the move and resettlement, these parents of teenage children might be older than the majority in the sample.

On the whole, the communities are constituted by people with a shared history of lasting cohabitation. It is especially young people for whom the given country is their homeland: only six per cent of the students in the sample were born somewhere else.

Strong bonds to the country also characterise the majority of their parents, among whom only approximately one-quarter were born outside the borders but, for the most part, even members of the latter sub-group had migrated in the early years of childhood (the proportion of parents arriving in adulthood is only 13 per cent). In the light of these data, one can say that the studied ethnic groups chiefly consist of settled minorities that had accommodated themselves in

---

[7] It has to be added that welfare policies might play a great role in invoking the sweeping dominance of the nuclear family formation. After all, support schemes, training programmes, job placement, and the wide range of benefits all tacitly assume that it is parents and children who live together, and the principles of access are adjusted accordingly. Furthermore, recent stringent rules in immigration policies have attempted to slow down the inflow of kin from the countries of origin – which might be another factor that manifests itself in the spreading of the nuclear family model.

their new home country decades, if not generations, before. Such a long history of being at home in the new environment makes it an interesting feature to mention that the involved ethnic minority groups still have preserved their distinct features in comparison to the cohabitating majorities: they live in bigger households, have more children, and the frequency of living in the close proximity of relatives is rather high among them. However, the explanations behind these distinctions vary. Most probably, it is religion and the traditions of organising all major relationships around the family that provides the reasons behind the very high fertility rate in Black African and Caribbean families, while – with a decrease in the importance of specific traditions and religiosity – it is primarily deep poverty and the pressing need for contributions of "all hands within reach" that raise the number of children in Roma families significantly above those in non-Roma families in the communities of Central Europe.

Parents' education

Being aware of the close associations between students' educational careers and their parents' educational attainment (OECD 2007 and 2008), it was of great importance for us to collect detailed data about the level of schooling of both the fathers and mothers of our respondents. At the same time, these data are significant indicators also of the social composition of the communities behind the schools that are in the focus of our inquiry. Although a lot can be learned from the distributions that will be discussed below, they have to be read with great caution. No less than 30 per cent of our respondents could not or did not want to reveal the level of schooling of their fathers, and though they were somewhat more informed about their mother's educational attainment, the proportion of missing information still was as high as 24 per cent in this regard.[8] A closer analysis of the missing data revealed that it was mostly students from poor households who could or did not want to indicate their parents' education. Therefore, one can assume that the "missing" levels of education would concentrate toward the lower end of the educational hierarchy; thus, the picture below is most probably more favourable than what a full-scale distribution would show.

In comparing parents' education to the mainstream patterns in their country, one has to face insurmountable difficulties. Although recent OECD and Eurostat studies have suggested new classifications to provide interchangeable categorisations for Europe's very diverse

---

[8] Around these averages, there is a substantial difference according to the respondents' ethnic background: ethnic minority students seemed to be less informed than their peers from the majority. The proportion of missing information at 35 and 29 per cent respectively might reflect the difficulties of the former group of students in translating educational attainment between the systems of the country of origin of parents and their current home; furthermore, they indirectly indicate the troubled and unsettled conditions that these families often face in their daily life.

educational systems, cross-country comparisons of attained educational levels of the populations are very rarely produced, and the available data are highly aggregated. Hence, Table 1.2 below has to be read as indicating gross tendencies. Since one can assume that parents of our 14–17-year-old students are dominantly between their late 30s and mid-50s, a proper comparison would require a breakdown by age. However, comparable data are available only for the much wider cohort of the working-age population. Furthermore, one can assume substantial differences by gender – however, comparative data-sets separating male and female data for the adult population are unavailable. Hence, Table 1.2 below compares our samples to the gross statistics of the working-age population as a whole, and indicates the internal differences by the aggregate categories of majority and ethnic minority belonging.

Table 1.2 reveals an interesting pattern across its fields. The communities where ethnic minority people make up a substantial group are characterised by a remarkable polarisation according to the level of education of the adult population. While it is people who have graduated from secondary education who make up the majority in all the involved countries, this level is rather underrepresented in the investigated communities. Instead, a bifurcated pattern seems to prevail in them: while it is low educational attainment that dominates the scene, the proportion of men and women with a degree in higher education is also remarkable. With the exception of France, the latter supersedes the proportions shown for the entire population. This dual pattern characterises as much the local majorities as the ethnic minorities. However, the relative advantage of the former above the latter is clear: the dominance of low educational attainment is more pronounced for the minority groups than for the local majority, and the case is just the opposite with regard to the proportion of those with higher education where the lead is taken by the majorities. An interesting exception is presented by people in North City in the United Kingdom (though due to the outstandingly large proportion of missing information, the data have to be read with caution). In this case, the proportion of poorly educated parents corresponds to the national average, while the ratio of those with a degree in higher education is much above the average ratio with ethnic minority adults lagging behind those from the majority by only a marginal rate.

The demonstrated patterns have evolved as results of different historical processes. First, as the data show, migration has shifted toward relatively highly educated groups. While the great boom of the 1970s of inviting guest workers to fill thousands of low-paid unqualified jobs was built on the inflow of poorly educated groups from the developing world, today's migration is driven mainly by people with high qualification – and among them, by men with valuable degrees in the first place. As the data from the "old" member states show without exception,

newly arrived fathers are better educated than their established counterparts. Seemingly, the pattern holds less for women, among whom the duration of being settled does not make a difference. This perhaps reflects another aspect of the process: migration is a family endeavour and its success hinges on men's prospects to find honourable and well-paid jobs in the new environment. At the same time, living in a community that is dominated by people whose social standing – at least as indicated by educational attainment – is toward the lower end of the social hierarchy indicates that the newcomers have not yet finished their "mobility project". As we will see below, neither their housing conditions nor the living standard of the families correspond to what established groups of highly qualified people are characterised by. In this sense, they are in a lasting transient state, and it is often the children who are expected to accomplish the process.

Another important characteristic of the prevailing educational patterns refers to Roma groups in Central Europe. As to their prospects, the length of the time living in the society in question simply does not matter: they have always been confined to the lowest ranks of the educational hierarchy, and this deprived position seems to be reproduced in an unchallenged manner generation after generation. While the above described trend of highly educated people being on the move prevails for the majorities, being born where one lives or moving in geographic terms does not conclude in upward educational mobility for the Roma community. The intergenerational reproduction of their educational disadvantages is shown in the sharpest way by the Hungarian case where inclusion of Roma into the sample was the highest among the four countries and where the rate of missing information was the lowest. These data demonstrate that even secondary level graduation is a rare exception among Roma adults (only two per cent of the fathers and nine per cent of the mothers were reported to have such an attainment), while the proportion of those with no less than elementary education is as high as 55 per cent for men and 63 per cent for women.

Table 1.2

***Level of education of parents, in comparison to the population,* by country**

(*Intra-group percentage distribution by highest level of educational attainment*)

Level of education	Group	Czech Republic	Denmark	France	Germany	Hungary	Romania	Slovakia	United Kingdom
At most, non-graduating vocational training	Majority	43	31	69	53	47	55	22	31
	Minority	65	55	68	69	90	60	60	31
	Together	54	46	68	61	51	57	33	31
	Population	**10**	**17**	**33**	**17**	**22**	**n.d.**	**14**	**31**
Secondary-level graduation	Majority	33	19	22	25	36	34	52	18
	Minority	19	16	19	17	8	35	31	26
	Together	25	18	20	21	26	34	46	21
	Population	**76**	**47**	**41**	**52**	**59**	**n.d.**	**72**	**39**
Degree in higher	Majority	14	50	9	22	17	11	26	51
	Minority	16	29	13	14	2	5	9	43
	Together	21	36	12	18	23	9	21	48

education	Population	14	36	26	24	17	n.d.	14	30
Within-group totals		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* "Population" refers to the working-age population (25–64 years of age).

Source: Education at a Glance 2008. Paris: OECD (2008)

As a more detailed breakdown of our data reveals, patterns of parental educational attainment show great variations according to ethnic affiliation. The differences in Table 1.3 reflect departing histories. Though the proportions of poorly educated males and females are higher in all minority groups than in the majority, there are substantial differences among the former, ranging from the relatively low rates of 23–25 per cent among the Eastern European immigrants and those from mixed backgrounds, to the outstandingly high proportions of 56 per cent among fathers and 62 per cent among mothers in the Muslim groups. The picture is more colourful among highly educated parents: though for the most part, the ratios among the various minority groups remain below those for the majority, there are a few important exceptions. Black African and Caribbean women perform better than the "hosting" majority, and the case is similar for Asian and Black African/Caribbean men. These achievements reflect different models of mobility. A comparison of the "newcomers" – i.e., those who immigrated as adults – with inborn peers of the respective ethnic groups reveals that it is to a large extent the best educated groups among Black Africans and Caribbean who provide the continuous source of migration, while among the Asian groups, it is the speedy upward mobility of less educated migrants that raises the proportion of well-educated people to a relatively high level.

At the same time, there are two large groups that stand out for practically being deprived of access to higher education: the Roma in Central Europe and Muslim parents in the "old" member states of the West. In the former group, the best that men and women can attain is the acquisition of some vocational qualification (42 per cent of fathers and 36 per cent of mothers). For people from the Muslim world, traditional gender differences induce further divides: though the 10 per cent rate of fathers holding a degree from higher education is the second lowest among the studied ethnic groups, it is still double that of the corresponding rate among mothers of the same ethnic group.

Another important feature of the patterns of parental education is the rather high degree of congruity between the attainment of spouses: in 56 per cent of the cases, they are identical,[9] while the remaining 44 per cent is equally distributed between the "traditional" configuration of the father having a higher level of attainment, and the "non-traditional" where the mother holds the educational lead in the family.

The overall outcome of the described tendencies is a remarkable divide between majority and minority ethnic people that is further refined by skin colour to the detriment of the "visible"

---

[9] Interesting exceptions to the rule are those highly educated Muslim and Eastern European men whose wives are significantly less educated. These traditional divisions of roles are assigned in 72 per cent of the respective Muslim families, and 62 per cent of the Eastern European ones.

groups. As a comparison of the first and the last two rows of Table 1.3 shows, the proportion of very poorly educated fathers is close to four times higher among those who "visibly" differ from the majority than for the dominant "host" group, and the respective multiplier is nearly twice that for mothers. At the same time, men and women in the "visible" groups have just half the chance to get into the highest educated echelon of that of their same-sex majority peers. "White" immigrants have a better outlook: though poorly educated people are somewhat overrepresented in the case of both sexes, the differences are significantly milder than for "visible" immigrants and are powerfully countervailed by the near to equal share of highly educated people.

Table 1.3

Parents' level of education by ethnic affiliation

Ethnic/national background	Percentage of fathers with		Percentage of mothers with	
	No more than primary schooling	College/University degree	No more than primary schooling	College/University degree
Majority	12	24	13	23
Roma	44	1	48	3
Eastern European	23	20	25	16
Asian	40	26	45	18
Muslim	56	10	62	5
Black African/Caribbean	31	30	35	28
Immigrant from a developed country ("White")	40	24	39	17
Mixed ethnic background	23	21	25	22
"Visible" ethnic minorities together	46	13	49	12
Other ("immigrant white") minorities	21	22	21	20

In conclusion, it is worth noting that the popular stereotype of immigrants as uneducated has to be thoroughly revised. Though there is a constant influx of such groups, they are certainly not the only ones: rather substantial parts of the immigrant communities represent the opposite end of the educational scale. Two important minority ethnic communities are exceptions to such a division: apparently, Roma and those from the Muslim world have little chance for educational improvement. Whether they had settled generations before or arrived relatively late, members of these two groups are confined to the lowest educational positioning in what are now their home societies.

It deserves an additional note to point out that parental education does not only influence individual careers but works also as a strong structuring factor of the school systems as such. Our data reveal that the higher the proportion of poorly educated parents, the higher the rate of ethnic minority students in a given educational unit, and vice versa: highly educated parents tend to send their children to schools dominated by the majority. These associations reflect the conviction that education is a powerful path for upward mobility which, in turn, requires a high degree of integration into the dominant society. At the other end of the spectrum, it is more an outcome of external forces than a sign of a choice: children of poorly educated parents gather in "ethnic minority" schools largely because such schools are abandoned by anyone who has the opportunity and the power to act upon other options.[10] As an outcome of these trends, while families where neither of the parents have more than elementary-level schooling represent 17 per cent on the average, their ratio is only five per cent in schools where at least 80 per cent of the students come from the majority , and the corresponding figure jumps as high as 36 per cent in those units where it is ethnic minority groups that are in exclusivity (i.e., children from such backgrounds form 80 per cent or more of the student body).

The shaping of departing school profiles is no less remarkable at the other end of the scale. While families with secondary or higher parental educational attainment represent 57 per cent on the average, the corresponding proportion is 71 per cent in majority-dominated schools, while dropping to 45 per cent in schools where ethnic minority students have the absolute majority. As we will see, these departing educational profiles influence in many ways how schools work and how students envision their educational careers. This is easy to understand: on

---

[10] This tendency seems to prevail despite the fact that some of the minority-dominated schools have come to existence by choice: this is the case with the two Muslim independent schools in Denmark that were founded with the explicit will of the Muslim community to preserve their culture. However, even these schools are attended by children of relatively poorly educated parents. As the data show, the proportion of students coming from a parental house with adults having only elementary education is 15 per cent higher, while the ratio of those from families where at least one parent holds a university degree is 23 per cent lower than in mixed Danish schools.

the one hand, educated parents exert a high degree of control on the quality and content of education, and in this regard, a high-performing parental educational environment in itself has a strong pulling effect. On the other hand, educated and successful parents provide role models even for those students whose own parents might have given up schooling at an early stage – hence, the environment might be a strong factor in individual mobility aspirations. Given these multifaceted implications, it is not only educational background taken individually but also the "parental educational environment" that we have to consider in our search for factors behind variations in performance and advancement.

Employment

The relatively low standing of the investigated communities in comparison to the main trends in the respective societies is clearly indicated by some data on employment, and even more, by those on access to regular full-time work. Country by country, rates of both male and female employment fall substantially short of the corresponding indicators of men and women in the comparable age-brackets. Taking into account that, given their life-cycle and age, our parental generation is at the peak of employability, it is worth comparing the data of our study to the aggregate OECD statistics on men and women in their late forties and early fifties. As Table 1.4 indicates, the relatively good access of this cohort to employment is demonstrated to a limited extent in our communities: the rates of parental employment fall 10–30 per cent below the national indicators.

Table 1.4

Rates of employment in the 45–54-year-old male and female population, and among fathers and mothers, by country

Country	Men	Women	Fathers	Mothers
	aged 45–54		in the community	
Czech Republic	90.2	85.3	74.5	72.2
Denmark	90.5	83.1	66.6	59.4
France	87.9	78.1	60.7	56.4
Germany	86.8	76.2	74.3	56.8

Hungary	74.2	71.2	72.2	60.2
Romania	n.d.	n.d.	68.0	62.7
Slovakia	83.5	78.3	71.8	71.6
United Kingdom	86.2	77.9	56.7	47.9

Source: Online OECD Employment Database.

The relatively low levels of employment of ethnic minority men and women are only partially due to the above disadvantages in adult educational attainment. As the data reveal, substantial discrimination on the part of employers as well as group-specific patterns of labour market participation might play important roles here that, together, conclude in clear ethnicised inequalities. Even better educated men and women from immigrant or Roma backgrounds have poorer chances to engage in gainful work than men and women with similar attainments from the majority. The relative disadvantages are outstanding in the case of two groups: Roma and Muslims. While among those with at least completed secondary education 89 per cent of the fathers from the majority are in stable, regular full-time employment, and while the rates are just a few points lower (between 80–87 per cent) for the fathers in most ethnic minority groups, Muslim fathers with 71 per cent and Roma fathers with 52 per cent access to similar jobs represent degrees of disadvantage that single out the marginalised positions of these two groups. As reflected by the data on mothers' employment, the pattern is replicated in the case of women. Though the current economic crisis certainly makes competition fierce on the shrinking labour market, it seemingly accentuates the effects of overt and covert forms of distinction by colour. This seems to be reflected in the fact that it is "visible" minorities who are first driven from stable, regular full-time work, and at best have access to precarious jobs on the margins of the labour market, or remain confined to the household.

It has to be underlined that these differences in access to regular employment cannot be explained simply by educational disadvantages. When reviewing the data of people with the same educational background, one experiences a similar hierarchical order. Just to mention the two extremes – those with incomplete primary education, on the one hand, and those with a degree in higher education, on the other – the findings for the fathers of our respondents speak about a significant degree of ethnic discrimination at play. While 73 per cent of the least educated fathers from a majority background are in regular full-time employment, the corresponding figure drops to 56 per cent in the group of "visible" minorities (with an in-

between indicator of 61 per cent for other minorities); similarly, while nearly all highly educated fathers in the majority (92 per cent) are in stable employment, the corresponding figure is only 80 per cent for those from a "visibly" differing minority background (yet again, with an in-between indicator of 85 per cent for the other minorities). While the tendencies are the same, the differences by ethnicity are even sharper among mothers. When considering the least educated among them, the rate of those in regular full-time employment is 63 per cent among mothers from the majority, while it sharply drops to only 28 per cent in the group of "visible" minorities (with a further decline of the respective ratio to 19 per in other minority groups). As for highly educated women, the tendency is repeated: the 77 per cent proportion among mothers from a majority background falls to only 51 per cent in the case of "visible" minorities (while it nearly reaches the indicator of the majority with a 74 per cent figure for other minorities).

As an aggregate outcome of the previously indicated educational disadvantages, discriminatory tendencies, clearly at play when choosing among people with the same level of schooling, are accentuated by the gender distinctions in distributing the available jobs. In addition, these day-to-day patterns of social injustices are imbued in deeply-rooted cultural patterns that ascribe certain occupational paths for male and female members of the community. As a result, access to employment as a foundation of daily life is assured to varying degrees for the members of the different minority ethnic groups. The differences in access to regular employment as presented in Table 1.5 also foreshadow rather substantial departures in the level and stability of living, and indicate the accompanying differential risks of poverty among the minority groups.

It is again the same two large groups of Roma and Muslims that stand out, though their patterns also differ from one another. As the data testify, Roma barely have access to any types of work: against 71 per cent for the sample as a whole, it is only 41 per cent of Roma families that can count on regular monthly income from contracted full-time employment, and 43 per cent of their households remain completely excluded from gainful work. The relatively low level of embeddedness in the primary labour market in the case of Muslim families is countervailed by intensive participation in less stable forms of work, but even with these efforts, every fifth of the families in this group are excluded from any access to gainful employment.

Although the rates of participation in the realm of stable employment remain below that of the majority in the case of all other ethnic minority groups, their disadvantages are substantially smaller than those of Roma and Muslim families; furthermore, they are usually powerfully countervailed by extensive participation in a vast sphere of precarious temporary employment.

In consequence, the proportion of households confined to provisions in welfare and various forms of informal help in the community remain relatively low: the ratio of families with such extreme dependence makes up 12 per cent on average, and remains well below 20 per cent in all the groups, except for Roma and Muslim households for whom local assistance is frequently the remaining last resort for survival.

Table 1.5

Families' embeddedness in the labour market by ethnic background

Ethnic/national background	At least one parent in		No access of parents to gainful work	Together
	Regular full-time employment	Precarious work		
Majority	77	16	7	100
Roma	41	16	43	100
Eastern European	66	24	10	100
Asian	70	12	18	100
Muslim	57	21	22	100
Black African/ Caribbean	60	24	16	100
Developed country ("white")	69	19	12	100
Mixed ethnic background	63	19	18	100

It is worth adding to the picture outlined here that full-time employment is attained by often substantial sacrifices on the part of well-educated members of the communities. Although the high rates of missing responses should warn to refrain from drawing generalised conclusions, a signal of the constraints between education and the actual level of the occupied position lies in the fact that only 46 per cent of fathers and 42 per cent of mothers holding a degree work in professional or managerial jobs, while 23 and 26 per cent of them, respectively, found employment by engaging in manual labour.

Put in general terms, on the sites of the study can be characterised as established working-class communities where blue-collar jobs provide a livelihood for up to 55 per cent of fathers and 43 per cent of mothers, with a relatively high occurrence (above 10 per cent) of homemaking in the latter group. Another distinctive feature of these communities is the relatively high ratio of small entrepreneurs among men. As several of the Survey Reports have pointed out, setting up a small commercial or service-based business is a typical path for partial social inclusion that is especially prevalent among Asian (Pakistani, Chinese, and Vietnamese) people and "white" migrants (24–26 per cent of the fathers are engaged in such activities) (Swann and Law 2010a, Felouzis et al. 2010, Thomsen at al. 2010, Ohliger 2009). Based on the demand that the ample market of the ethnic community provides, these small businesses help to maintain the self-contained character of the community while generating a decent income to attain a respected social position. As will be demonstrated later, this transient state toward social inclusion also provides a desirable pattern for the next generation: when asked to imagine their work and position in adulthood, a frequent option among boys from ethnic minority origins has been taking over a small family workshop.

Housing and living conditions

Since less than half of our respondents attend a school that draws its student-body exclusively from the immediate neighbourhood, their responses – as to the character of the nearby community that provides their everyday contacts as well as regarding the details of the housing arrangements in the immediate environment where they live – can be read only as tentative indications of the living conditions of the involved social and ethnic groups. Still, information on the patterns of accommodation provide some particulars of the organisation of everyday life. First of all, the data in question yield an insight into the degree of ethnic mixing and powerfully highlight the tendencies of residential segregation that, in turn, have significant impacts on how far local schools can strive to create a multiethnic environment and thereby facilitate inclusive education. Second, data on housing are also important indicators of families' advancement toward attaining standards and forms of living that count as "mainstream" in the given society.

In this context, it is important to mention that most countries run special welfare and housing programmes for newly arrived immigrants. For the most part, these people are accommodated in apartments in housing projects that have been set up for migrants and that are usually built in a concentrated form, in given segments, or on the outskirts of the cities that serve as targets of mass immigration. Since the apartments here are usually modest in quality, and since confinement to housing projects populated by "strangers" is in itself a signal of being

unaccepted, it is often taken an acknowledgeable achievement to escape from these conditions, leaving behind the segregated community of "othered" people, and buying a decent house in a some area known to be inhabited mostly by "white" people.

Although the emergence of poor Roma enclaves in central slums or on the outskirts is mostly an outcome of a different history of spontaneous processes of ethno-social segregation within urban communities, efforts to leave such conditions behind might have similar motives: resettlement among the majority is usually a sign of a successful move toward acceptance and integration.[11]

Third, the quality of housing serves also as a meaningful indicator of the standard of living. Although per capita space that is regarded as a norm or access to basic facilities like running water or sewage might differ country by country, people give quite accurate assessments against these norms about where they are situated on the housing scale. In this sense, students' evaluations of their home conditions can be taken as reliable indications of well-being or poverty.

With these implications in mind, it is important to underline that our data speak about a rather high degree of segregated living for families from "visible" minority backgrounds. A comparison between them and mostly "white" groups of immigrants reveals that it is not migration *per se* that produces separation. Looking at the data of only those students who attend the local school where, at the same time, they make up the numeric majority, it turns out that the involved communities are rather different in the case of the two groups. While no less than a third of students from "visible" minority backgrounds come from neighbourhoods that are populated by families from their own ethnic group (and/or by other "visibly" distinguished people), the corresponding proportion is only 19 per cent among "white" migrants. These figures gain genuine power as indications of substantial residential segregation against the finding that shows that more than two-thirds of the majority students in these local schools come from majority-dominated neighbourhoods, and their placement in ethnic enclosures remains a rare exception in only seven per cent of the cases.

---

[11] However, it has to be added that the moves do not always signal success. Urban living might turn out far too expensive, and thus many Roma families feel forced to leave behind a housing project for even less prestigious housing arrangements outside the city in a neighbouring village. In their case, ownership of a house frequently means squatting in empty weekend cottages or farmhouses that lack even the minima of comfort and facilities. Such downward moves are indicated by the fact that, while among those living in a family-owned house, only one per cent characterised the immediate environment as "poor", the corresponding figure is 11 per cent among Roma students.

It is not simply the composition of the neighbourhood but also the prevailing forms of housing that signal some hindrances to social inclusion. Our data indicate that many of the families lack the resources to move from the housing project where they had been assigned upon arrival, or where intense flight by the majority has left them behind amidst highly segregated conditions. At the same time, a long-term stay in these neighbourhoods might reflect also deliberate choices. Leaving would imply a loosening of the local support network that many immigrant families heavily rely on. Furthermore, such estates often accommodate their kin also: thus, it is not only assistance in case of need, but accustomed ways of spending leisure time and providing mutual help for realising longer-term plans in business or work that keep many families with a migrant background in these neighbourhoods. However, if compared to the state of "white" migrants, it becomes evident that it is mainly difficulties that force families from "visibly" different groups to stay. While the proportion of those living according to the mainstream middle-class standard of owning a family house is 37 per cent among people from "other immigrant background", it is only 29 per cent among those from a "visible" minority origin. At the same time, the respective proportions of those living in a housing project are departing in an even more pronounced manner: while 37 per cent of the "visible" migrant students record living in such conditions, the corresponding ratio was only 21 per cent among those who, despite being migrants and thus "aliens" to a certain degree, are still considered "fellow Europeans" by the "hosting" society.[12]

The data on housing do not only show widespread segregation by ethnicity, but also reveal the social implications of such separations. Seemingly, neighbourhoods populated by ethnic minorities simultaneously tend to be characterised by widespread poverty. Taking again only the group of those who attend local schools in the given neighbourhood, it turns out that the school registers in ethnic minority neighbourhoods keep records of those outstandingly high proportions of students who come from disadvantaged backgrounds and are thus entitled to certain welfare provisions due to poverty. While only 24 per cent of students from the majority attend schools at least half of its student-body made up of disadvantaged students, the corresponding indicator is as high as fifty per cent in the case of locally schooled students coming from "visible" minority backgrounds. The strength of this high association between poverty and ethnicity is underscored by the corresponding data of students from "white"

---

[12] For the sake of a full-scale comparison, it is worth noting that the proportion of students living in a family house owned by their family is 44 per cent among those from majority background. At the same time, 22 per cent of students in this group live on a housing project – which is an indirect indication of rather widespread poverty, as it will be discussed below.

minorities who apparently escape similar situations successfully: only a third of students in this category attend schools where the majority of peers are recorded as "disadvantaged"..

It is worth adding in this context that opening the school district to a more diverse pool of students does not conclude in reducing the strength of the association between ethnicity and poverty. As the overall data show, regardless of attending the school where they belong administratively or crossing the borders of their catchment area to attend a different school, no less than 55 per cent of students from a "visible" minority background attend schools where disadvantaged children are in the majority, which is in sharp contrast to the corresponding ratio of only 22 per cent for students from the majority population. This means that widespread poverty, whether mediated by the school or experienced in the immediate community, becomes a decisive experience of minority ethnic children whose major lessons about daily life substantially differ in this regard from those of their majority peers. In other words, minority ethnic children learn early on that being different from the mainstream also means being poor – while majority children often draw the conclusion that being embedded in the invisible community of the ruling nation is a ground for success in itself.

Personal poverty turned out to be rather frequent experience in our communities. Being aware of the fact that adolescent students commonly do not have a detailed insight into the running of the households where they live, our questionnaire attempted to approach these experiences mainly through aspects of consumption that directly affect children's comfort and well-being. This is the reason why our inquiries focused mainly on the quality of housing and the items at the disposal of children for immediate use.

The above differences often recurred in this regard. It is mainly students from a "visible" minority background who are accommodated in dwellings that are well below the prevailing standards in the given society (overcrowded, lacking a bathroom or a toilet inside, unconnected to the communal sewage system, etc.) – no less than 47 per cent of the group lives in such conditions. At the same time, local majorities are just a tiny bit better accommodated than them: poor housing conditions characterise no less than 42 per cent of the children in this category.

A remarkable surprise appears with regard to the comforts that directly serve children. While 85 per cent of the students live in apartments that, despite often modest standards, contain a separate room for children, the corresponding ratio is only 67 per cent in the case of those from "visible" minority backgrounds. Similarly, nearly all the children in the majority (95 per cent) have their own desk for homework, but such a comfort is available only for 84 per cent of their peers from among "visible" minorities.

Obviously, these differences do not merely reflect the prevailing inequalities among families in regards to their resources but are also informed by differing choices in consumption. Nevertheless, knowing that the comfort of the children is a high priority as much as for the poor as for the rich, and as much as for those parents who belong to the mainstream as for those who are marginalised, the unsatisfactory conditions to facilitate children's' daily learning in 16 per cent of the families from a "visible" minority background, compared to only 6 and 8 per cent among those from the majority and "white" migrant backgrounds, respectively, is a telling indicator of the deeply rooted inequalities by ethnicity that seemingly imbue all arenas of living – and range from the most private spheres, to the structuring of the communities, and to the organising of schools.

The aggregate indices signalling families' living standards reflect these differences in a pronounced way. Taking into account the quality of housing, the level of consumption, and the regularity of income in one single measure, two important features of our communities can be established. First, people here rarely belong to the affluent segments of their society: the proportion of such families is only 12 per cent, even among the majority. Nevertheless, they still enjoy a good deal of relative advantage in comparison to the cohabitating ethnic minorities for whom affluence and outstanding conditions remain rare exceptions of personal fortune. The overwhelming majority lives on a decent "average" level that allows for a certain degree of comfort and does not preclude advancement – at least not in intergenerational terms.

At the same time, poverty is a more frequent experience in these communities than affluence. It hits families from "visible" minority backgrounds in the first place (29 per cent of them),[13] but the corresponding indicators of 18 per cent and 16 per cent in the case of families from the majority and "white" migrant background, respectively, signal a rather high degree of "familiarity" with the phenomenon in the communities in general.

The schools: On socio-ethnic "profiling" in a comparative perspective

As pointed out previously, the country-based EDUMIGROM surveys arrived at their sampling through two subsequent stages: the first stage involved the selection of ethnically diverse communities with a pronounced presence of ethnic minority groups, and the second stage

---

[13] Roma communities stand out among the "visible" minority groups with their exceptionally high rate of poverty that jumps to 41 per cent in their case. It is worth adding that 14 per cent of Roma in our survey live in genuine destitution, an outstandingly high proportion in comparison to the sporadic occurrence of such deep state of exclusion among all other minorities.

implied the choice of the educational units where the fieldwork was to be carried out. So far, some basic features of the communities were presented. However, a general characterisation of the sample would be incomplete without also introducing the immediate educational environment that the schools offered for our research.

Before turning to the data on the chosen schools, a few notes have to be made about this second stage of the selection process. The initial idea was to cover entire communities by involving all the organisations and units that provide education in concert with the definite turning points in the students' educational careers. Such a broad definition intended to take into account the significant differences in the national educational systems: while in most of the countries it was students in the last year of primary education who faced such a turning point of making decisions about advancement, in some others, such decisions had been made at an earlier stage still well into the years of primary schooling (e.g., Germany), or students were expected to make choices for continuation several years later. In the light of the difficulties that harmonising the structural and institutional differences required, the principles of choice had to be somewhat modified. Instead of focusing on the types of schools, it was the age of students that came into the focus of selection: we intended to pick schools where 14–16-year-old students typically study, be they in institutions on the primary or the secondary level.

A further modification had to be made with regard to "full coverage". Given the huge differences in the population sizes and the stronger or weaker boundaries of the involved communities, some restrictions as well as some easements of this principle had to be introduced, too. First, in large urban areas (mainly in Western cities) it was the geographic placement of the schools that entered as a secondary principle in picking the units for the survey. Instead of "all" schools that are attended by children in the selected communities, it was mainly the schools prioritised by minority ethnic families (both inside the community and from the outside) that were selected for the investigation. Second, the migration of students also had to be taken into account: given that a substantial proportion of children from rural areas regularly commute toward urban centres, the chosen urban schools also opened a window on those villages beyond the borders of the given community. Such a broadening was most characteristic in Hungary and Slovakia, but affected the composition of the sample in France and the Czech Republic as well. As a result of the indicated modifications, the overall comparative sample provides a picture of the 14–16-year-old population of schools that are attended by ethnic minority students at a higher proportion than what one would expect on the basis of uniformly designed national statistics (OECD 2006), but most probably also higher than what would be projected on the ground of the ethno-demographic composition of the selected communities.

Altogether, 105 schools with 287 classes were selected, providing data about 5,086 students. This report will speak about their experiences with schooling, the relationships offered on this main domain of adolescent life, and the ways how schools open, or for that matter, limit the choices and aspirations of teenagers in multiethnic communities.

The peculiar institutional composition of the sample obviously does not allow for generalisations on the state of majority/minority relations-at-large. Nevertheless, it offers the ground to gain insights into how people and schools choose each other, and how such choices influence the conditions and outlook of different groups of students. As this study will demonstrate, these choices suffer serious constraints: people belonging to ethnic minority groups, especially to those that "visibly" differ from the cohabiting majorities, face severe restrictions in exercising their citizens' rights to equal access to knowledge and opportunities. The landscape of the schools shows deep fault-lines across socio-economic and ethnic compositions. As a rule, minority students from poor socio-economic backgrounds are concentrated in schools far apart in quality and conditions from a distinct other segment of the schools where children from the better-off majority are concentrated (together with the more fortunate upper layers of the cohabiting minorities). As it will be demonstrated, the emerging divides have far-reaching consequences on all aspects of school life: their implications manifest themselves in significantly departing performances, different qualities of interpersonal and interethnic relations, with important implications on attainable social skills, and also deeply inform the self-portraits that adolescents draw about themselves in the wake of their identity formation and the build-up of plans for the future. Given their multifaceted impacts, it seems important to give a detailed introduction into these divides at this stage.

Although how schools were selected for hosting the survey varied country by country, the overall composition of the comparative sample speaks for itself: one-third of children from "visible" minority ethnic backgrounds attend schools where the proportion of minority students is above 80 per cent, while 44 per cent of those from the majority are to be found in schools where it is the domestic majority that represents at least 80 per cent. Such a segmented picture cannot be owed to the particular ways of choosing the communities where the national surveys were run. After all, despite our focusing on "visible" minorities, students from a majority background are dominant with their 59 per cent representation, while "visible" minorities make up only 28 per cent of the aggregated sample. Hence, if put in simple statistical terms, one would have good grounds to expect a healthy "multicultural" mixing between majorities and minorities. However, real life does not adjust itself to statistical probabilities, but follows the pressure of claims and needs that shape the composition of the schools either toward balanced

patterns of mixing or, more frequently, toward sharp departures by ethnic belonging. It can be noted as a telling indicator of the pressures in the background that no less than 36 per cent of the students who belong to one of the "visible" minority groups find themselves in schools that become minority-dominated due to certain selection processes among the schools in the community, while 38 per cent of the students of the ethnic majority end up in majority-dominated schools that have emerged due to similar processes in the other direction. These intense processes of separation partly follow from spontaneous developments. It is chiefly the residential and demographic fragmentations within the urban settlements investigated here that bring about the emergence of selected majority/minority schools as the "natural" products of movements within the community. However, the purposeful organisation of ethnically separated schools also proved to be frequent: either it is the widespread phenomenon of "white flight" that concludes in ethnic segregation, or – in a smaller number of the cases – it is the minority groups themselves that claim separation on cultural and/or religious grounds.

Although all three types of selection are present at most of our sites, tendencies toward ethnic segmentation seem to differ in their intensity. As it can be seen in Table 1.6, the clearest imprints of the strong demands of families from the majority for making sure that their children learn in an ethnically "cleaned" environment can be detected in Central Europe where no less than two-thirds of the local students from the majority learn in schools with an unassailable domination of peers from the same ethnic group. It is no surprise that one-third of the children of other "white" groups also strive toward such schools that are considered the safe haven of high quality and promising opportunities for advancement.

The tendencies for separation for those students from an "immigrant background" are also significant in communities in countries that are targets of economic migration, though such pressures are countervailed by the pronounced needs for voluntary separation on the part of certain Muslim groups. As an outcome, four-fifths of the children of the majorities end up in schools with an over-representation (but not an exclusionary domination) of the majority, while two-fifths of children from ethnic minority backgrounds are concentrated in "ethnic minority schools" (mostly Muslim schools) with very high (often 100 per cent) participation of ethnic minority students.

The schools located at post-socialist sites show the least signs of separation on the level of the institution on top of what regional/residential movements had "prepared" for them: children from majority and ethnic minority backgrounds usually study in schools with a fair representation of the majority and the minorities alike. At the same time, strong attempts at

segregation can be detected within the walls of the institutions: by forming tracks, streams and specialisations to invigorate achievements, it is regularly the Roma students who are left behind in classes that "happen to be" filled just by them.

Although the described trends of separation by ethnicity foreshadow a hierarchical ordering and the accompanying inequalities among the schools, it is perhaps not these, but an exceptionally intense intermixing of the ethnic and social aspects of shaping the institutions' profiles that makes segmentation one of the most problematic features of compulsory education in contemporary Europe. As we will see in the subsequent chapters of this report, it is not "ethnic" segmentation *per se*, but the squeezing of "socially" and "ethnically" less-desirable parts of youth into institutions apart from the daily life of those occupying higher positions on the socio-ethnic ladder that induces differences in the quality of teaching and achievements to a magnitude that hardly can be countervailed at later stages, even by the best designed compensatory programmes.

Table 1.7 provides some insight into these deeper layers of selection. On the sheets that schools reported about their major characteristics, they rendered some information about the proportion of disadvantaged (registered poor) students in their student-bodies. Likewise, in asking for informed estimations of the units' administration, we could collect data about the ratios of ethnic minority students in the institution as a whole. On the grounds of this information, certain categories could be set up that, despite significant differences in regulations on attendance, make it feasible to compare schools along some quality indicators and that also provide the basis on which to follow the impact of selection on students' achievements, advancement, interethnic contacts, and future aspirations.

As the data show, students from "visible" ethnic minority backgrounds are the great losers of selection: regardless of the socio-economic standing of their families, nearly half of them attend the poorest part of the schools on offer: those local units where disadvantaged ethnic minority children make up the dominant part of the student-body. As the detailed analysis reveals, it is only a tiny segment of this group who are able to utilise strategies that are typically followed by the well-situated part of the majority: they are those very few who gain acceptance to schools that are exempted from general regulations on confining admittance to their administrative catchment areas. These schools are usually offering some special training or organise special streams, and thereby establish the justification for selecting from among the applicants. The outcome is a clear "majority" profile for these institutions, and what is more,

most of their attendees come from well-educated and better-off families – and those in the best positions among the ethnic minorities are "allowed" to mix with them.

As it turns out, student selection is equally intense, both upward and downward: in a true reflection of the concentration of ethnic minority students in the lowest ranks of the school system, majority students are concentrated, contrarily, in schools where their ethnic majority peers are dominant and where the presence of disadvantaged children is an exception. As a rule, these schools are placed in neighbourhoods that are populated by rather affluent families from the ethnic majority, or that represent the aforementioned "elite" institutions providing special services for the entire town or even beyond.

As will be shown subsequently, the high degree of intersectionality between the social and ethnic aspects of "profiling" induces the sharp divides and creates a hardly bridgeable segmentation among our students. Given the scope and the framework of this study, we cannot go into a detailed discussion of the social, economic, and political factors and processes that bring about such an intense selection on the first level of education where, at least in principle, schools all share the same goal of serving the fulfilment of comprehensive compulsory education. However, a few comments still have to be made.

Table 1.6

Ethnic "profiling" in schools by historical typology of the sites

Historical type of the site	Ethnic background	Distribution (%) of students among schools				Together
		1 Dominated by students from	2 Attended mostly by students from	3 Attended mostly by students from	4 Dominated by students from	
		majority background		minority ethnic background		
Post-colonial migration	Ethnic majority	–	58	33	9	100
	"Visible" minority	–	26	42	32	100
	Other minority	–	9	72	19	100
Economic migration	Ethnic majority	–	79	18	3	100
	"Visible" minority	–	21	33	46	100
	Other minority	–	60	29	11	100
Post-socialist transformation	Ethnic majority	68	28	4	0	100
	"Visible" minority	19	39	29	13	100
	Other minority	33	35	17	15	100

1. The proportion of minority ethnic students remains below 20 per cent

2. The proportion of minority ethnic students is between 20–50 per cent

3. The proportion of minority ethnic students is between 50–80 per cent.

4. The proportion of minority ethnic students is above 80 per cent.

Table 1.7

Distribution of students from different ethnic backgrounds among the types of schools by socio-ethnic "profile" (%)

Type of school by socio-ethnic profile	Students' ethnic background			
	Majority	"Visible" minority	"Other" minority	All students
"Top" schools[1]	30	2	10	19
Majority schools, dominantly non-poor[2]	43	21	24	34
Majority schools, dominantly poor[3]	14	7	11	12
Ethnic minority schools, dominantly non-poor[4]	5	22	27	13
Ethnic minority schools, dominantly poor[5]	8	48	28	22
Together	100	100	100	100

[1] The proportion of students from ethnic majority background is above 80 per cent, and the ratio of disadvantaged students remains below 20 per cent.

[2] The proportion of students from ethnic majority background is between 50 and 80 per cent, and the ratio of disadvantaged students remains below 50 per cent.

[3] The proportion of students from majority ethnic background is between 50 and 80 per cent, and the ratio of disadvantaged students is above 50 per cent.

[4] The proportion of students from minority ethnic backgrounds is above 50 per cent, while the ratio of disadvantaged students remains below 50 per cent.

[5] The proportion of both students from minority ethnic and disadvantaged backgrounds is above 50 per cent.

First, for the most part, this high degree of intersectionality is a "given" for schools: according to our data, 45 per cent of the students in the sample attend schools that take their student body from within their administrative catchment areas. True, students from majority backgrounds cross these borders somewhat more often than their "visible" minority peers, but 42 per cent of them still remain within the residential neighbourhood. The implication of this is

clear: schools are neither capable nor powerful enough to countervail the impacts of larger-scale social processes that work toward segmentation. Since "visible" minorities are often concentrated in poor ethnic enclaves (urban slums, decaying neighbourhoods in urban outskirts, derelict nearby villages, etc.), the local schools hardly can do anything else but take these disadvantages as one of the givens of their working that is fabricated for them by outer forces beyond their control.

Second, the "liberation" of rules on student enrolment works as a strong motive for socio-ethnic selection, both upwards and downward. As we saw above, schools offering some special services, unique tracks or programmes, or other attractive provisions work as magnets drawing the upper classes of the community. Ironically enough, responses coming from the other end of the socio-ethnic hierarchy work toward the same outcome: religious schools or schools with special programmes for mentally disadvantaged children become the collectors of socio-ethnic disadvantages. Although they often offer secure conditions and sometimes strengthen pride and ethnic self-reflection, these institutions easily become ghettoised, and the road from here hardly points toward social integration. In some, specialisations (be they articulated by different actors with different needs and for different purposes) intensify socio-ethnic segmentation, and thicken the walls of institutional separation.

Third, by creating equations between the co-occurrences of ethnic and social belonging, schools become powerful institutions to legitimise departing standards of teaching and performance by "cultural" factors. Since social inequalities in education and educational opportunities fell under sharp criticism in the 1970s and 1980s, potently contributing to delegitimising any differentiation by class and gender, "ethnicity" now comes as a handy substitute. Much of the selection among and within schools is justified by particular needs and is further warranted by perceiving inefficient ways of instruction in a "minority environment" that otherwise are experienced to work with "majorities" – and under this cover, nothing but a high degree of ethnicised social selection is attained, quite powerfully. In this sense, the findings of our survey can be interpreted in the context of a new form of "class struggle", where ethnic "otherness" serves to hide contrasting and conflicting interests.

Fourth, by institutionalising a high degree of intersectionality between ethnicity and social background, schools provide the justification for inequalities in the quality of teaching, and in this way work as gatekeepers to social mobility. As earlier research and later discussions in this report concede, those students graduating from the higher echelons of the system carry the additions of their school's ranking: admission to good schools on the next level and/or entrance

into the most attractive segments of the labour market becomes independent to a large extent from the efforts and achievements of the individual – the school serves as a strong recommendation on its own. The impact is similar at the other end of the scale: the label of a poor, remote school works as a deterrent, and thereby reduces unnecessary investments in personal testing and interviewing. Obviously, these selective processes and the important function of "labelling" by brand name are age-old in education. However, their ethnicised hints hide some crude social aspects, and dress the process in a socially acceptable garment of a "cultural" refinement of the competition. Since all the actors are aware of the content and the stake of the process, there are strong motivations for intensifying the ways and forms of segmentation – that work against genuine and inclusive multiculturalism, but benevolently serve the reproduction of the prevailing power and social relations that are now further accentuated by huge inequalities along ethnic lines.

It follows from all the above that "ethnicity" does not remain a pure and neutral characteristic of the young people whom our survey has embraced. Besides the socio-cultural implications that ethnic belonging bears upon the individual, it is its heavily-loaded institutionalisation that makes the ethnic stigma a nearly inescapable social statement about all those whom it affects. As we will see in the subsequent chapters, schools are outstanding agents of the making of such institutionalised "labelling": their ethnic (and together with it: social) "profile" strongly impacts the paths that are open or closed for their students, and thereby educational institutions become as much the products as the producers of those deep divisions and inequalities of contemporary societies that gain their manifestations in school-related justifications of differences in performance and attainment.

— … —

By taking into account all the above features, we can establish a few general characteristics of the communities and schools that the EDUMIGROM survey has investigated. By and large, these mostly working-class communities are inhabited by people who are somewhat less educated and remarkably less embedded in the world of labour than the majority of their respective societies. At the same time, the majority manages to maintain a material standard and a way of life that provides satisfactory backing for their children to proceed in schooling. However, these standards differ remarkably by ethnic affiliation: compared to those with whom they live, local majorities enjoy substantial advantages above those from "visible" minority backgrounds, and "white" migrants apparently successfully dissolve in the former group. Ethnic

divisions do not appear only in the form of inequalities but also strongly structure the spaces and arenas of everyday life. As it turns out, due to a high degree of residential segregation at all our sites, people from the groups of "visible" minorities are frequently confined to live in ethnic enclosures that selective processes in education are inclined to turn into the foundations of justified selection by "colour" among and within schools. Later discussions will point out a range of consequences of such a high degree of ethnic separation as the fundament of social structuring. In the current context it is perhaps enough to underline that ethnic distinctions as givens are an important aspect of social stratification that tend to relate advantages and disadvantages to the colour of skin, and that thereby confer a "biological" reasoning to the prevailing inequalities that characterise the cohabitating communities.

II. STUDENTS' SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENTS IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Since the publication of the OECD's authoritative results on the disadvantages that students from "immigrant backgrounds" suffer in comparison to their majority peers in performance and advancement in Europe's highly varied school systems (OECD 2006), the study of ethnic differences in education has become a prime area of research and policymaking within national frameworks and throughout the continent as a whole. While the facts of ethnic differentiation in and by schools are widely acknowledged, their explanations show significant variations. Many would argue that there is little new about the registered differences: figures that we read and interpret as manifestations of departures due to "ethnicity" are in fact a new materialisation of age-old divides by social class. Since people from ethnic minority backgrounds tend to occupy social and occupational positions toward the lower end of the social hierarchy, it is the old inequalities of class appearing in a new garment: "ethnicity" is nothing but a new name for the contemporary working class and the lower strata of the (new) middle class sharing the fate of low rates of upward social mobility and high risks of temporary or sometimes even terminal impoverishment (Steinberg 2001, Kroneberg 2008). Others see "ethnicity" as an independent factor working in its own right and point out that Europe's school systems and its individual schools have not adjusted themselves to the rapid inflow of millions of people from other than "white European" backgrounds, and thereby the systems blindly reproduce old cultural supremacies both in the ways of instruction and the unreflective "Eurocentric" content of teaching. This inflexibility logically concludes in the disadvantages of those groups that hardly find comfort and support under the unchanged – for them: alien – conditions (Heckmann et al. 2008). Yet another group of researchers and policymakers would take a human rights position by arguing that disadvantages of minority ethnic students in schools mainly follow from the visible and invisible procedures of discrimination that conclude in ethnic separation, devaluation, and stigmatisation – all having their part in forging disinterest and low motivations in performance and the widespread lack of forward-looking aspirations among the youth of minority ethnic origin (Luciak 2004).

By looking at schools in their threefold capacity as acting as agents of knowledge transmission, socialisation, and preparatory "filters" of later occupational and social positions, the EDUMIGROM survey provides a unique ground to have a closer look at the "making" of ethnic differences in education. As we will show through the discussion of performance and

advancement, it is a blend of all three roles that informs the differential ways how students from varied backgrounds are seen and "labelled" by the stamp of grading at school that society accepts as the sanctioned and legitimate form of assessing achievement and then assigning differential paths and positions to the attained grades as the objectified measures of accomplishment. Being aware of the multiple functions and, simultaneously, the high stakes of grading in schools, the involved actors of the process – students, teachers, leaders of educational institutions, parents, and sometimes even future employers – invest into the attainable objectified measure of *personal quality* according to their varied interests. Hence, grading becomes a "playground" where – as will be seen– ethnic, social, cultural, and, sometimes, political capacities are at play, and where the outcomes (individual grades or average grades as indicators of the "value" of educational institutions) are shaped by partly visible, partly invisible bargains, negotiations, and compromises. Given the ongoing intermingling of the involved factors and processes, it seems more appropriate to apply an approach that aims to reveal the combined effects of ethnicity *and* social background than to argue for replacing either of them by the other, while looking at the more encompassing processes of institutional and interpersonal discrimination as the ones that largely set the stage for their influence – be they intense or weak. Therefore, instead of aiming at singling out one leading component, we will attempt to show how the prevailing important factors of social background, ethnicity, gender, and locality join into a complex interplay in producing a kaleidoscopic picture that – as will be shown – is much the same in its end-result: it tells about the invariably reproduced disadvantages of ethnic minority youth in the highly varied arrangements of schooling in the eight countries that our study embraces.

Before entering the discussion, a few methodological remarks are needed. First, our approach to performance has to be addressed. As it followed from the nature of our survey that was based on questionnaires filled out by the students themselves but had very limited access to other sources of information at the schools, we decided to depart from both of the customary ways of performance assessment: we neither turned to students' certificates or the class registers that take note of their test results and exams, nor did we use PISA-like methods of measuring "capacities" in certain school subjects by internationally comparable tests. Instead, we asked our respondents to recall their grades in a set of core subjects at the end of the preceding semester. It is obvious that "remembrance" can somehow alter the written results: students might think back inaccurately or might even be interested in painting a better picture than what their results actually were. Nevertheless, we trust in the old wisdom of empirical research: people do not "lie" in a systematic way, and even if they make attempts to improve the picture that a stranger

might perceive about them, such attempts do not go too far. Furthermore, the conditions of the research helped us to get grades more or less corresponding to reality: since the questionnaires were completed in the schools (classes), it can be assumed that peers and friends helped each other out in case of uncertain recollection or hesitance. In fact, the dispersion of the results seems to confirm the above: the self-reported results of students as analysed by the well-known influential factors of social background, gender, locality, school-type, etc., were in accordance with the findings and trends that one learns from other national and international studies. At the same time, a clear advantage of our method might be added here: the applied "soft" way of asking about performance gave us a chance to contextualise what achievements actually meant for students by interviewing them about experiences with schooling, the motives they consider when choosing a school for continuation, and their longer-term aspirations in education and beyond. By taking into account such a broader embedding of performance, we hope to show how personal achievements are informed by what one can call "the way of life" at school, and the better or less satisfactory adjustment of the prevailing conditions of schooling to the broadly perceived needs of the involved students.

The second remark relates to educational advancement. Though in most of the countries the survey took place in the final year of primary education, there were notable exceptions from this rule. The first one was France where, upon universal college attendance, adolescents continue in different types of schools – and within them: in different streams with remarkably different future opportunities – and these departures made it a meaningful choice to focus on the still compulsory first years of secondary-level schooling. The second case was Germany where tracking as early as at the age of 10 or 11 orients students toward significantly departing strands with very limited opportunities for later moving among them. Though all the interviewed students were still in "primary" education, its actual content covered utterly different paths for those in the *Hauptschule* as opposed to those in a Gymnasium. A third, partial, exception was Denmark where students are free to make a choice whether to remain for one or two more years in the comprehensive system of primary education or go on into the tracked system of secondary schooling. Given all these variations, our data on where and how students intend to continue their studies upon concluding the primary stage have to be handled with great caution. Nevertheless, the departures between schools that leave open the gate toward higher education and those that lead one directly to the labour market proved to be meaningful – and we will duly discuss them. Additionally, information about the failures in continuation (either repetitions or reported constraints to suspend studies because of pressing needs in daily life) are telling indicators of disadvantages, as are responses on future plans for getting a degree in higher

education good indicators not only of aspirations, but also of feelings of security and embeddedness. With this additional information, we hope to be able to draw a rather refined picture about the paths that ethnic minority students and their majority peers intend to follow in education and beyond.

What does grading assess?

In order to gain an insight into the "making" of the overall assessment of students, our questionnaire asked about five larger areas of instruction, each incorporating several related but distinct subjects: maths, often including computer science and/or geometry as a distinct discipline), literature (together with grammar, writing, etc.), history (incorporating civic education), science (embracing biology, physics, chemistry, geography, nature, etc.) and foreign languages. An overall assessment of performance was computed on the ground of average grades in these areas. These results were then converted into the widely accepted and applied international grading scale (ECTS) that has been used in recent years as a base for cross-country comparative analyses of the highly varied national traditions of performance assessment (European Commission 1998).

The employed approach gave us a chance to study from several angles how assessments of performance are made by schools. On the one hand, an analysis of the overall results offers us the grounds to see how school achievements are forged by the well-known important major factors of social background, ethnicity, gender, and the various forms of selection that the school systems apply. On the other hand, an analysis of our data along the detailed indicators of performance might give us insight into the "technology" of assessment. In this latter regard, it is of key importance to reveal how far does grading address strictly the attained level of knowledge and skills in a given area, and how far does it evaluate the person instead? In simple terms, are schools evaluating bits and pieces of knowledge in a "technocratic" way that focuses exclusively on the subjects that are taught and the measurable sides of performance in them, or, are they actually making "good" and "bad" students by a "holistic" mode of assessing cultural and behavioural aptitude through using a language – that of marking – that hides these *ad hominem* evaluations behind the curtain of objectified and duly fragmented tests in independent disciplinary areas? It is needless to argue at length that responding to these questions might lead us closer to the understanding of the great secret of schools: the transformation of knowledge into departing pathways in the educational systems that is mediated by the authorised ways of

assessment but that actually concludes in the production and reproduction of highly-unequal social statuses and positions.

Let us first take the "classic" approach and have a look at the overall indices of performance in light of the widely acknowledged major dimensions of differentiation. As can be seen from Table 2.1, our survey confirms the associations that have been revealed by a great number of investigations and that have been repeatedly demonstrated also by the subsequent PISA surveys (OECD 2007 and 2008): out of the composite impact of social background, it is especially the cultural capital of the students' families (measured by the level of schooling of the parents) that matters. Despite huge differences in the systems of schooling and variations in the ways of instruction, institutionalised education proves rather inefficient in countervailing the effects of family background: students from highly educated families have nearly a five times greater chance to attain an "excellent" qualification than fellow students from a very poorly educated parental background, and the ratio is roughly the same, though in the opposite direction, at the other end of the scale where "marginal performance" (sufficiency or failing) is measured. As an outcome of remarkably differing distributions of the achievements as acknowledged by one's overall grade, those from highly educated backgrounds attain an average more than 0.8 points higher than their peers from the lowest educated segments of society.

Beside the cultural aspects, it is living conditions that directly affect the ways and forms of how children can devote themselves to studying and how their efforts are "rewarded" by better or worse grading. These known associations are approached from two perspectives in Table 2.1 that considers the standard of material well-being, on the one hand, and the family's socio-economic embeddedness as a measure of status and the regularity of living, on the other. As it can be seen, these two factors induce similar differences to those of cultural-educational background – though their impact is milder than the latter. Students from relatively well-off families enjoy the facilities of well-equipped homes, opportunities for quiet studying, and being saved from taking part in income-raising duties. These good conditions are "rewarded" by enjoying the qualification of being "excellent" by one-third of them, and the very rare occurrence of poor performance, while those living under destitute conditions have less than half the chance of concluding their studies with outstanding results, and being assessed as marginally acceptable is the fate of more than 17 per cent of them. These differences are reflected in a compound way by a 0.55-point difference in the averages of the two groups – which is still a strong indicator of inequalities, though its strength is somewhat less than the 0.82-point departure as measured along the educational level of the parental house.

Yet again, the differences are similar, if the family's socio-economic embeddedness and the related regularity of income are taken into consideration. It is perhaps the complex impact of economic hardships, an unsafe feeling due to exclusion from access to work, and the consequent low motivations for respecting schooling as a "worthwhile investment" that are reflected in the very low (14 per cent) rate of "excellent" and very high (13 per cent) proportion of "marginally performing" students among the children of families where access even to partial and/or irregular work is missing. Since regularity of work is the strongest safeguard against impoverishment while loss of contact with the world of labour sooner or later concludes in deep poverty, it is no surprise that the induced differences along the two dimensions of students' living conditions are near to equal with a 2.15 average result for students from well-embedded families against an index of 2.57 among those coming from excluded families.

The fourth segment of Table 2.1 looks at how ethnic background makes a difference in assessed performance. In comparison to the above, the most important aspect to emphasise is the outstanding strength of the divisions that "ethnicity" implies: as the data show the impact of ethnic affiliation is close to that of the family's cultural capital, and in its intensity, it certainly surpasses the influence of differential living standards and conditions. While nearly one-third of students from ethnic majority background attain an "excellent" qualification, only every tenth of their peers from "visibly" differing groups enjoy a similar chance. It is worth noting that being from an immigrant background does not have the same effect in case of "other" (dominantly "white immigrant") minorities:[14] 17 per cent of students from such backgrounds end up among the best performing groups. At the same time, the differences are smaller among those who are assessed as "marginally performing": though "visible minorities" take the lead here with 12 per cent, the 10 per cent ratio among children from the majority (with the recurrent in-between position of "other" minorities with their 11 per cent proportion) indicates that upward ethnic differentiation is more pronounced as a filtering toward future educational careers than incentives for "devaluation". The overall averages reinforce the statement about the remarkable strength of ethnicity in shaping assessments about performance: students from the majority enjoy a position 0.54 points stronger on this refined ladder than those coming from "visible" minority backgrounds, and "other" minorities occupy their in-between position by lagging only 0.32 point behind their majority peers. We will return to a more detailed discussion of the factors that make "ethnicity" such a strong factor in shaping assessments later. This issue all the more deserves our attention because such a strength of distinctions along ethno-cultural traits is demonstrated in a relatively homogenised environment. In this context, it is worth recalling that

---

[14] On the justification of denoting "other" minorities as "white immigrants", see Footnote 2 in Chapter I.

the "majorities" presented in this study are socially selected majorities. They are groups living in the proximity of ethnic minority communities, and – as shown is Chapter I – their socio-economic conditions, family formations, and characteristics of daily living largely resemble those of the ethnic "others" in the neighbourhood. In the present context it means that ethnicity serves some "hidden" social purposes that help to express differences in status and perspectives among those who look largely "alike" from an all-societal perspective. Below we will attempt to show how differentiation in assessing performance actually serves such "hidden" but very powerful claims and how schools respond to these claims by turning performance into the legitimised basis of selection.

Finally, the fifth segment of Table 2.1 shows differences in performance along an important division of everyday life at school: gender. Our data also confirm what is known about the gendered differences in achievements, though they suggest that the impact of this third dimension is significantly milder than those of one's social or ethnic background. Schools seemingly better "fit" girls than boys, or to put it differently, girls apparently better adjust to the official requirements of schooling than boys do: though the probabilities of being marginalised by grading are nearly equal among the two sexes, girls have some 8 per cent higher chance to finish up with a grading of "excellence" than boys, and their more favourite positioning is manifested also in the difference in the averages, that is, 0.12 points better than that of their male peers. These mild differences might have two, opposite, readings. On the one hand, they suggest a certain convergence in interests, performance, and expectations toward the future – and as we will see in later parts of this study, this is a new and welcome reality of compulsory schooling across our eight countries. On the other hand, the relatively "equalised" performance of boys and girls might be an artefact of our study: given the fact that we investigated modest working-class communities for the most part, such an "evenness" might be the indication of the restricted perspectives for breaking through and aspiring for status and position where wholesale studies indicate a persistence of deep-rooted gender inequalities in access.

The strong associations that students' performance show with the educational level of the parents on the one hand, and with ethnicity on the other, call forth an important question about some potential causality in the background. Are we facing here the influence of two important, but independently working factors of social stratification, or is it the relative social disadvantages of people from ethnic minority backgrounds that manifest themselves in the garment of ethnically perceived "cultural otherness"? To put it differently, does the role of ethnicity come in addition to the influences that students' home conditions play in shaping achievements by underlining the implied cultural diversities – and thereby forming a message

about the departing social acceptance of status that looks alike in the crude terms of positions in the social hierarchy? Or do we simply see two sides of the same types of inequalities of positions and conditions where "ethnic belonging" offers a biological expression to justify the inevitable hierarchies that arise in the form of "assessment" but that then provide the grounds for subsequent selective social reproduction? As pointed out above, the involved dilemma is one of the most debated issues of contemporary educational sociology that certainly has far-reaching implications for policymaking and attempts at adjusting Europe's school systems to the significantly changed ethnic landscape of recent decades. The EDUMIGROM survey does not provide enough tools to give a definite answer, and we do not aspire here at settling the debate about causality. Nevertheless, we hope to make some important contributions by sorting out how schools – and teachers – translate the experiences about the great diversity of knowledge and skills among their students into objectified measures of assessment and how they "use" their perceptions of social and ethnic differences in this process.

Table 2.1

Indicators of performance at school

Characteristics	Proportion (%) of students assessed as		Average overall grade**
	Excellent	Marginally performing*	
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE PARENTS			
None of the parents above primary level	9	15	2.71
At most, vocational qualification without graduation	16	9	2.40
At least one parent holds secondary-level graduation	30	5	2.07
At least one parents holds a degree in higher education	38	3	1.89
LIVING STANDARD			
Well-off	33	4	2.03
Mediocre	25	7	2.20
Poor	15	12	2.48
Destitute	15	17	2.58
PARENTS' EMBEDDEDNESS IN THE LABOUR MARKET			
At least one parent in regular full-time employment	27	6	2.15
At best, one parent in part-time/casual employment	18	8	2.36
None of the parents have access to work	14	13	2.57
ETHNIC BACKGROUND			

Ethnic majority	31	6	2.08
"Visible" ethnic minority	10	12	2.62
"Other" (white) ethnic minority	18	11	2.40
GENDER			
Boy	20	8	2.32
Girl	27	8	2.20

 * Marginally performing: overall grade is "sufficient" or "failed".

** Computed as an average of grades in the five subject areas – according to the international scale of grading where 1=excellence … 5=failing.

Table 2.2 gives us some responses to the outlined questions. As the data clearly show, ethnicity plays a distinct role in students' evaluation: the clearer the signs of "otherness", the gloomier the perspectives of students to catch up in assessed performance to their majority peers sharing similar social backgrounds. Furthermore, the better the indicators of the cultural capital that are brought from home, the greater are the differences to the detriment of ethnic minority students: while the difference between the proportions of "excellently" qualified students of majority and "visible" minority backgrounds is 6 per cent in the case of those coming from poorly educated families, it jumps to 26 per cent among the children of highly qualified parents; the same trend is indicated by departures in the average grades that grow from just 0.16 points in the least qualified group to 0.59 points among students from the highest educated families that clearly indicates that ethnic distinctions in evaluations become ever more intensified by moving upward in the social hierarchy. These surprising trends suggest as if the entrance of "visibly" different young people from well-educated backgrounds into the competition for the truly good positions in society would entail an "unwanted" risk for the majority – and their relative devaluation actually serves to keep them away from making even an attempt at crossing the invisible ethnic boundaries Certainly, although such processes of differentiation and relative devaluation rarely arise from the deliberate actions of face-to-face discrimination (below we will return to the issue of how they are still put forward), such an interpretation seems to be confirmed by the data on the departing educational careers of the two groups of youth from highly educated "majority" and "minority" backgrounds that will be discussed later in this chapter. In the case of students arriving from relatively poorly educated families it is "enough" to rely on social distinctions: poor performance associated with poor cultural capital from home seems to be "enough" to be lowly valued – and ethnicity does not add to this. However, in the higher echelons the expected "order" is reconstructed also in the context of poor grades: students from better educated families are 3–8 times more likely to prove to be "marginally performing" if they come from "visibly" different ethnic backgrounds than their majority peers, and while "white" minorities also suffer some disadvantages, their chances for becoming devalued remain in the proximity of their fellows from the majority. It is worth adding yet another implication: ethnicity apparently proves such a powerful ground for distinctions that it washes away the customary gender differences in measured performance and forges an even devaluation of boys and girls from minority backgrounds.

In sum, we can establish that ethnicity is a strong factor that is played out in its own right in informing performance, or to put it more accurately, in informing how performance is assessed and acknowledged by the school. Furthermore, the importance of this vaguely

contoured "cultural" evaluation sharply increases further upward on the social ladder: the more one expects it to be counterbalanced by other components of cultural capital, the more it seems to be in vain to make efforts for letting it be forgotten by the larger social milieu. These associations raise a new set of disturbing questions. On closer scrutiny, can one identify events and conditions in the life-histories and upbringing of ethnic minority youth that make them more vulnerable to aptly perform at schools than their majority peers? Or is it instead the still widely prevailing prejudices and discriminatory inclinations of the "host" societies that forcefully downgrade the ethnic "others", even if the latter were born to the same conditions and also share the language of the majority? Or is it a third set of factors that institutionalise the differences by ethnic segmentation at schools and then devalue those units where students from minority backgrounds are concentrated? Our survey data reflect the impact of all three sets of factors.

Let us first consider the differences in the familial conditions. At a closer look, it becomes clear that one induces some undue simplifications by using the level of parental educational attainment as the sole indicator of a family's cultural capital. Though it is true that highly educated parental homes usually bring about rich cognitive and linguistic skills at an early age, and moreover, experiences gained by moving between countries and cultures might even powerfully deepen children's general knowledge about the world, the new conditions only partially allow families to capitalise on these assets. First, in reflection of the new rigorous trends in immigration policies, the higher the level of education, the greater is the proportion of those who arrived relatively late in their new home country (no less than 41 per cent of the highly educated mothers immigrated in adulthood). This involves a great deal of uncertainties in matters of daily life: they can hardly help their children with books taken in a routine manner from the shelves, or with information on the history, literature, civic life, politics, and institutional arrangements of the new country. Furthermore, intense energies are taken by organising daily life: even the best-qualified parents have to take jobs well below their capabilities in the required skills and knowledge, and much of their time is occupied by mere adjustments. If one draws a balance sheet, all these imply certain "holes" in the parental cultural capital, a great part of which is forcefully set aside under the pressures of the new conditions and challenges of accommodation.

A further important component of the difficulties and disadvantages that appear in the form of ethic "otherness" relates to the uses of language. Although some 90 per cent of our interviewees from immigrant ethnic minority backgrounds belong to the category of "second generation" migrants, a surprisingly high proportion of them still seem to live between two worlds. Given that the overwhelming majority (some 70 to 95 per cent) of recently arrived

parents of children belonging to various "visible" minorities, at best, poorly speak the dominant language of their now home country, it follows as a natural outcome that the language spoken at home remains that of the country of origin for yet another generation: it will perhaps be the third generation that will find it more comfortable and appropriate to "unite" the languages of their public and private domains. However, our ethnic minority respondents clearly represent a typical in-between situation on this long road toward full accommodation. The proportion of students whose first language is other than the dominant one in the country[15] is varied by the departing histories of migration and majority/minority cohabitation: it is no less than 94 per cent among the children of "visible" minority groups in countries where it is mostly economic migrants who make up the group; the ratio drops by some 20 per cent (to 74 per cent) for the corresponding groups in the countries of post-colonial migration, and falls to 39 per cent among Roma in post-socialist Central Europe. All these figures imply that students from ethnic minority backgrounds may suffer certain difficulties and disadvantages due to the mere fact of underdeveloped language skills. And the data seem to confirm such a hypothesis. Taking only the "visible" groups with the best cultural capital, native-speaking minorities enjoy a clear advantage in comparison to their peers whose first language still used at home differs from that of the language of instruction at school: native speakers have nearly twice the chance of students with different mother tongues to receive excellent results and have just a sixth of the probability to become assessed as "marginally performing" (these differences are reaffirmed by the data on the average results, where the respective figures are 2.11 against 2.42). Of course, linguistic disadvantages due to a fragmentary use of the dominant official language offer but just a partial explanation for becoming devalued. First, the sharp disadvantages of Roma in Central Europe can only very vaguely be explained by the use of language: in Hungary, where the discrepancies are the strongest in overall grading, 73 per cent of the Roma students speak Hungarian as their mother tongue, and the remaining 27 per cent also state proficiency in the country's dominant language. Secondly, knowledge of a language is hardly a "given": as some school experiments show (especially in the Nordic countries), great advancement can be made by carefully designed developmental programmes and/or by teaching certain subjects in the original languages of the minorities if they claim such services; furthermore, if not suppressed and stigmatised, language

---

[15] The registration of this difference does not imply that adolescents born into a family that occasionally or regularly turns to the original language of the ethnic group do not speak the dominant language of their now home country. To the contrary: as experience shows, by the time of entering school, and even more so when finishing, these children usually have a good command of the latter language. At the same time, the situational switching from the "first" to the "dominant" language and back may result in certain holes in their vocabulary, a relative poverty of skills of expression, and even the improper use of grammatical rules. Most probably, it is such "holes" and disparities that manifest themselves in the disadvantages that ethnic minority students demonstrate in reading and storytelling (OECD 2006, Christensen and Stanat 2007).

skills certainly develop in the course of schooling; hence, the aforementioned differences most probably speak about some indirect consequences of early linguistic disadvantages than about the actual state of proficiency in the language of instruction.

While the above address certain differences in the content, composition, and straightforward suitableness of cultural capital at the possession of various ethnic groups, there is a further set of differences in their practical conditions that requires attention in regards to the implications on performance. The rapidly growing literature on the daily life of people from ethnic minority backgrounds in Europe has introduced a set of difficulties that native people know to a much smaller extent than those who have arrived, at best, just a few decades ago: the hardships of conflicting customs, dress codes, beliefs, and the uncertainties that accompany them; the lack of knowledge, information, and – especially – networks to gain access to proper jobs and to claim support for one's citizens' rights; the oscillation in material conditions and income; the exposure to mental and bodily stresses and injuries due to improper working and living conditions, etc. As our data indicate, the early occurrence of suffering from the dramatic experiences of everyday life, small and large, is significantly higher among teenagers from ethnic minority backgrounds than among their majority peers (and in this regard, the exposure of "white immigrant" minorities is more or less equal to the "visibly" differing groups). Negative events and the uncomfortable feelings that accompany such experiences leave enduring marks on students' educational careers. Their lasting imprint often becomes the cause for suspending school attendance for a while, which then concludes, in turn, in referral to class repetition: no less than 23 per cent of the group of students from "visible" backgrounds had to face such decisions (the corresponding ratio was only 10 per cent among those from the majority which indicates that perhaps the schools were more ready to cope with the temporary difficulties in the latter case and somehow found solutions to keep the student within the class community while "problem children" of the minorities were more easily left behind.) However, if one is held back a year, the stigma hardly withers away: such an event in one's school career concludes in indices of performance significantly below the average of the fortunate majority (in the case of students from "visibly" differing backgrounds, repetition in itself induces a remarkable difference of a magnitude of 0.38 points – and the aforementioned instability of daily living certainly plays a significant role here.)

As the above findings suggest, coming from an ethnic minority background implies a good deal of vulnerability – even if paired with relatively favourable socio-economic conditions. Our data indicate that schools show little sensitivity toward the involved insecurities and difficulties: instead, teachers often read them as "easy excuses" for underperformance and a lack of true

interest in the values that schools aim to convey, both by teaching and discipline. As it turns out from the rich material provided by classroom observations, focus-group discussions, and individual interviews that have emerged in the qualitative phase of our research project, teachers coming from the majority often criticise minority ethnic parents for the lack of support they give their children to properly adjust to the "host" society: in their view, parents do not show up often enough in the school, do not help enough with homework, etc. Looked upon from the perspectives of parents and students, such outspoken or implicit criticisms are often read as signs of non-acceptance, sometimes even as manifestations of prejudices and discrimination. At any rate, the systematic differences in performance by ethnicity indicate a good deal of unresolved conflicts: teachers and schools find it a "problem" to work with students from other than majority backgrounds, and vice versa, and even if acknowledging the outstanding importance of school in children's life, students and parents from ethnic minority backgrounds often look at the school as an "alien" institution that embodies majoritarian prejudices and (often coded) ambivalence or non-acceptance toward ethnic "otherness".

Table 2.2

Students' school performance by parental educational background, ethnic affiliation, and gender

Parental educational background	Ethnic affiliation	Percentage of students assessed as		Average overall grade	Average overall grade	
		Excellent	Marginally performing		Boys	Girls
None of the parents above primary level	Majority	13	17	2.66	2.60	2.71
	"Visible" minority	7	14	2.75	2.76	2.75
	Other minority	12	16	2.57	2.53	2.62
At most, vocational qualification without graduation	Majority	20	9	2.31	2.39	2.21
	"Visible" minority	10	8	2.56	2.56	2.56
	Other minority	11	12	2.50	2.58	2.41
At least one parent holds secondary-level graduation	Majority	35	4	1.94	2.07	1.79
	"Visible" minority	11	11	2.49	2.46	2.51
	Other minority	20	8	2.30	2.44	2.15
At least one parent holds a degree in higher education	Majority	45	1	1.72	1.85	1.59
	"Visible" minority	19	8	2.37	2.44	2.31
	Other minority	24	7	2.23	2.30	2.15

Such feelings of ambiguity and distrust lead us to the second set of possible explanations for ethnically-informed differences in assessing performance: the working of discrimination at schools, especially, the orientation of teachers toward their ethnic minority students and how they assess them. Though the degree, intensity, and open manifestation of discrimination and prejudiced attitudes differ to a large extent among the countries in our survey (with the dubious championing of widespread and deep anti-Roma sentiments in the four post-socialist societies), recent research has documented that schools are nowhere exempt of such phenomena: ethnic stereotypes and often masked or otherwise disguised, racial distinctions are at work all everywhere. (Luciak 2004). In light of the widely prevailing experience, the exploration of how racial/ethnic distinctions affect the school life and longer-term career perspectives of our students was of key importance in both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the EDUMIGROM research.

However, we faced unexpected difficulties in revealing the issue through our questionnaire-based survey. Although the distributed forms asked detailed questions about the students' experiences with discrimination, injustices in assessment, rewards and punishment, and also about the quality of teacher-student relations, the acquired information is very poor in these regards. Despite rich and detailed accounts about the mutual lack of understanding, frequent stigmatisation, and "lighter" or harsher forms of discrimination in the qualitative materials (including the accounts and openly articulated complaints of students in the 250 collected interviews), the questionnaires paint a largely unproblematic picture: as shown by the data that emerged by asking students in a straightforward manner about their experiences, teachers act in fair and unbiased ways for the most part; the school is an environment safe from stigmatisation, disrespect, and downgrading; and students usually find at least a few teachers among the school's staff who like them and whom they can trust.

The strong discrepancy between the quantitative and qualitative information calls for some explanation, indeed. We assume that students' reluctance to report bad experiences about their school followed mainly from the circumstances in which the survey was run. After all, they where sitting in the classroom, often in front of the personnel they might criticise, and though the filled-in questionnaires remained anonymous, the respondents most probably feared that, if they wanted, teachers and headmasters could easily find out who was critical about them and how. Such an assumption is all the more probable because it was mainly the well-performing students from the best-embedded families from a majority background who felt safe, secure, and well-protected enough to announce some criticism – though presumably they were least

affected. Furthermore, the outstandingly high rates of missing or hesitant responses to questions asking about discrimination and school-related injustices indicate a spontaneously discovered tactic: in the context of an otherwise amply filled in questionnaire, skipping whole questions or putting a sign in the respective boxes of "I don't know" signals receptivity and goodwill toward the study, but simultaneously expresses unwillingness to go into detail about certain "unpleasant" or even "dangerous" subjects – in brief, if read in their context, these "empty" responses carry the message that "I don't want to say anything".

As a consequence, we hardly can provide convincing numeric figures about the associations between the prevailing prejudices of teachers and the relative devaluation of ethnic minority students. A slight indication of the functioning of such relationships is rendered by the higher-than-average rate of refusal for responding to questions about the teacher/student relationships among students from "visibly" differing backgrounds that – against an average of 21 per cent – jumped to above 30 per cent among the two ethnic minority groups that are known, according to their own personal accounts and a range of lay and expert reports, to suffer the harshest discrimination: it was 31 per cent among Roma students and 36 per cent among the Black African and Caribbean respondents who used a spontaneous tactic of "distancing" themselves from the subject matter. As further analyses of the data show, these "distanced" students are assessed some 0.23–0.30 points lower than others in their ethnic group, and while they hardly ever enjoy being qualified as "excellent", the proportion of "marginally performing" students is double that of the rest of the respective groups (17 per cent against 9 per cent in the case of Roma, and 23 per cent against 11 per cent among Black students.)

A further indication of the perceived role of discriminatory attitudes of schools and teachers in assessing their ethnic minority students came from an "unexpected corner" of the survey. Concerning plans for the immediate future, the questionnaire enquired about the motives that students and their families had considered in making a choice of where to continue schooling upon finishing the given grade.[16] Ten different motives were listed, and the respondents were asked to indicate for each of them whether it played a role in their deliberations. Inclusiveness of the future institution – meaning acceptance irrespective of social and/or ethnic background – was one of the most frequently mentioned constituents behind the choice: 49 per cent of the respondents put a tick next to this motive – which in itself speaks in a silent way about claims informed by experiences of relative deprivation that youths in our working-class communities continuously face in their daily lives. However, a closer analysis

---

[16] A comprehensive analysis of these plans and the motivations behind them will follow in the second part of this chapter.

revealed significant unevenness in the background: while the ratio of mentions remained at the average level among students of well-educated parents in the majority, it reached a ten per cent higher rate (59 per cent) among their ethnic minority ethnic peers from poorly educated families. Even more tellingly, the choice of this motive seems to be associated with how the current school evaluates one's achievement. Out of the group of poorly performing students,[17] only 13 per cent of those from a highly educated majority background indicated inclusiveness of the future school as a high priority,[18] while the corresponding proportion was more than the double of this (29 per cent) among their peers coming from poorly educated ethnic minority families. One perhaps is not mistaken to read this difference as a signal of experiences and feelings of ethno-social discrimination in grading. Those from the higher echelons of the dominant ethnic group do not have to fear that being qualified by relatively poor grades creates insurmountable difficulties in future advancement – after all, their strong social embedding and the protective actions and interventions of the parental home will amply counterbalance the poor message of their school certificates. The situation is utterly different at the other end of the socio-ethnic hierarchy: besides continuously feeling devalued by the very working of the school and, especially, by marking, students in this group have good reasons to fear disadvantageous future tracking and other exclusionary developments due to their poor results – hence, for them, inclusion and equal treatment becomes a highly praised facet of the future school.[19] All in all, experiences about overt or covert ethno-social prejudices and about the often half-conscious use of double standards by teachers in marking seem to be present in the everyday school life of ethnic minority students in general, and especially of those whose ethnic "otherness" is accompanied by socio-economic disadvantages. What is more, the above associations suggest that the affected students are usually well aware of their achievements being unjustly devalued – though rarely do they have the strength and the power to freely articulate their impressions. It will be the task of our forthcoming in-depth analysis of the collected qualitative material to bring up the richness of their experiences and interpretative reflections.

Turning now to the third set of factors that contribute to the ethnicisation of differences in assessing students' acknowledged performance, Table 2.3 brings up dramatic differences

---

[17] Due to the limited number of cases in some cells, here we consider those who are assessed "satisfactory or poorer".

[18] Motives enjoying a "high priority" are the ones that are mentioned if only 1–3 motives were indicated out of the pool of ten.

[19] Even the best performing students of this group cannot be sure that their good results will provide strong enough protection against future disadvantages. This is signalled by the fact that no less than 61 per cent of these outstanding, achieving children of poorly educated ethnic minority families indicated inclusiveness of the future school among the 1–3 most important motives of choice – while this aspect was "naturally" infrequently mentioned by their peers from the upper echelons of majority society: only 17 per cent of the best performing children of highly educated families put a tick in the rubric of this motive.

according to the socio-ethnic profile of the schools. The hierarchy is steep, indeed. Average grades in the "top" schools[20] are no less than 0.79 points higher than in the ones dominated by disadvantaged ethnic minority students. Obviously, these differences reflect the diverse compositions of the schools, and in this sense, one could say that the findings of sharp hierarchisation are a socio-ethnic "tautology": they simply reflect what has been discussed so far about the strong influence of social and ethnic background on school performance. However, a closer analysis of the results shows that the institutional distinctions by social and ethnic background play a significant role in their own right: they accentuate individual differences by organising them into powerful institutional arrangements. This can be justified by a look at the sharply differing opportunities of students from the same backgrounds to attain "excellent" qualification and to end up among the "marginally performing" group, respectively. If attending one of the "top" schools, no less than 48 per cent of majority students from a highly educated family finish with "excellent" grades, while the corresponding ratio is as low as 18 per cent among those less fortunate members of the group who, despite the family's high standing, found themselves in the lowest ranked schools that are dominated by disadvantaged students from ethnic minority backgrounds. The distinctions by ethno-social characteristics also work strongly toward the other end: while one seeks in vain "marginally performing" students in the higher echelons of the institutional hierarchy (these students most presumably were transferred earlier to one of the weaker schools), 12–16 per cent of children of the least educated ethnic minority families find themselves among the "marginals" in schools attended in high numbers by poor students from ethnic minority backgrounds. If they show up at all, children of qualified majority parents rarely fall into this group: the figures of 2–4 per cent most probably reflect personal disorder, disturbed home conditions, troubles in the family, and the behavioural problems that often accompany such situations. Institutional differentiations in the average grades reflect the same selective processes from another angle. As Table 2.3 indicates, distinctions in grading work in identical directions for all the social and ethnic groups: depending on the position of their school in the hierarchy, students from similar social and ethnic backgrounds are evaluated differently, as if the value of the same social and cultural capital differed in different segments of the institutional market (such institutional distinctions induce differences among the best and

---

[20] These are the schools that are usually considered the best by the community. Half of them are so-called "elite" schools that provide special courses and are known for performing well in academic competitions. Seventy-two per cent of their students come from well-educated families of the majority, and if at all, they accept talented minority ethnic and/or poor children as rare exceptions. This highly selected type (with less than 20 per cent of minority students and an equally low rate of those qualified by the schools as "disadvantaged") was found only in our Central European communities that are characterised by intense spontaneous "white flight" and very weak (educational) governance to halt local pressures for setting up units with "countrywide fame" at the expense of harsh social exclusion.

the worst average measures in a range of 0.5 to 1.1 points – which our findings indicate as substantial departures, indeed.)

While the above ordering by socio-ethnic belonging is maintained by students from well-educated families on the top in each category, and by children of poorly educated parents from "visible" minority backgrounds at the lower end of the scale (and additionally, "other" minorities always in-between), the type of the school powerfully refines the picture. It adds the "quality" stamp of the school to one's results and thereby accentuates the social meaning of individual grades. This way it provides a reading, according to which students from a well-educated majority background rest in the "top" schools' "value" of 1.65 points on the educational market, and in contrast, children of poorly educated parents from "visible" minority background are valued only for a 2.73-point average grade if finishing primary education in one of the poorest minority schools of the given community. With these additions, schools help to refine the socio-ethnic picture that, without such contributions, tells a fainter and simpler story: the 0.8-point difference in average grading between students from highly educated majority backgrounds and those coming from the least educated "visible" minority families is stretched to 1.08 if the "institutional origin" of the grades is also taken into account. After all, such a filtering of the school results – that we fairly can characterise as double grading – fulfils important social functions. From the point of view of the receiving institutions of secondary education, it posts easily legible messages about the academic strength of the sending primary schools that provide orientation for all the involved parties: grades underscored by their institutional origin increase the probability of students applying to the proper school that has been set up "for them", and vice versa, given groups of families and students are automatically attracted by those secondary institutions that wait "for their kind" while distracting from those others where their "pedigree" would not be welcome. In other words, with the help of tacit differentiation on the primary level, selection becomes an easy-going and conveniently objectified process on the next stage where departures by content, quality, and service are a professionally acknowledged and openly installed constituent of the system.

The "gateway" role that the school-level aggregation of students' results fulfils has further advantageous implications. Importantly: it hides sharp differences in social and ethnic compositions by converting their compound impact into objectified academic ranking and thereby creates the ground for comparisons in quality that seem fair by taking into account only one single attribute: the standing of the institution on the academic market. Hence, those aspiring to sending their children to the best institutions on the subsequent secondary and tertiary stages of education will properly "read" these messages well in advance, and already at

an early age, they will make great efforts to enrol their child in one of the top institutions (by the way, these attempts are made relatively easy even in countries where school districts imply restrictions for movement and choice: by offering some "specialty" that is not available in other – "ordinary" – schools, these units are usually made exempt from administrative regulations for taking applicants mainly from the designated catchment areas). Likewise, poor and uneducated parents – especially those from ethnic minority backgrounds – who often value friendliness and non-discriminatory attitudes of teachers and staff more than the content and actual quality of teaching will "read" the message of lower expectations in schools run for minorities and the poor, and might find good reasons to send their children to such institutions. At any rate, this way selection by institutional quality becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy: the invisible institutional addition to assessments on the individual level boosts ethno-social differences in performance, and this way informs and legitimises further selections, while assisting in socialising all the involved actors to look at the distinctions as "natural" and "inevitable" givens carried by the impersonal structure of schooling.

Additionally, the average performance result of final year students serves as a useful indicator for important projections: it offers information about the students' chances for entering different pathways of continuation. In this sense, the aggregate performance score (together with statistics on the "success rates" of alumni) becomes the "brand name" of the emitting school, and as if it was on the market, actors in the educational arena devise their steps, pressures, and ways of expressing interest and disinterest accordingly. As the data reveal and as it will be discussed below in detail, depending on the position of their school in the invisible, but widely recognised institutional hierarchy of brand names and attached "scores of institutional performance", students from similar social and ethnic backgrounds with formally the same good results have remarkably different chances on the secondary level. Taking the case of those from highly educated majority backgrounds, the likelihood for continuing in schools that provide graduation and that open the way toward higher education is as high as 83 per cent, if they conclude their primary studies in one of the "top" institutions, but it drops to the relatively low level of 52 per cent, if they happen to finish in the lowest ranked schools dominated by children from poor ethnic minority backgrounds. Likewise, it is probably the "brand name" of their school that, by carrying some promising alternatives, holds back "marginally performing" children of poorly educated ethnic minority families from leaving education behind: against the otherwise worryingly high rate of 27 per cent for this group of students as a whole, the proportion of those planning to stop studying is only 21 per cent among those concluding primary-level education in one of the majority-dominated schools, while it jumps to 33 (!) per

cent among those finishing in the most deprived segment, i.e., in schools dominated by children from poor minority backgrounds. It is hard to read these latter differences other than indications of hopefulness and hopelessness: relatively good institutional backing probably somewhat countervails failures in individual achievement, while being unsuccessful in a school with a bad reputation rightly entails despair with regard to an acceptable educational future.

In sum, we can state that the data derived from the eight country surveys highlight institutional segmentation as one of the most powerful ways of institutionalising, legitimising, controlling, and smoothly reproducing ethnic distinctions in education. Such a powerful impact of the institutional "profiles" emerges as an aggregated outcome of processes that seem independent on the surface but that are closely intermingled in accentuating and making distinctively clear the social messages that schools send out about their students' performance and the actual "market value" of these evaluations.

By recalling the earlier results about the socio-ethnic aspects of differential individual assessments, we can establish that, all in all, European schools are characterised by a very high degree of intersectionality between the "social" and "ethnic" factors of one's background in shaping school performance that, in turn, significantly impacts young people's expectations, motivations, and perspectives. At the same time, our survey indicates that the intermingled play of these two fundamental aspects of students' positions is played out in a rather complicated way. On the individual level, "ethnicity" works toward aggrandising (or, for that matter, belittling) the importance of social belonging. If similar social backgrounds are compared, schools are inclined to devalue those from anywhere other than majority background, and especially those coming from "visibly" differing groups. These devaluations follow mainly from the distinctions that schools make in appraising different compositions of ethnically informed cultural capitals by explicitly favouring the dominant culture. Additionally, a rather low level of understanding between teachers and families deprives ethnic minority parents from capitalising on social and cultural networks that are necessary for proper orientation and successful endeavouring in the educational system and beyond. As to the institutional level, sharply differing ethno-social compositions of the schools further refine the differences in assessed individual performance and deepen the ethnic divides in attainment. The interplay between the institutional and individual distinctions concludes in making the numeric assessments of performance (that is, the grades) a kind of a socio-ethnic "trademark": as we will see, these objectified indices of human capacity then work as socially acknowledged and strongly legitimised foundations of selection for entering the next level of the educational system, and

thereby importantly influence departures for the longer-term prospects of youths from different socio-ethnic backgrounds.

While the objectifying and legitimising functions of grading are in place in all educational systems, there seem to be differences in the degree of taking school grades as the single most important indicator of "personal value". In other words, there are variations in the "strength" of the attached labels in expressing evaluations about individual inputs and achievements against "holistic" assessments of students' personalities.

Let us now turn to the closer exploration of these differences.

By asking about the five general areas of school subjects, our questionnaires offer an insight into the variations of how teachers strictly focus on performance in their professional field when making their assessments. One can assume that students are rarely "excellent" or "poor" in all subject areas: for the most part, one may be very good in humanities

Table 2.3

Average grades of students from different ethnic and parental educational backgrounds* in different types of schools

Type of the school**	Average grade	Majority		"Visible" minority		"Other" minority	
		Well educated	Poorly educated	Well educated	Poorly educated	Well educated	Poorly educated
		family background					
"Top" schools	1.75	1.65	1.85	2.00**	2.18	1.66	2.27**
Majority schools, dominantly non-poor	2,18	1.84	2.49	2.06	2.54	2.19	2.42
Majority schools, dominantly poor	2.29	1.91	2.47	2.50	2.57	2.50	2.63
Minority schools, dominantly non-poor	2.51	1.93	2.83	2.42	2.73	2.19	2.70
Minority schools, dominantly poor	2.66	2.15	2.54	2.62	2.73	2.76	2.54
Average	2.24	1.84	2.38	2.43	2.67	2.27	2.52

*The content of the categories of *parental educational backgrounds* is as follows:

– Poorly educated background: neither of the parents has attained a level above vocational training without graduation.

– Well educated background: at least secondary level graduation has been attained by at least one of the parents.

** Due to the very low number of cases, the findings should be read with caution.

** The categories are as follows:

– Majority schools for the non-poor: the ratio of students from the majority is above 50 per cent, while the ratio of those qualified by
the school as "disadvantaged" is below 50 per cent.

– Majority schools for the poor: both of the ratios of students from the majority and those qualified as "disadvantaged" are above 50 per cent.

– Minority schools for the non-poor: the ratio of students from minority ethnic backgrounds is above 50 per cent, while "disadvantaged" students are represented
in less than 50 per cent.

– Minority schools for the poor: both of the ratios of students from minority ethnic background and those qualified "disadvantaged" are above 50 per cent.

while weaker in maths; good achievement in a new foreign language rarely suggests outstanding knowledge in physics, etc. If it is performance in subjects that is marked by the grades, then a rather high rate of variance can be expected. At the same time, the more frequent the occurrences of uniform results, the more we can assume that schools and teachers see some "added value" in marking the students, and this way they intend to express some "holistic" views about the person as such. This latter hypothesis does not imply that teachers would be engaged in a kind of a "conspiracy". Instead, it reflects the shared experience of school life: teachers exchange experiences about the students whom they all teach and often form some common opinion. Whether these collectively shaped opinions make their way into grading which then translates them, in turn, into green or red lights toward certain pathways of continuation remains an important question of how the selective functions of the school become institutionalised.

Our survey brought about some good news but also a few warning signals in this regard. On the whole, the data suggest that "holistic" evaluations are rather rarely articulated: in the overwhelming majority of cases, students gave accounts of variations in their grades which carries the message that it is strictly the technicalities of a given subject that are considered, and teachers refrain from crossing the professional boundaries by sending out generalised assessments about their students. Since there has been a shift in assessment from oral exams to written tests in recent decades, grading has been filled in with a good deal of "technocratic" contents – and our results confirm that, for the most part, teachers go along with these new trends. Nevertheless, the 13 per cent proportion of the cases where "uniformity" across the subjects indicates a departure from the mainstream and points toward "holistic" evaluations deserves some attention. First, if compared according to the varied historical contexts, it turns out that it is still the post-socialist world, with its deeply "disciplining" traditions, where schools, instead of sending out duly itemized information of distinct capabilities and capacities, seem to be inclined to consider it their task to make authoritative assessments about "personalities" (the proportion of such generalised assessments is somewhat above 13 per cent in the region). The second in the order are schools in France – that represent here the post-colonial tradition:[21] "holistic" assessments make up 10 per cent of the cases here. Not far beyond them (with a proportion of 9 per cent), schools in countries of economic migration seem to give out generalised assessments the least.

Second, wherever applied, generalised assessments seem to serve to underscore the two extremes of the scale, i.e., instead of simply speaking about "excellent performance", "holistic" statements help to single out "persons of excellence", and similarly, instead of pointing to "marginal performance", they help to designate "bad students". It turns out (and, at the same time, seems to justify our hypothesis about a high degree of intentionality behind collateral grades) that holistic

---

[21] Due to a grading system in Britain that is profoundly different from the continental versions, we do not have detailed results for each subject area from the United Kingdom.

statements about "outstanding" and "bad" students make up two-thirds of the cases in high accordance with the needs to such qualifications.

Third, it then makes sense to look at these needs and ask the question: who are those who "deserve" the underscoring of generalised and personified statements. As a detailed analysis reveals, such underscoring techniques are applied mostly by schools where it is students from the majority who are in clear domination; within their student-body, it is primarily students from "other" (white) ethnic background who receive personified additions from their teachers. The way to report their "excellence" is most probably aimed to compensate for the disadvantages that they might face in applying to the good schools that they "deserve" and give them some extra assistance with the label of "excellence". At the same time, the "troublemakers" of this group might be found in schools with a high proportion of disadvantaged students: against a 6 per cent average for the group, 13–16 per cent of students from "other" ethnic minority backgrounds attending "schools for the disadvantaged" receive personified negative evaluations that certainly distinguishes them from their peers. It would require further exploration to find out whether it is their difficulties to become accommodated in a new school environment,[22] or some prejudices on the part of teachers who expect them to behave according to the ruling "white" norms that lead to such symptoms of devaluation. Nevertheless, we probably correctly read these findings as signals of conflicts of those migrant children in school who "otherwise" seem to relatively easily adjust to their new home society. The lack of similar attempts at applying personified "labelling" in the case of students from "visible" minority backgrounds probably reflects the sheer reality: since their overall results usually lag behind the "white" groups, this simple fact is self-expressive enough to carry the "right" message. Furthermore, since ethnic minority students are concentrated in schools "for them", their institutional affiliation provides strong enough a "stamp" to make sure that they do not orient toward schools and positions where they certainly would not be welcome. One might add here a third component about teachers' – sometimes paternalistic – goodwill: since they latently do not expect the same level of knowledge and performance from their "white" and "coloured" students while trying to evaluate them along the same "technocratic" lines, it is most probable that they are keenly refraining from over-generalised statements, but welcome good achievements in their own right. Such a "neutral" and strictly subject-oriented attitude seems the most appropriate in terms of political correctness, while helps to prevent misunderstandings and conflicts of interpretation between teachers and families from an "ethnically other" background.

In sum, we can establish that "personified" and "holistic" evaluations – at least in the form of grading – are more the exception than the rule in the schools of compulsory education. If applied, these methods are more in use for "rewarding" the label of "excellence" than for punishing uniformly bad results. Still, these kinds of distinctions have their role – especially in expressing the "otherness"

---

[22] With its 19 per cent proportion, the ratio of first-generation migrants is relatively high in this group.

of the newly arrived, mostly Eastern European immigrants whom the schools consider ill-adapting. Since grading has important orientating functions in the choices to be made about continuation, we may welcome that most of the students are exempt from receiving over-generalised "personal labels" to their marks, and in any event, it is truly good news that the most vulnerable groups of students who carry the "personal labels" of their skin and outward appearance are mostly saved from such additions.

At the same time, some reservations have to be made here. For in order to express negative "personalised" assessments, schools have some tougher tools at hand other than grading: it is first of all referral for repetition – an authoritative ruling of the school that, as we will see below, is not concluded on equal grounds at all. In principle, teachers' decisions to tell parents that their children should be held back at a lower grade for an additional year could have preventive and corrective functions: repetition might help to ease the burden that schoolwork involves, earlier acquired elements of knowledge might be capitalised on for attaining better assessment results, and the advantage in age in comparison to the new classmates might assure some prestige and a leading role. In fact, these are the very considerations that teachers most frequently bring up in justifying their decision that affect no less than 13 per cent of the students in our schools. However, being held back does not work this way: instead of positive effects on catch-up and self-assurance, grade retention usually turns into a powerful and lasting stigma that is difficult for the school environment ever to forget. Although 90 per cent of the students who had been kept behind at a point in their career in primary education had faced such a decision in the very early years (two-thirds of the repetitions occurred at some point in the course of the first to sixth grades, that is, at least two academic years prior to our investigation), their performance grades still reflect the depreciating implications: against 6 per cent among the "non-repeaters", 21 per cent of them are still assessed as just "marginally performing", and their average performance grade falls 0.69 points short of the group advancing directly.

The huge gap between teachers' intentions and the actual outcomes is brought about by a number of factors at play. First, a referral for repetition is rarely a decision made purely on academic grounds. It is often a response to behavioural deficiencies and symptoms of non-adaptation, and this way, instead of working as a source of inspiration, it is taken as an expression of power and authority that schools have in making degrading "personified" evaluations.[23] Second, being overage among the new classmates does not induce the boosting of one's prestige; nor does it contribute to feelings of comfort in the new setting.[24] But besides these failed personal implications, it is most probably the

---

[23] In the context of the above indicated general attitude to refrain from expressing criticism about teachers and the school, it is a telling signal of their hurt feelings that students who had been kept behind gave voice with significantly higher occurrence to opinions about injustices on the part of teachers, and especially their "unfair" decisions about class selection than their directly advancing peers (23 per cent of the "repeating", while 17 per cent of the "non-repeating" students complained about frequent injustices at school, and out of these groups, the proportion of those who spelled out selection as the source of the problem was 21 per cent in the first, while only 10 per cent in the second group).

[24] As an expression of feelings about alienation and solitude, 13 per cent of the "repeaters" (against only 7 per cent of the "non-repeaters") complained about the troubled atmosphere in their class due to highly individualised relations.

involved social, ethnic, and institutional aspects that make academic retention a generalised "personified" statement that works as a strong stigma and a powerful source of selection.

This is the point where our welcome words about the self-restraint of teachers to make "personified" statements about their "visibly" different students in the form of underscored performance grades become seriously relativised. For our data show that instead of the fine-tuned message of numeric points, it is the crude and negative substance of referral to repetition that affects students from "visible" minority backgrounds in the first place. While students from the majority very rarely face such depreciating decisions (the rate of occurrence is only 8 per cent among them), retention for academic failures is a stigma in the curriculum vitae of no less than 22 per cent of those who "visibly" belong to the category of "Other" (yet again, students from "other" minority backgrounds occupy an in-between position with their 15 per cent ratio). Furthermore, while the decisions roughly equally affect girls and boys, they are very unevenly distributed by social standing: students coming from a poorly educated parental home have a 3–4 times higher chance to find themselves in the failed category of "repeaters" than their peers from highly educated families.[25] On top of all these, retention rates show high institutional concentration. With an outstandingly high ratio of 24–28 per cent, such decisions seem to belong to the ordinary daily routine in schools dominated by students from minority backgrounds, while practically never come into consideration in "top" schools, and affect only some 8–10 per cent of students in educational units where the ethnic majority is dominant. Such an unevenness implies that it is not only the individual students but also their institutions that get stigmatised: some of the latter – especially minority schools with a high proportion of disadvantaged students – become known as the "collectors" of troubled cases, and the larger environment looks at them as such. Other schools tend to send students with behavioural and adaptation problems here and thereby "save" their own institutions. With the growing number of failed students among their attendees, these stigmatised schools then start to "use" repetition as an ordinary routine of discipline, and thereby provide a feedback about their "collecting" role – the arising vicious circle grows self-sustaining, and works toward severe segregation. Together with this, the double stigma of "personified" failure in a "collector" institution leads to the most severe risk of long-term loss: to become a dropout. Though most of them are still in the compulsory age, no less than 36 per cent of ethnic minority students who were once held back and now attend one of the "collector"

---

[25] Before one would assume that these differences in occurrence are because of cultural components, it is worth noting that command over the language of instruction as otherwise an important indicator of departing grades does not seem to play a role in the drastic failures of being kept behind: regardless of whether students speak the language of the country as their first or second language, those coming from minority backgrounds have twice the chance to be kept behind than their majority peers. This is another indication of "personified" assessments playing the major role in the background of the decisions.

schools plan to skip schooling next year – and this worryingly high proportion is exactly the double of the 18 per cent all-inclusive ratio of finalisers[26] in the sample as a whole.

In the light of the rich arsenal of tools at schools' disposal to send out highly structured messages about their students' performance, we have to agree with those critical thinkers, social scientists, practitioners, and innovative policymakers who vehemently argue for giving up traditional test- and exam-based marking and find alternative ways of assessment that better reflect personal qualities, talent, and motivation, and that leave enough scope for acknowledging the diversity of cultural inputs (Kohn 1999, Keesing-Styles 2003). Nevertheless, societies have a great deal of vested interest to maintain the system largely in its current form. As we saw before, grades are the main tool to calibrate values that are meant to be read as "cultural", and consonant with this, schools gain a good deal of power to send out easily understood assessments about each of the individual students they deal with. This way educational institutions are and will remain the agents of making the first steps toward shaping social positions: after all, grades are taken as information about marketable knowledge and skills and as such, school results are turned into diverging pathways in our increasingly "knowledge-based" societies.

Obviously, there are no one-to-one relations between the attained performances that grading measures and students' actual advancement. There are a number of important considerations put on the table of deliberations before families make the ultimate choice about where their children should go next, what the most appropriate type of school would be to select, and how to make sure that the choice fits longer-term plans. These deliberations are informed by the attained results, but their "weight" in the decision remains open. At the same time, experience from all over the place shows – and we will confirm some facts about it later – that the information on performance and the school where it comes from is highly utilised by the receiving institutions: the units of secondary and higher education. A mostly invisible bargaining between the involved actors concludes in the well-known end-result: students graduating with "excellence" in the best first-level institutions usually boost their advantage by enrolling in one of the best secondary schools with practically unlimited access to higher education, while poorly performing students concluding primary education in one of the schools in the lowest segment of the educational hierarchy have but a limited choice, and, provided that they do not skip the system, usually end up in secondary schools that turn their earlier disadvantage either to early leaving or to low-level employment in the least prestigious and low-paid segments of the labour market.

Our survey was run in a time of the school year when familial deliberations met the offers of the secondary schools and when the two parties had arrived at a decision in most of the cases. At this point

---

[26] This proportion includes that 14 per cent who are aged above 16 and thus are most probably exempt from compulsory schooling in any of the countries that participated in the survey.

in time, it seemed interesting and important to gain some insights into the motivations as well as into those limitations that students' actual earlier attainment puts on families' choices.

Let us turn now to this issue and bring up the details that these complicated "bargains" among families, old and new schools, teachers, and students involve.

III. WHERE TO GO NEXT?
IDEAS ON ADVANCEMENT IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The questionnaires give accounts on what our respondents intended to do upon concluding the class that they attended at the time of responding and also mapped their motives behind the choice. As has been already mentioned, the classes that were included in the fieldwork had been selected on purpose: regardless of the type of the school and the grade that the respondents were actually attending, all of the targeted students faced important ramifications in the education systems that required their decisions concerning the next stage in their lives. Irrespective of the actual arrangements in the country, they all faced their first truly crucial decisions about impending adulthood: whether to opt for a form of secondary schooling that concludes in graduation and opens the door toward higher education, or to choose a track or school that offers a vocation without an academic certificate but entails the promise of a relatively early entrance into the labour market, or else, suspend school attendance as such – or at least, to do so for a while – with a hazy outlook but temporary relief from academic obligations (though with obvious implied risks for the future). In addition to enquiring about the pathways that the respondents planned to follow, the questionnaire also put forth questions about the motivations behind their choices. Offering a broad scope of answers to pick from aimed to explore the immediate considerations and longer-term ideas that concluded in submitting an application to a given educational institution on the secondary level, while also intending to reveal the confinements and pressures that forged the decision to leave education behind. Furthermore, the questionnaire attempted to draw up a map of the network of "counsellors" by asking about the partners and companions who assisted our respondents in arriving at an ultimate choice. Was it only them and their parents who came to the necessary conclusion? Or was it mainly their teachers who gave some guidance? Or, in order to keep loyalty to important traditions, was it some influential members of the community in the first place (a cleric, , relatives, or parents' friends from the family's country of origin) who gave the necessary orientation? Or else, in addition to adult wisdom or in its stead, was it rather the available patterns provided by peers and friends that students thought best to follow?

With all the givens that students' earlier educational histories and the above analysed structural constraints imply, we had good reason to assume that the choice of pathways at this turning point will inform us about those freedoms and restrictions that allow adolescents to navigate toward their envisioned adult careers: the selected directions imply more than just the technical details of schooling and training, and also tell us about some longer-term ideas and considerations. At the same time, the data speak about dreams, plans, and attempts and have to be read as such. While we know, that ideas mostly relate to realistically weighted options and rarely lose touch with the consonant down-to-earth experiences, we still have to be cautious in interpreting them as information about the future as it

actually shapes itself. At the same time, to our regret, the necessary follow-up that would have been needed to find out success and failures in realising what had been envisioned or hoped for did not fit into the time and financial limits of the EDUMIGROM research project.[27]

Nevertheless, the responses to the above set of questions brought up a large pool of robust findings that point toward meaningful departures – sometimes it is perhaps more appropriate to call them *fault lines* – in students' prospects. As will be demonstrated below, choices at the young ages of 14–16 are far from being free: earlier achievements more or less define the "playground" for any deliberations, but it is only those coming from families in the best positions in their community who can be said to enjoy genuine freedom to correct earlier academic failures by approaching a strong and acknowledged institution for the next educational stage.

Notwithstanding, our data indicate a high degree of commitment to schooling: regardless of being poor or rich, coming from educated or uneducated backgrounds, leaving behind a stronger or weaker primary-level institution, and also irrespective of one's ethnic belonging, the overwhelming majority of our respondents think of a future of studentship. Although below we will qualify this statement, it still seems rather important to emphasise that staying on and being involved in education well into the second half of one's teenage years has become a general norm in Europe, and young people and their families observe this norm for the most part. However, it is equally important to pay close attention to those who fall through the cracks of continued education as the most potent safety net against marginalisation and social exclusion. This at-risk group of adolescents (of a magnitude of no less than 15 per cent in our sample) is in a sense the victim of the working of the highly competitive school systems in our countries in which they lost the capacity to keep up long ago – and neither their family, nor the school and the teachers, nor the immediate and larger referential communities have been able to help them.

---

[27] It is more accurate to say that we have only partial knowledge about the correspondence between the envisioned choice and its actual realisation. This partial information comes from two of our participating countries – France and Germany – where the survey brought up data to make some assessment. Due to the peculiarities of their school systems, by the time of the survey, students were aware of the definite decisions on their applications regarding studying the following year. Hence, it made sense to ask them about the success of their attempts. The results are telling. The average rate of failures was nearly identical: 28 per cent in Germany and 29 per cent in France. However, there were significant variations around these averages. With close to identical proportions among those who made attempts toward graduation (25 per cent) or a vocational school (22 per cent), the greatest disappointment was experienced among those who were advised to remain one more year in their current setting (41 per cent). In addition to these, the group-specific rates showed huge variations according to students' earlier achievements (grades on performance), and – most significantly – according to their ethnic and social background. Out of those who all concluded the preceding semester with "excellent" results, the success rate was 94 per cent among those from the majority, but only 73 per cent among the children of ethnic minority families. Similar ethnic differences remained in force even among those who just "marginally performed" before: the applications of those from the majority were accepted in 69 per cent of the cases, while the corresponding proportion was only 56 per cent for those considered as coming from an "immigrant background". As to differences along the social hierarchy, the departures are significant again. Well-performing children from the upper echelons of society could count on being accepted in 90 per cent of the cases, while every fifth of the applications of equally well-performing students from lower-ranked backgrounds were turned down. The differences were smaller but pointed toward the same direction among those with "marginal" performance whose success rates were 70 and 63, respectively.

As it is manifested by the data in Table 3.1, the high stakes that the achieved performance results imply are confirmed, indeed. The proportion of those imaging themselves in a secondary school that provides graduation and thereby draws the contours of a promising longer-term future (either with entrance to the labour market in the hope of relatively good middle-class positions or with securing the way toward higher education) is steeply declining along the line of the numeric grades: while more than four-fifths of the "excellently" evaluated students are determined to head in this direction, the corresponding proportion comes down by half among their "marginally performing" peers. Those who earlier failed to get into the "club" of good performers now face very gloomy prognoses: with an equally steep rise into the opposite direction, the ratio of potential dropouts climbs from the 5 per cent level among the "excellent" students to the outstandingly high index of 33 per cent among those who belong to the "marginally performing" group (remarking on the latter index, we have good reason to add the 19 per cent proportion of those whose "undecided" responses involve a high risk of probable similar outcomes that may ultimately end in them opting out from education or landing in a secondary-level school that does not provide useable certificates for the future).[28]

Apparently, vocational training comes along rather infrequently as a prompt choice: only 3–7 per cent of our respondents put a tick next to this type of school. However, this low rate of interest is probably an artefact that reflects certain administrative categorisations. In attempts to make vocational training more attractive and to ease movement among the different tracks of secondary-level education, important reforms have been introduced in several countries in the last two decades. Vocational tracks have either been administratively drawn under the roof of schools providing graduation through comprehensive exams in academic subjects (e.g., in France, Germany, Hungary), or several arrangements have been set up to access graduation semi-independently from the type of institution that one had previously attended (e.g., Denmark), and/or efforts have been made to enrich the curricula with academic subjects and this way make steps toward convergence among the divergent tracks. It follows that some of those who sorted out "secondary-level graduation" as their option will most probably find themselves in a vocational class from where they actually have little hope to graduate at the end – though their unit still carries the prestigious emblem of a "secondary comprehensive" or "secondary technical" school.[29]

---

[28] "Undecided" cases also popped up among the better-performing students, even among the best ones. A closer analysis revealed, however, that a large part followed from yet unresolved appeals (see the footnote to Table 2.4), or consisted of deliberate parental decisions to wait one or two more years for entrance to the highly competitive secondary-level educational arena. In some countries (Denmark, Czech Republic, and Slovakia), a choice can be made whether to go forward within primary education (usually attending the ninth and tenth grades), or to enter the secondary system. In Denmark, it is often the best-positioned families and their well-performing children who prefer the first option that involves a good deal of protection and implies the lengthening of genuine childhood.

[29] It follows from the mentioned reforms and reorganisations that it often was very difficult to draw a clear line between the two classic types of secondary schools. While traditionally it has been the comprehensive schools that put an emphasis on academic training and the secondary technical schools have been known for compromising between arts/science and vocational training in their curriculum, the pattern has become blurred during the last two decades. In several countries with historical roots in the school system of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, one still can observe the remnants of this classic pattern (in our sample, this holds primarily for the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Slovakia), and a similar logic

The last row of Table 3.1 deserves particular attention as an aggregate characterisation of the student population of our selected working-class communities. Despite widespread commitment to the continuation of studies, we have to be concerned if this distribution is taken in the wider context of the available European-level data. It becomes clear by a quick glance at the indices of the highest attained level of education of the 25–64-year-old adult population (OECD 2009) that the most optimistic predictable scenario for our students tells of stagnation. As against the 70 per cent ratio of completed secondary graduation in the preceding generations (with 34 per cent holding also a degree in higher education), the 68 per cent proportion of *planned* continuation toward this end is just about at the margin of closing, provided that one does not take into account the well-known facts of early leave – that affects poor and minority populations in the first place (Kritikos and Ching 2005).

Table 3.1

School results and choices for the next school year

Overall grade in the preceding semester	Proportion (%) of those who are				Together
	heading toward:			Undecided*	
	Secondary school with graduation	Vocational school, without graduation	Leaving education behind		
Excellent	82	3	5	10	100
Good	74	5	11	10	100
Satisfactory	64	7	19	10	100
Marginally	41	6	33	19	100

characterises the Danish arrangements as well. However, vocational tracks in combination with graduation have been partly incorporated into the comprehensive system in France and Germany, while new arrangements between educational institutions and the business world provide graduation and "out of academia" vocational qualifications for youth in the United Kingdom. Due to such a kaleidoscopic picture, it seemed more appropriate to consider "secondary-level institutions with graduation" a unified category, than to arbitrarily make some artificial clustering. When it seems necessary and where our data allow for it, we will take notice of internal differences and departures.

performing					
Together	68	6	15	11	100

* Students in this category were either advised to remain in a lower-level class for an additional year, or an ultimate decision concerning the immediate future still has not been arrived at, either because of failing, or because their appeal against turning down their application had not been concluded yet.

However, the most truly distressful indicator is reflected in students' intentions on leaving education behind education. The 15 per cent proportion of leavers – with the mentioned deviations among the different groups – suggests severe trends that imply an unbroken reproduction of social exclusion among the poorest and a spreading of high-risk careers, as yet largely unnoticed. A few data are enough to see this. Although comparative figures are unavailable on the ratios of dropouts, the OECD indicators still give some orientation to assess the magnitude of the problem. As to the latest statistics (OECD 2009), 83–90 per cent of youth in the age-bracket of 15–19 years are involved in education in our countries,[30] and within this cohort, one can assume that the rates of participation are higher for those in or around the age of compulsory schooling.[31] In the light of these figures, the 15 per cent proportion of determined leavers[32] is very high, indeed. But the causes for actual concern are in the details. It is a serious warning that no less than 44 per cent of the group in question come from among those who will not reach the age of 16 even in the next academic year. Moreover, "dedicated" early leavers are recruited from the most severely marginalised social groups: against the 21 per cent share of students from poorly educated minority backgrounds in the sample, their proportion jumps to 32 per cent among the quitters; furthermore, it is a telling indicator of their pressing conditions that close to one-third of them reasoned their decisions to leave due to the desperate financial situation of their families that made it a *must* for them to look for some gainful employment; the constraints certainly have to be considered grievous in light of the very high occurrence of truly destitute conditions: no less than 23 per cent of these at-risk students come from families without any regular income and with experience of lasting unemployment. All in all, the large frequency of such desperate "choices" among the poor seems to be grounded in day-to-day reality: due to the lack of support and

---

[30] The only exception, with its 71 per cent index, is the United Kingdom where, as indicated, vocational training is not part of the educational system, hence data on a large part of the 16–18-year-old population are unavailable for this comparison. And a further note: not being a member-state of the OECD, the corresponding indicator is unknown for Romania.

[31] For the most part, the compulsory age is 16.

[32] Of course, these determinations should not be taken for granted. After all, respecting compulsory education is a legally prescribed duty everywhere, and there are authorities with tools at hand to enforce its observance – though they presumably act with varying rigour and commitment (European Commission 2008). Hence, many of these students will still remain for a while in one or another educational framework – though their explicit will to skip will sooner or later become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

protection that would help ease their conditions, these families on the margins of society cannot allow themselves the "extravagance" of letting their child go on in education. What these data show is nothing but the straight reproduction of destitution – though the responsibility hardly can be shifted to those affected. (We will return to some of the policy implications in the concluding chapter of this report.)

Table 3.2 gives some introduction to the important details behind the aggregate picture that has been outlined so far. The three sections of the table look at the patterns of future options from different perspectives. By recalling the conclusions of the previous chapter that highlighted the significant influence of familial social and ethnic background on school achievements and also showed the strong impact of institutional arrangements on extending/limiting the scope of attainable performance results, it seems important to ask the question: what are the implications of these differences on the freedom of choice that students and families can exert within the otherwise identical "brackets" of earlier qualifications at the time when these numeric results come to be "exchanged" for positions in the openly selective systems of secondary education and work? In other words, do cultural and social capital, their institutional embodiment, and the power that the emerging different socio-institutional constellations involve come into play to "colour" the otherwise strong determinations that prior school results imply for future pathways and careers? And if they do, how are these influences played out in our educational systems that are increasingly built on acknowledging only knowledge and high performance?

Table 3.2

Choices of well- and poorly-performing students regarding the next school year – from different perspectives

A) Choices by families' socio-economic status

Overall grades in the preceding semester	Socio-economic status*	Proportion (%) of those who are				Together
		heading toward:			Undecided	
		Secondary school with graduation	Vocational school, without graduation	Leaving education behind		
Excellent	Upper status	88	1	4	7	100
	Lower status	66	9	13	12	100
Marginally performing	Upper status	44	15	26	15	100
	Lower status	42	7	30	21	100

* "Socio-economic status", as a compact characterisation of a family's social standing, observes parental education and labour market position, the regularity of income, and the attained level of living. "Upper status groups" enjoy a high level of stability and material conditions well above the average of their community that are assured by parents' good education and valuable labour market positions. As for the "lower status groups", parents' vulnerable labour market positions are the source of a high degree of volatility of income that allows, in turn, for very limited material conditions. Thus, the majority of the affected families land in poverty – and many of them explicitly suffer destitution.

Table 3.2 (continued)

B) Choices by ethnic background and parents' level of education

Overall grades in the preceding semester	Ethnic background/ parents' level of education	Proportion (%) of those who are				Together
		heading toward:			Undecided	
		Secondary school with graduation	Vocational school, without graduation	Leaving education behind		
Excellent	Majority, well educated	86	1	4	9	100
	Majority, poorly educated	84	4	2	10	100
	Minority, well educated	80	4	9	7	100
	Minority, poorly educated	68	12	17	3	100
Marginally performing	Majority, well educated	51	6	23	20	100
	Majority, poorly educated	38	9	37	16	100
	Minority, well educated	40	6	38	16	100
	Minority, poorly educated	45	9	27	19	100

Table 3.2 (continued)

C) Choices by the type of the school on the concluding level

Overall grades in the preceding semester	Type of the school	Proportion (%) of those who are			Undecided	Together
		heading toward:				
		Secondary school with graduation	Vocational school, without graduation	Leaving education behind		
Excellent	Majority school, dominantly non-poor*	86	0	3	11	100
	Majority school, dominantly poor	78	3	7	12	100
	Minority school, dominantly non-poor	75	–	20	5	100
	Minority school, dominantly poor	59	20	10	11	100
	Majority school, dominantly non-poor*	41	5	31	23	100
	Majority school, dominantly	41	4	31	24	100

	poor					
Marginally performing	Minority school, dominantly non-poor	42	6	36	16	100
	Minority school, dominantly poor	41	8	35	16	100

** The category "Majority school, dominantly non-poor" also contains the data of the "top" schools.

The three sections of Table 3.2 seek answers to these important questions by introducing the options on the two extremes of the assessment scale: among those entering the "exchange market" of secondary education with "excellent" grades and among those with the stamp of "marginally performing", respectively.

As Table 3.2/A indicates, social status as the bearer of greater or lesser magnitudes of social and cultural capital for building on the future career of the subsequent generation is an important factor in shaping advancement. However, the parents' social and cultural capital chiefly come into play in the intense competition for potential entrance into the higher echelons of society. This is shown by the clear association between a family's status and the chosen path for advancement among those students who are finishing with "excellent" evaluations. If one comes from the upper echelons of society, it is an exception to enter any other pathway than continuing one's studies toward graduation: nine out of ten follow this route. At the same time, their equally well-performing peers from poorer social backgrounds seemingly have to take into account other concerns: the speediest access to work is a heavily considered option in their case. Although the proportion of early leavers and those with "floating" decisions still remain below the averages among the best-qualified students from poorer backgrounds, in comparison to those in much better positions, the corresponding figures are 1.5–3 times higher (additionally, the 9 per cent ratio of those opting for vocational training also speaks about the pressing situation at home that inspires these young men and women to head toward the labour market as soon as possible.)

At the same time, socio-economic differences do not seem to imply similar departures among those who concluded the preceding level only with "marginal performance". Although there are minor deviations to the detriment of students from poorer backgrounds among the early leavers and their potential followers in the group of "undecided" students, the demarcation lines between them and their well-performing peers still seem to be more important than these small-scale divergences: regardless of their families' status, almost half of the group in question are at high risk of entirely dropping out from the system. Those from more affluent and better-embedded families apparently try to avoid such a fate by applying to a vocational school, but knowing the insecure position of these schools in our educational systems, such a safeguard seems rather weak. The critically low rates (42–44 per cent) of those applying to a "proper" secondary school call again for a reconsideration of the implications that the current ways of assessment bear upon students' longer-term future. As the data show, the harm that "marginalised" qualifications imply cannot be countervailed and certainly cannot be corrected

by mobilising even the best familial social and cultural capital. In this regard, the "conductor's baton" is in the hands of the schools and the teachers.

Table 3.2/B refines the picture by pointing out the disadvantages in advancement that ethnic minority students face in comparison to their majority peers. The distinctions by ethnicity regarding access to those schools providing the best quality in teaching and the most freedom for future choices – secondary-level institutions with graduation at the end of studies – are rather remarkable: downhill on the socio-cultural hierarchy from students from well-educated majority backgrounds at the group of poorly educated ethnic minority students, , those who accomplished the prior level with "excellence" lose 18 per cent in their probability to opt for such a school (from 86 to 68 per cent), while the ratio of those considering a farewell to education climbs from 4 to 17 per cent.

When taking parental education and ethnic belonging together with the otherwise undifferentiated gloomy future of those who did not succeed in attaining "marketable" school results earlier (i.e., the "marginal performers"), it is only the dual potency of majority belonging and good educational background that involves some likelihood for meaningful corrections of prior failures. A little more than half of the students in this category drift toward graduation, and one can assume, due to the interventions of their parents and their respective networks, that the exceptionally high (20 per cent) proportion of "undecided" cases will ultimately be settled toward this same direction. Interestingly, students from poorly educated majority backgrounds do not seem to be able to maintain the "customary" ethnic advantage in comparison to their minority peers: the low 38–45 per cent rates of applying to schools with graduation, and the worryingly high proportions of the determined school leavers and those in a "floating" situation, respectively (27–37 and 16–19 per cent), carry the uniform message of widespread insecurity and the high potential of ultimate marginalisation and exclusion for all poorly performing ethnic minority students and their equally failing peers from disadvantaged majority backgrounds.[33]

---

[33] It is worth noting in this context, that among the poorly performing students from minority backgrounds, it is the group of "other" minorities whose risks seem the biggest of all: 45 (!) per cent of them declared their wish to leave education as such, and a further 18 per cent gave account of yet unsettled decisions (all in all, the proportion of those applying to a school where graduation can be expected fell to the lowest rate of 35 per cent). As the detailed analysis revealed, these students are mostly from an Eastern European background or from another EU member state from where their families migrated in the hope of better earnings and perhaps a wider and brighter future for their children than back home. The quoted figures signal a good deal of frustration, while also indicate the feelings of considering the situation an only temporary sacrifice for a later happy return home. This latter reading of the data is justified by a quick look at the argumentations, desires, and fears of these students (that we will address in detail later in this report). Much above the respective averages, 83 per cent of the "leavers" in this group argued for such a decision by strong commitment to work, while their mentioning of fears of unemployment or improper employment superseded the respective average. But the most telling is their dedication to go back to their home country: against 10 per cent on average, the proportion of those articulating such a will was 23 per cent in this group of early marginalised youth of "white" migrant background.

Finally, Table 3.2/C seems to confirm what has been said above about the secret "mission" of selection among the schools on the primary level: as the data show, prior attendance to a "good" or a "bad" school wields important implication on one's subsequent educational career, and the departing antecedences greatly deviate the actual value of otherwise identical school results by "inflating" or "deflating" them. However, such a great impact of the invisible "scoring" that prior schooling adds to one's school certificate can be observed only among those – the well-performing students – for whom institutionalised selection makes sense by reducing the competition for places in the most prestigious institutions on the secondary level that are in excessive demand in all our societies. Apparently, poor performance results provide enough information on their own to make such refining scoring unnecessary: the involved careers conclude in risky outcomes in any case.

The competition among those qualified as "excellent" seems to be the most intense for admission to schools that finish with graduation and involve the promise of straightforward continuation toward higher education. Those leaving behind a school dominated by the non-poor majority follow this pathway nearly without exception. At the other end of the scale, such an option is open only for 59 per cent of those "excellent" students who demonstrate diligence and knowledge in an institution that is generally despised and devalued by the surroundings, especially by those actors of the next educational stage who occupy the decision-making positions to determine selection and admission. True, vocational training still seems to be an accessible pathway for many of them: every fifth of the group considers this option.

Although prior institutional affiliation carries much less importance among those with "marginal performance", the quality of the former school still makes some "colouring" among the risky outcomes. While the proportion of compulsive "leavers" reaches the extra high figures of 35–36 per cent among those who came to the decision to make an end to studentship in a minority-dominated school, the 23–24 per cent high ratio of yet "undecided" cases among those who finish in a majority-dominated institution implies some hopes for still being accepted by a "proper" secondary institution.

If taken together, our findings provide us with the grounds to give an affirmative answer to the earlier set of questions about the relativity of the determinations that school results imply. Yes, in theory, there is certainly a spacious playground for options that depart from what prior achievement would designate for one's advancement. This playground is, however, highly structured by intersecting social, ethnic, and institutional forces. It is huge and comfortable for those well-performing students who possess the cumulative advantages of coming from the

well-educated and strongly embedded families of the majority, provided the parents have been prepared enough to look ahead and enrolled their child in a "good majority school" well in advance. However, the playground is reduced to a tiny space for those "marginally performing" students who can be found on the opposite end of the scale. By coming from poorly educated and marginalised families, and by being squeezed into the segregated quarters of primary education, their fate is largely predetermined: for the most part, they have to say farewell to the "childish" way of life of regular school attendance and take up duties either at home or in the least stable segments of the labour market where uneducated and untrained workers are still in need in substantial quantity.

The described trends and associations seem to prevail across all the countries participating in the research. However, one would hypothesise variations in their strength and the magnitude of the implied socio-ethnic inequalities. After all, it can be assumed that the long history of interethnic cohabitation in communities that have come into being by subsequent waves of migration from the one-time colonies would provide certain established and routinely followed pathways for their minorities; this would be distinguishable from the prevailing patterns in societies that are just about to enter the historic phase of recognising and accepting their changed ethnic character and are currently experimenting with reforms to reshuffle their institutional systems and provisions to the new conditions of ethnic heterogeneity. Yet another constellation can be expected in the new democracies of Central Europe where experimentation with defining the actual contents of inclusionary citizenship has been paralleled with exclusionary attempts at making the concept bifurcated along the lines of ethno-national superiority. In the light of these distinguishable models, one would anticipate rather remarkable deviations in the intensity of how social and ethnic inequalities inform students' options and longer-term pathways, and how the involved determinations portion different degrees of freedom for them.

Table 3.3 allows us to draw a few conclusions by looking at some telling figures along the introduced typology that clusters the participating countries according to the ruling principles of interethnic cohabitation.

Table 3.3

Departing routes according to socio-ethnic belonging in the three clusters of countries

Historical type of country	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of those who					
		stay on in education			are determined to leave education		
		Upper	Lower	All social groups	Upper	Lower	All social groups
		social status			social status		
Post-colonial migration	Majority	74	56	67	23	37	29
	Minority	78	71	69	22	25	26
Economic migration	Majority	89	71	80	11	28	19
	Minority	85	79	82	13	19	17
Post-socialist transformation	Majority	95	62	84	3	20	9
	Minority	85	70	76	11	21	16

The first lesson of the table is clear: regarding the potentials for continuation, the Western democracies that are represented in the EDUMIGROM project have uniformly erased differences by ethnic belonging. While inequalities in advancement are significant according to social status, assignment to the dominant pattern of continuing on the secondary level does not differ along ethnic lines – or better to say, minor differences work *in favour* of adolescents from minority backgrounds. At the same time, the peculiar character of our investigated communities has to be emphasised in this context. As we have learned from the Survey Reports of the involved countries (Felouzis et al. 2010, Swann and Law 2010, Thomsen, Moldenhawer, and Kallehave 2010, Ohliger 2009), the "majorities" of these communities are characterised by some special traits that distinguish them from the mainstream in their societies: the concentration of poverty is very high and "troubled" family backgrounds are outstandingly frequent among them. By taking into account these facts, the preceding statement thus has to be rephrased in a more accurate way. In these working-class communities, ethnic minority people – regardless of

whether they are well or poorly educated, rich or poor – seem to approach or even slightly supersede the state of the lower echelons of the majority society living in their proximity.

With all the implications of this reservation, the situation of students from "immigrant backgrounds" in the West significantly differs from that of their Roma peers in the post-socialist world whose dual deprivation by low social standing and ethnic "otherness" is clearly demonstrated by the data in the last two rows of the table. These data and the details behind them tell the story of strong-handed attempts by the local majority to keep Roma away, even from those small advantages that "white" people living in similar conditions enjoy. The stake of this ethnicised struggle is to gain a modest degree of superiority. The data confirm what the country reports portray in so many convincing details: the status of the deprived strata of the non-Roma majorities are protected by massive movements of "white flight" and the squeezing out of Roma youth from access to the channels of upward social mobility that together induce extreme selection and conclude in the emergence of socio-ethnic ghettos in education and the labour market (Fučík et al. 2010, Messing, Neményi, and Szalai 2010, Kusá et al. 2010a, Magyari and Vincze 2009).

At the same time, the figures for those who are determined to leave education do not indicate any specificity along our typology.[34] However, the message is clear all across the countries: apparently, neither the welfare states, nor the school systems of the "old" and "new" member states of a united Europe are strong enough to prevent high proportions of adolescents living in poor multiethnic communities from becoming severely marginalised and from entering a route that leads straight toward the reproduction of the deprivation of their forebears. Although students from "troubled" families of the majority are not protected either, the risks of social exclusion are exceptionally high for teenagers from ethnic minority backgrounds.

Is there still some freedom for making a choice?

The extensive discussions that have been presented so far looked at the optional routes toward adulthood through the prism of those macro-social and institutional factors that largely define

---

[34] However, one should be shocked at first glance by the very high – 26–29 per cent – rates of potential dropouts in the communities in countries of post-colonial migration; actually, they are partially the product of differences in how schools are registered: as mentioned previously, vocational training institutions are not considered as part of the educational system in the United Kingdom, thus, students planning to follow this path appear among the potential "leavers".

the scope of choice for different groups of students. As we saw earlier, freedoms and limitations are distributed rather unequally: except for children of the best-positioned social groups of the majority, those with poor results face a great deal of constraints on their future choices, and many of them are at the risk of ultimate marginalisation. At the same time, restrictions on opting freely for a preferred alternative are rendered by the highly uneven distribution of socio-cultural potentials among the good performers that conclude in intense rivalry for placements in the best secondary schools and that are played out, for the most part, to the detriment of ethnic minority students.

Given such a rather complex interplay of influential factors that individuals hardly have the power to alter, one is somewhat hesitant to ask: do otherwise important individual traits play any role in shaping one's future? Do differential attitudes, tastes, and ideas about one's adult life make any contribution here? Or have our school systems made these inputs the "luxury" of only those in the best positions? To put it differently: being well aware of the degree of freedom that has been assigned to them by the givens in their conditions, what are the expectations of families and children when they decide to apply to a specific school? Within the limitations that most of them face, do they still aspire for stretching the personal "playgrounds" by making an ample choice that still leaves open a path toward the academia while also offering a good qualification for applying for some acceptable jobs upon graduation? Or is it mainly considerations about the socio-ethnic milieu of the future school that drives them, with the implied hope of becoming integrated members of the community-at-large? Or are they driven primarily by certain external indicators and blindly rely on word of mouth about the good reputation and community-friendly atmosphere of the prospective institution?

True, these and similar ideas, and the personal attitudes that inspire them, do not change the structural features of education. Nevertheless, we consider them as inputs equal in importance to the structural factors discussed earlier – and we have at least two serious reasons to do so. On the one hand, despite the fact that individual aspirations are strongly informed by the recognition of external givens, personal ambitions that point against the "prescribed rules of the game" on a massive scale might also gradually become the source of future alterations on the macro-level. In this context, it seems to make sense to look at our adolescent generation of established "newcomers" – the second and third generation of one-time migrants and the urbanised groups of once rural Roma – as the articulators of new needs and claims.

On the other hand, the personal drives behind the particular patterns of choice throw some light on the longer-term shaping of careers and perspectives. As such, students' one-time plans

for the next months and years ahead can be considered partly as the blueprint of their life history, with certain important experiences and impressions, while these ideas are also the reflections of self-perception and visions about one's standing in the wider context of social relations. In this sense, the following discussions can be considered as a prelude to what will follow in the next two chapters of this study. Through the lens of students' thoughts about the immediate future, we hope to give an introduction to an understanding of the damage that might be the source of the reasons for opting out of the educational system with resignation or in frustrated opposition to schooling, as well as of those manifestations of strength and self-reliance that point toward the rise of a generation who is no longer inclined to consider the rights of citizenship as a matter of benevolent concession on the part of the "hosting" majority but who claims recognition on equal grounds.

In a search for the major considerations that drove our respondents in selecting the institution where they intend to study next, the questionnaire offered a diverse set of motives to choose from.[35] Obviously, such important decisions are usually born by concluding a long process of deliberations and a thorough examination of all the pros and cons of a given option. Hence, one would expect a high occurrence of multiple choices from among the listed items. Nevertheless, given their young age and the inhibitory conditions of the classroom-based surveys, the abundance and complexity of the responses was a surprise: with a low rate (3 per cent) of refusals to react, students picked up five different motives on average. This figure also involves the contribution of the "dedicated" school leavers: no less than 83 per cent of them paid attention to this question and accounted for four items on the average. One might interpret such a high rate of interest perhaps as a promising sign of being prepared to change their minds, and still consider some options in a way like this: "If I were to go on in education, I make a choice according to…"

---

[35] The question was phrased in the following way: "Did the following influence your choice of the direction of schooling for next year?"

The list of items for multiple selection were the following:
– the education provided by the school should facilitate my interest;
– the education provided by the school should facilitate the subjects I am best at;
– the school should be nearby;
– the school should have a good reputation;
– the school should be inclusive, accepting students irrespective of their social background or "ethnic origin";
– the school should provide religious education;
– the school should provide graduation (matriculation);
– the school should provide vocational qualifications;
– the school should facilitate access to higher education;
– the school should facilitate access to a good job.

The high ratio of composite responses implies the technical probability of thousands of combinations of the motives involved. However, an analysis of the data reveals only but a few distinguished configurations that are indicated with high frequency and that draw up the contours of a limited number of distinctive patterns. The first among them is academic dedication: it is personal interest, good prior performance, expectations toward later continuation at a higher level, and the necessary secondary certificate that are bundled behind this option. The second decipherable cluster of motives crystallises around expectations toward entrance to the world of labour. Those whose choice had been driven primarily by such concerns emphasise as their leading considerations: straight access to a vocation, predictable easy furtherance toward employment, and graduation for the sake of employability. The third pattern emerges from the responses of those whose choice of school had been conducted by knowing (or hoping) that the prospective institution highly appraises human rights: for this group, the observance of social and ethnic equality in admittance is a primary motive that precedes the mentioning of claims for religious education.

By considering the decisive impact of previous school performance and the varied degrees of freedom of choice along the lines of socio-ethnic belonging discussed previously, Table 3.4 provides some telling data about the shaping of the patterns that the three clusters of motives draw up with the highest occurrences.

The first lesson from the table is the dominance of three very clear constellations that make up 74 to 93 per cent among the kaleidoscope of motives involved. The message is clear: regardless of otherwise important differences among them, by the time of arriving at the gateway of secondary schooling, young people are uniformly aware of living in highly structured societies and this state of affairs compels them to make an early choice among pathways that lead them toward diverging positions in adulthood. A genuine choice is made between two distinct careers. The first of them is ruled by the prescribed route to the higher echelons of society through extensive studying, while the second implies early entrance to the world of labour with predictable lower middle-class positions as the best ones to hope for. The two patterns depart in an "either/or" way, indeed: while 36 per cent of our respondents listed "academic" motivations and 39 per cent picked up "work-related" considerations, the proportion of those who allowed themselves to remain open toward both directions by postponing the ultimate selection for a while was only 14 per cent in the sample.

However, a secured path toward employability apparently satisfies only the smaller part of the group who intend to follow the second route (even if the door remains open for a later turn to

academic directions). For the overwhelming majority (65 per cent) of this group of future workers, in addition to assisting early entrance to the labour market, the observance of human and minority rights is an equally highly prioritised aspect for a future school. What is more, it is primarily the well-performing students who articulate the demand for inclusion, and they do so without any remarkable differences according to social or ethnic belonging. The high occurrence and the close to equal proportions by socio-ethnic status are to be taken as an interesting and important finding of our research. The data in question seem to signal widespread frustrations among the youth of deprived communities who, regardless of important inequalities among them, consider themselves discriminated against en masse by the broader social environment. The degree of frustration seems to be the most intense among those coming from the poorer segments of the community: irrespective of their ethnic background, it is well-performing students of the lower echelons heading toward early participation in the labour market but still hoping for respect and recognition who highly appreciate the potential of an inclusive school in decreasing those inequalities and devaluing distinctions that, so far, have kept them at a remarkable distance from the more fortunate strata of society.

The second important lesson that can be drawn by comparing the "left" and the "right" halves of Table 3.4 concerns the power of students' prior school results to apparently impregnate even their ideas about the longer-term future. By comparing the "left" and the "right" halves of the table, we can see two simultaneous tendencies. On the one hand, the relative weight of the different options is close to identical, indicating that the major patterns that students' future plans follow are shaped primarily by their socio-ethnic positions and better or worse achievements do not alternate the order. On the other hand, poorly-performing students seem to face a good deal of confusion. As the data on "fuzzy ideas" show, they are much less clear about the drives, values, and paths to follow than their well-performing peers. After all, by recalling the decisive impact of one's former school achievements on the choice of the schools within reach, the high degree of uncertainties among the poor performers is understandable – though it is certainly not self-evident. It speaks about the impact of earlier frustrating experiences well beyond their original frame of reference and demonstrates the enduring influence of one-time devaluations that apparently work as self-fulfilling prophecies that are now shaping up in accidental outcomes and risky marginalisation.[36]

---

[36] As the details reveal, apart from the parents of the affected students who themselves face substantial difficulties in navigating the "alien" worlds of education and work, these adolescents often lack adult support. According to the information about the "counsellors" who participated in the deliberations, despite their obvious need for extra support and attention, children with uncertain visions had *fewer opportunities* to ask for some advice, either from their teachers or from the respected members of the community, than their peers with a clear path ahead.

Table 3.4

Patterns of motivations behind the choice of school (track) for the next academic year

Patterns of motivations behind the choice of school (track) for the next year	Percentage ratio of choices among:							
	Well-performing students* from				Poorly-performing students* from			
	Upper status families		Lower status families		Upper status families		Lower status families	
	Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority
Purely academic motivations	50	43	34	32	41	34	22	26
Mix of motivations: academic advancement and employability	12	14	15	11	16	15	9	17
Mix of motivations: employability and observance of human rights	31	34	38	35	26	25	46	32
From them: employability and inclusion	25	25	29	32	18	20	37	26
Other configurations (fuzzy ideas)	7	8	14	22	17	26	23	26

Determination to attend higher education (%)		82	88	58	58	57	60	39	42
From them, those driven by:	Academic motivations**	88	92	60	68	64	75	49	55
	Consideration on employability**	77	85	63	52	47	55	42	43

* Students are considered "well-performing" if their overall grades were "excellent" or "good" in the preceding semester. Those who are classified as "poorly-performing" reached a "satisfactory" qualification at most.

** Excluding mixed options that are driven by academic motivations and considerations on employability in conjunction.

The two peaks in the "right" side of the table deserve special attention: as shown, close to *half* of the poorly performing students from low-status majority backgrounds and a third of their like peers with ethnic minority belonging opt for a path that not only ascertains early entrance to the labour market, but promises a future of respect and recognition. These figures that provide the lead in the respective groups of reference reveal inequities and frustrations that deserve attention. As the detailed analysis shows, the first one throws light on the vulnerable state of lower-class students from majority backgrounds in the highly selected "minority schools" in our post-colonial communities, especially in the French "*banlieues*". As the French and British Survey Reports have pointed out with a range of telling figures and adjoining explanations, these adolescents often feel being excluded and cut off from the society where they actually consider themselves to belong, and perceive their "misplacement" in poor "immigrant" communities a manifestation of severe injustice and discrimination. The extremely high – 62 per cent – mention of claims for inclusion among students who belong to this group can be read as a sign of protest and clear demand (Felouzis et al. 2009, Schiff 2010, Swann 2009 and 2010).

The corresponding 32 per cent proportion opting for the same path among their like peers with ethnic minority backgrounds reveals a somewhat different story. As the details bring into light, this second "peak" is the product of massive Roma objection to the prevailing state of affairs in the countries of post-socialist transformation. While their immediate neighbours from the majority consider it "natural" that Roma should attend segregated institutions and then go on to the least qualified and worst paid jobs that are assigned "just for them", the young generation of Roma apparently question these arrangements. Despite their deep poverty and the marginalised position of their families, they claim admittance to the pathways that have been occupied so far by the majority and emphasise, with their outstandingly high rate of 72 per cent occurrence of the most important choice, that the way toward "integration" starts with inclusion in education.

Finally, let us consider the last three rows of the table that provide the percentages of those who gave a definite positive response to our enquiry about longer-term plans for obtaining a degree in higher education. The aggregate indicators by prior performance and socio-ethnic belonging show what one would expect: while such determinations are very intense among the well-performing children from the upper echelons of the social hierarchy, those who have to seriously consider an early start of adult-like gainful work , and especially those whose prior history in schooling does not easily qualify them for catching up in knowledge and skills, demonstrate lesser degrees of clear commitment. Nevertheless, the relatively decent slope of the

trend and, especially, the systematically *higher* rates of dedication among students from ethnic minority backgrounds in comparison to the referential groups of the majority are good news, indeed. Taken together, the figures signal that, despite all the limitations that they and their parents are well aware of, adolescents see their future with a rather high degree of freedom for upward move, and consider later entrance into the extended and democratised systems of higher education a path that is still open for them. The last two rows qualify this statement. While determination to go on toward higher education is understandably more intense among those whose choice of school on the secondary level has already been shaped by academic considerations, the proportions are only some 7–20 per cent lower among those whose primary concern for the time being is employability.

All this provides a rather optimistic reading. Although the structural determinants that regulate advancement toward adulthood with a high degree of rigour and designate truly unequal positions for students along the socio-ethnic hierarchy, important changes beneath these structures point toward a gradual change. Whether the change will be worked out toward more respectful interethnic cohabitation and the general observance of human rights that conclude, in turn, in social inclusion for those whose preceding generations have faced harsh discrimination and exclusion – this is, of course, an open question of European social development. However, the silent struggle for recognition and the widely internalised values of modernisation among the adolescents of today's deprived social and ethnic communities certainly provide the potential for such a change.

In order to refine the latter conclusions that perhaps render the most important message of our comparative research, let us next inquire into the actual experiences about the state of interethnic relations that the adolescents of our considerably structured multiethnic communities have gathered in their daily life at school.

IV. LIFE AT SCHOOL BEYOND STUDYING:
INTERETHNIC TIES, TEACHER-STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS,
AND EXPERIENCES OF DISCRIMINATION

In the previous chapters we presented the complexity of factors and multilayered associations that are at play in influencing the performance and immediate and longer-term educational aspirations of youth in a cross-country comparative perspective. The present chapter turns to a broader understanding of life at school and takes into consideration the role of the school in the process of socialisation. The discussion will be built up in subsequent stages. In the first part of this chapter, we will portray students' relationships in the class that they attend, their networks, and the general atmosphere as they perceived it, with a particular focus on interethnic relationships in various school environments. In this context, we will naturally introduce how these relationships and perceptions differ between adolescents from majority and ethnic minority backgrounds in the countries participating in EDUMIGROM survey research. In the second part of the chapter, we will search for differences in teacher-student relationship and will tackle the issue of perceived justice and injustice. The last part of the chapter will discuss the expressively negative experiences of being "othered" within and outside the arena of the school and show the factors behind bullying among adolescent students and discrimination in the wider environment.

Relations among students

The questionnaire asked students about being engaged in various socialising activities by presenting a list that included five different types of interethnic contacts within and outside the school, in public and private spaces. We asked our respondents whether they sit next to a classmate in the canteen, learn or hang out together, share secrets, or visit each other's homes with a classmate whose ethnic origin is different from their own.[37]

---

[37] Since school-based contacts were in the focus of our inquiry, only those students were addressed who studied in ethnically mixed classes or at least whose school was a multiethnic one. Hence, data from only about a 70 per cent segment of the total sample are analysed here that involves students who, regarding simply the conditions, principally could be engaged in close daily interethnic interactions. Depending on the type of interethnic activity under consideration, a further 15 to 32 per cent of the responses were excluded from the analyses, including missing answers and those where the question did not hold because of the lack of the given activity (i.e., no collective forms of meals in the school).

Eighty-four per cent of those who attend a school or class with a multiethnic student community mentioned being engaged from time to time (or for that matter, regularly) in at least one of the listed interethnic activities. The patterns of engagement show that occurrences of the various types are apparently interlaced: 86 per cent of those who mentioned the occurrence of interethnic activities as part of their daily life indicated more than one such activity. Activities that involve a more personal relationship (sharing secrets or visiting each others' homes) occur less often among peers from differing ethnic backgrounds.

If we look at the associations between the various interethnic activities and the major background variables, we can establish with some surprise that certain – otherwise important – aspects such as one's socio-economic background or gender do not influence students' engagement in any of the listed activities. In contrast, ethnic background and the historically shaped traditions of interethnic relations in the country (as approached by our historical clusters) and, especially, the intersecting of these two variables prove to have a strong impact on such engagement. At the same time, the associations are rather peculiar. It is majority students and, in particular, those residing in the Central European communities who stand out with a very low rate of interest: it is only 68 per cent of them who mentioned at least partial or irregular involvement – the figure of which remains far below the 80 per cent ratio of interethnic engagement reported by their cohabitating Roma peers and falls sharply short of the respective 84 per cent proportion for the sample as a whole. As the detailed analysis shows, all the listed activities were mentioned significantly less frequently by ethnic majority students than by ethnic minority students, and thus, generally speaking, we can state that it is primarily students from the majority in the Central European region who exhibit a clear preference for socialising exclusively with peers from the same ethnic group. Roma adolescents, Black African, Caribbean, and Asian students in the United Kingdom and other "old" EU member states, on the contrary, consider ethnicity of their peer, friend, or partner less frequently when they do things together in or outside the school. In general, differences between adolescents from the majority and those belonging to various ethnic minority groups are minor in this respect in our communities in the western half of the continent.

It can be concluded that, apparently, ethnic distancing is significantly more important for majority students in the "new" member states, where ethnic hierarchies are much more powerful, than for their counterparts in the "old" member states where – despite prevalent inequalities, prejudices, and trends of "minoritisation" – multiculturalism is a widely accepted governing value of interethnic cohabitation. This observation might indicate that interethnic activities are more a function of minority-majority relations in general – especially of its

hierarchical nature characteristic in the given society – than of any influences of the actual cultural backgrounds of the interacting ethnic groups. This hypothesis is further supported by the following analysis: we selected one group – those from various Muslim backgrounds – who reside in significant enough numbers in several of the participating countries, and analysed the intensity of their interethnic relationships across the three countries with the largest Muslim populations in our study (Germany, France, and Denmark). Cross-tabulating the data revealed a very clear pattern: Germany provides the case of the strongest ethnic hierarchy among the four participating "old" member states, where Muslim students have significantly fewer interethnic contacts than their peers from the same ethnic group in Denmark or France. (Let us present here just a simple indicator: in Germany, only 66 per cent of them sit together in the canteen with schoolmates from an ethnic group other than their own, which is in sharp contrast to 100 per cent in Denmark and 90 per cent in France.) It is worth adding that our hypothesis is also supported by the findings of a recent cross-country comparative project[38] that investigated the educational conditions and career opportunities of second generation Turkish youth in communities of 12 European member states (Crul and Schneider 2009b). The qualitative studies of the EDUMIGROM project demonstrate, however, that we have to take the high proportions of affirmative responses about socialising with peers from ethnic groups that differ from one's own with due reservation. Community research in various countries shows that, while there is a great deal of willingness and openness towards integration and the building of interethnic relations on the side of adolescents from ethnic minority backgrounds, in reality such relationships might be scarce due to the refusal on the side of the majority students, and their parents in particular. This departure between desires and reality is especially prevalent in the case of Roma in some of the countries in Central Europe, with outstanding occurrences in Slovakia and Hungary (an in-depth analysis of the phenomenon will follow in Chapter V). In response to the experienced refusals, another frequent strategy among ethnic minority adolescents is the conscious building and maintaining of ethnically homogeneous circles and the simultaneous strengthening of ethnic pride. This is the case for Gábor Roma in Romania, some traditional Vlach communities in Hungary, and for Turkish communities in Germany. True interethnic friendships and circles of friends are developed mainly among the circumstances of an ethnically mixed school environment, and if ethnic differences are not intertwined with strong status differences within the peer group, and furthermore, if ethnic hierarchies are not reinforced by the teachers or the adult surrounding. Our survey results show that in schools

---

[38] The initiative in question was a comprehensive research project titled "The Integration of European Second Generation" (TIES) –with the participation of 15 universities and research institutes that concluded in 2009.

where ethnic minority teachers are employed, significantly more students report about engagement in interethnic activities than in those schools where the staff consists exclusively of teachers who represent the country's dominant group by ethnicity (the difference is 10 per cent in confirming such an occurrence).

A further aspect that we investigated was the influence of the socio-ethnic composition of the school and the attended class, respectively, on inter-group relations and interethnic friendships and activities. This is a core issue that is amply discussed in the academic literature in the United States. Intensive desegregation policies in the 1960s were justified, among other reasons, by the expected positive effects that desegregation at school implies on altering the patterns of socialisation. An important thought behind desegregation measures was exactly the idea that, whether driven by deliberate goals and principles or not, a significant part of social learning takes place at schools. Hence, racially or ethnically mixed schools have an effect on inter-group relations of students in one way or another (Schofield 1991). Students have their first in-depth experiences about the "other" at school and hence, school may – willingly or unintentionally – greatly influence interethnic relationships and the formation of identity, including ethnic identity. The question is what these effects are, and what circumstances determine the contents of interethnic relationships in a desegregated school environment. Research in the United States shows that desegregation did indeed positively shape inter-group relations and social relations between students in multiracial schools as well as studying in such an environment has a significantly positive impact on ethnic minority students' academic achievement and their later occupational success (Braddock and McPartland 1982).

Our cross-country comparative data provide an opportunity to test the effect of the ethnic composition of the school environment on the formation of interethnic friendships and activities based on togetherness.

A most powerful finding of the comparative research is the difference between the three country groups representing various traditions of interethnic relations in how ethnic composition of the school and class environments affect interethnic activities and preferences in making friends. While peer-group relations of students attending segregated schools and classes in the Central European communities differed to a great extent from those of students in ethnically mixed or majority school environments, differences along the same divide were nonexistent in the two post-colonial countries and were only minor in Germany and Denmark.

We also explored how the importance of religion in everyday life, attempts towards keeping one's traditions, or contrarily, intentions toward becoming integrated into the majority

are associated with the frequency of interethnic contacts.[39] It was found that religiousness does not have any significance in influencing the occurrence of such contacts Naturally, strives for integration are strongly correlated with a high frequency of mixing and togetherness with peers from the majority: against an 88 per cent average ratio of responses among students from ethnic minority backgrounds, there was not a single exception among the members of the "integration-oriented" sub-group in affirming regular daily interethnic contacts.

As to the details of close contacts, Table 4.1 gives an account on the factors that students evaluated according to their importance in influencing them when making friends.

The most frequently mentioned considerations in developing friendships were individual factors such as having the same taste and the same way of thinking (70–75 per cent of those who responded did mention such personal traits). There were, however, several external aspects listed, aspects that are primarily defined by background and belonging, i.e., the social status of one's family, the neighbourhood, religiosity, or ethnic affiliation. Such aspects came up much less frequently, but their mentioning was still rather substantial: the importance of belonging to the same social group in terms of status was indicated by 58 per cent, that of identical ethnic affiliation by 41 per cent, and a need for shared belief by 29 per cent.

Table 4.1

Factors influencing friendship through different prisms

Characteristics	Proportion (%) of those who are concerned about a friend's:					
	Social background	Neighbourhood	Taste	Way of thinking	Religion	Ethnic background
GENDER						
Boy	57	57	67	71	29	41
Girl	52	47	67	70	24	35
FAMILY'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS						

---

[39] The composite variables measuring attitudes toward traditions and becoming integrated into the majority, respectively, were constructed on the basis of questions measuring their relationship to religion, ideas, and values considered important in marriage and social contacts, language use, striving for mobility, and concerns about being accepted on ethnic grounds.

Upper status	59	54	73	78	22	39
Average	50	48	67	67	23	36
Lower status	47	49	57	57	30	34
ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
Majority	56	52	68	70	22	41
"Visible" minority	52	51	63	70	37	38
Other minority	53	53	69	75	26	31
COMPOSITION OF THE SCHOOL/CLASS						
Dominantly majority school	60	52	67	68	23	49
Mixed school	55	53	70	73	24	35
Minority school	48	46	62	71	36	34
Intra-school ethnic separation	55	54	57	67	30	38
HISTORICAL TYPE OF THE COUNTRY						
Post-colonial migration	55	53	73	77	33	33
Economic migration	53	51	71	79	29	29
Post-socialist transformation	56	52	63	63	24	46

The data reveal some interesting associations. The higher the level of affluence of a country (approached by the index of per capita GDP), the more social background played a role in forming friendships. The only exception to this tendency was the United Kingdom, where socio-economic background of a potential friend was valued the highest among all the countries of the study.

The ethnic background of the potential friend proved to be an aspect that was very differently valued by students from various country groups. While 46 per cent of the responding students in the post-socialist countries mentioned that ethnicity played a role in choosing friends, the corresponding proportions were only 29–33 per cent in the Western countries of post-colonial and economic migration, respectively. None of the listed aspects (taste, neighbourhood, social background, or religion) has brought up such a sharp "East-West" divide. Under closer scrutiny, it turns out that the significant departure is a blend of the existing differences in public attitudes and some artificiality that has been induced by the different compositions of the samples. If looking at the options in favour of friends of the same ethnicity according to the respondents' own ethnic belonging, the data reveal three distinct patterns: majority and ethnic minority students give alike responses in the societies of post-colonial migration (with a relatively low rate of 32–35 per cent of frequency); at the same time, while students from the majority in the countries of economic migration seem determined to disregard ethnicity, it has certainly more pronounced importance for the ethnic minority students with whom they cohabitate (the corresponding ratios are 22 and 34 per cent, respectively); finally, the trend is the reverse in our post-socialist communities where no less than 48 per cent of the respondents from a majority background refuse ethnic mixing in friendships (i.e., nearly half of these students resists socialising with *Roma*), while many of their Roma peers would be willing to break through the walls of sharp ethnic divide (only 40 per cent of them would be inclined to make friends within their own ethnic group). Since the weight of the respondents from the majority greatly differs between the samples of the two historical types among the western countries, on the one hand (where they represent 38 and 44 per cent, respectively), and the post-socialist communities, on the other (where they are in an underscored domination with a share of 76 per cent), the latter voice of anti-Roma resistance becomes amplified and "triumphs" the scene.

At any rate, it seems that interethnic attitudes are importantly shaped by differences in historical development and traditions of interethnic relations and ethnic hierarchies. This hypothesis is supported by looking again at one of our most populous minority ethnic groups, i.e., students from a Muslim background who exhibit very different attitudes in the various countries. The proportion of those who think ethnic background is a significant aspect of forming contacts is 32 per cent among the Muslim respondents in France, while it is a significantly higher ratio of 42 per cent among students in Germany of the same ethnicity and 49 per cent in Denmark. Differences in considering religion as an important aspect in friendships are even greater among those Muslim students who live in the respective communities of the said countries. While the ratio of affirmative responses is only 26 per cent among those in

France, the corresponding proportions are 45 per cent in Germany, and 51 per cent in the Danish Muslim sub-samples. (Following from its own methodology, the survey could only register differences in the occurrences. However, it will be the comparative analysis of the qualitative research materials – individual interviews, focus-group discussions, and participant observations – that will provide a more in-depth understanding of the importance and group-specific meanings of religion in forming teenage interethnic relations.)

Another group that represents a sizeable part of the population in several of the studied countries, the Roma, shows similarly large differences across borders, with those living in Romania and Slovakia indicating more of an inclination toward social and ethnic enclosure than their peers of the same ethnic background in the Czech Republic or Hungary. Sixty per cent mentioned that social background and 64 per cent that ethnic belonging were important aspects of forming friendships in the first two countries, while the corresponding proportions were 45 and 55 per cent, respectively, in the case of the Czech Republic, and 51 and 40 per cent, respectively, for Hungary.

These variations within the given clusters of countries that share a number of commonalities in history and their current social, economic, political, and ethnic structures do not seem to question that, considering the quality of interethnic cohabitation, the genuine line of demarcation lays between the "West" and the "East". However, the large difference experienced between the "old" and "new" member states may have causes that the present research is unable to reveal. After all, it requires further inquiries to explore whether the significant departures are due to socio-cultural differences in the acceptance/refusal of Roma and migrant groups, or are informed by the histories of century-old traditions of multiethnic cohabitation and the accompanying interethnic relations? One thing seems to be sure: the differences are not due to the methodology relating to site selection, in the course of which sampling at the Central European sites included a large number of schools where the ethnic majority dominates, while in the Western sites of migration, it was mostly ethnically mixed schools and ones with the dominance of ethnic minority students that constituted the sample. In our analysis, we controlled for these specificities of sample selection, and concluded that interethnic composition of the schools does not change the variations between the prevalent patterns in the "old" and "new" member states.

As the first rows of Table 4.1 demonstrate, gender is also an important factor in shaping adolescents' attitudes in socialising. Girls are more open in all the listed aspects, than boys: irrespective of the country where they live or their ethnic belonging or socio-economic

background, a lower proportion of girls than boys mentioned that external aspects (social, ethnic, or religious background) would play a role in forming friendships.

A further significant factor that apparently has a "say" in informing students' responses is that of the ethnic composition of the school and, in particular, the class that students attend. This is not particularly surprising by recalling that – as was shown previously – this is an important constituent in influencing interethnic activities, as well. Again, we may support the findings of research on the effects of desegregation in the United States: an ethnically mixed environment makes both ethnic minority and majority students more tolerant toward ethnic differences, and furthermore, the significance of ethnic and social background becomes less salient in forming friendships in all of the investigated countries.

Ethnic composition of the school had a similar effect in all three clusters of countries: fewer students studying in ethnically mixed classes mentioned the significance of ethnicity in forming contacts than students studying in a school environment dominated by the majority. In the "old" EU member states the worse environments in terms of interethnic contacts seemed to be those where separation of students along ethnic lines was practiced within the walls of the school: that is, where students of various ethnic backgrounds were separated into parallel classes.

Expressed preferences are more salient when we asked about more intimate relations, namely, aspects influencing one's actual or imagined partnerships.[40] The analysis of the data revealed that it is primarily certain personal characteristics (such as good appearance, similar taste, or similar age) that play a significant role in choosing a partner. At the same time, external factors that are largely unchangeable "givens" in the life of our young adolescents (i.e., the family's socio-economic status, religious affiliation, and ethnic background) might also be a less, though still important issue: 40 per cent of the students mentioned that these factors shaped their choice of present or future partners.

---

[40] In the case of questions asking about partnership preferences, the rate of missing answers was significantly lower (10 per cent) than what we saw in the case of interethnic activities. The only country with a large proportion of missing responses was the United Kingdom.

Table 4.2

Significance of various factors in making a (potential) partnership

Characteristics	Proportion (%) of those who are concerned about the partner's-					
	Social background	Neighbour-hood	Religion	Taste	Appearance	Ethnic background
GENDER						
Boy	40	56	23	55	75	39
Girl	43	48	26	59	75	40
FAMILY'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS						
Upper status	59	71	33	78	89	51
Average	56	71	47	74	88	55
Lower status	56	70	50	69	84	58
ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
Majority	34	48	30	52	70	29
Minority	48	56	21	63	81	48
COMPOSITION OF THE SCHOOL/CLASS						
Dominantly majority school	58	62	24	67	89	61
Mixed school	39	50	21	58	73	35
Minority school	24	42	32	43	61	26
Intra-school ethnic separation	46	51	33	55	81	44
REGIONAL CLUSTER OF COUNTRIES						
Communities in Western Europe	56	59	24	63	64	56
Communities in Central Europe	27	44	25	51	85	23

Contrary to inquiries about the important aspects of making friendship, gender differences in the distributions of responses to this question are insignificant. There is a noteworthy departure in terms of openness and acceptance between adolescents residing in Western, as opposed to Central European, communities. Students in the four countries of Western Europe seem to attribute much smaller significance to the family background or ethnic identity of their (potential) partners: the proportion of those mentioning socio-economic or ethnic background as an important factor in choosing a partner is almost twice as high among respondents in the "new" than in the "old" member states (56 and 56 per cent, in contrast to 27 and 23 per cent, respectively). When the classification is further refined, we see additional differences: it is not the "East-West divide" on its own, but also the history and traditions of interethnic relations that apparently play a role in distancing social and ethnic groups from one another. Students seem to refuse the "other" (both in ethnic and social terms) the least in those countries that are characterised primarily by migration from the one-time colonies (France and the United Kingdom). In these countries, only 15 per cent of the respondents mentioned that ethnicity or social background (would) take a role in forming a partnership. This proportion is more than double (30 per cent) in countries where migration is a more recent process and where it has been kept in motion primarily by the economic needs of the "host" country (Germany and Denmark). Yet again, the ratio of those who identify the different ethnic or social background of their (potential) partner as a significant factor in their choice increases by a multiple of almost two, if we turn to the countries of post-socialist transformation (56 per cent). These figures reflect that the history of interethnic relations, and the traditional distance between people who are affiliated with different groups by their ethnicity, are impacting the choices of contemporary individuals in an essential way – in our case, the options that are made in shaping the private life of adolescents from multiethnic communities.

Interestingly enough, the social background of the respondents does not influence their preferences, while ethnic affiliation does. With the notable exception of expectations on religiosity, which is apparently more important for adolescents from less advantaged backgrounds than for those from the higher echelons of the social hierarchy (with the respective ratios of replies of 47–50 per cent in the two former groups, while 33 per cent in the latter one), socially less advantaged and affluent students have similar preferences in terms of factors influencing their choice of partners. Contrarily, the ethnic belonging of the respondents makes an important difference: majority students seem to be significantly less open and less inclined to accept values other than those that characterise their own group than their ethnic minority peers and the difference is most salient with regard to importance of socio-economic background and ethnicity of the (potential) partner. In the light of the above variations in interethnic relations in

the participating countries, this association deserves some further refinement. The data are crystal clear in that preferences are organised into different patterns among minority and majority students in the three clusters of countries. In the countries with a post-colonial history, the ethnic identity of the partner seems to be significant only for a tiny portion (14 per cent) of both majority and minority ethnic students. In the countries with a more recent history of migration, there is some difference in the prioritised aspects between majority and ethnic minority students: apparently, the ethnic identity of the (potential) partner is more important in the eyes of ethnic minority students (32 per cent mentioned so) than for their peers from the majority (24 per cent). The association seems to be reversed in the communities in the countries of post-socialist transformation where Roma students mentioned that ethnicity of the (potential) partner is an important factor with a significantly lower frequency (40 per cent) than their schoolmates from a majority background (62 per cent). But more generally speaking, the gap between majority and minority respondents with regard to the expressed acceptance of the ethnic "other" is critical in the "new" member states and is far less so in the "old" ones.

Like with the preferences concerning friendship, the acceptance of a partner who belongs (or would belong) to the category of the "other" in ethnic or social terms is the most pronounced among those who study in ethnically mixed school environments and in schools where ethnic minority children are dominating the student population. Almost two-thirds of the respondents in schools where majority students are dominant are of the opinion that the (future) partner should be from an ethnic background identical to their own. But more generally, students in such schools demonstrate the smallest degree of openness with regard to any of the listed internal or external factors. Our analysis supports the assumption that an ethnically mixed school environment significantly enhances tolerance toward and acceptance of the "other" – be it defined in social or ethnic terms. An ethnically homogeneous environment deprives adolescents from experiencing the "Other" and the unknown increases fear, as social psychology describes it, that further supplies the need for distancing oneself from the imagined "Other" (Tajfel 1981 and 1982).

Class atmosphere
Peer-group relations are significantly shaped by the general atmosphere in the class, the occurrence and frequency of bullying, and any potential discrimination among classmates. In the questionnaire, we inquired how the respondents feel about their attended class. Answering this question, half of the students characterised their class as a friendly, cohesive community, but 38 per cent found that hostile groups dominated their class, and 9 per cent qualified the class

community as highly individualised. There are some important manifestations in the perceptions: as the distributions show, it is students from the majority who give account about hostility in the class with greater frequency than their peers from ethnic minority backgrounds (33 per cent versus 42 per cent); it is the Roma students and children from Muslim, North African, and Eastern European migrant backgrounds, in particular, who identify the surrounding environment in the class as "friendly" (in contrast to the previously mentioned nearly 50 per cent, the corresponding ratio of responses is around 60 per cent in these groups). There is also a significant variation in terms of how ethnic composition and the build-up of the attended community along the lines of selection/integration affect the feelings of comfort in the class among students from different ethnic backgrounds: in the countries of post-colonial migration, the ethnic composition of the class has no influence on such feelings; in the countries of economic migration, intra-school segregation has a negative effect: those students who study in such circumstances find their class community hostile in a significantly higher proportion than students studying in a mixed environment. The same association is true in the "old" member states: students studying in ethnically mixed schools identify the atmosphere as "friendly" with greater frequency than those who attend schools that apply ethnic separation among parallel classes.

The ethnic heterogeneity of the teaching staff seems to provide a more relaxed, friendly environment, especially in schools where there is a significant proportion of ethnic minority students. Students in schools where teacher(s) from ethnic minority backgrounds are part of the staff report intra-class hostility in significantly lower proportions than those who attend a unit where it is exclusively teachers from the dominant majority who are in employment (28 per cent versus 41 per cent). It is not particularly difficult to image that students, especially if they themselves belong to an ethnic minority group, feel more comfort in a school where they may identify with some of the staff belonging to the same ethnic community. According to some of the important findings of the qualitative research in our project, the participation of ethnic minority teachers in the daily life of the school proves to be an outstandingly important factor in accepting the school and internalising the values that it intends to transmit. This is clearly demonstrated by the German case where students who attend dominantly "Turkish" schools recurrently gave accounts of the important influence that teachers from the same ethnic group have had on their feelings and educational aspirations (Strassburger 2010), and similar trends were revealed by the qualitative study among the students of two Muslim schools in Denmark (Moldenhawer, Kallehave, and Hansen 2010). Furthermore, although Roma teachers are as rare as white ravens in the schools of Central Europe, Roma school assistant projects that have been introduced in several counties (the Czech Republic and Romania) seem to exert an important

impact. Even if assistants are not the equal partners of teachers in the schools, the qualitative studies have revealed that they are particularly important for Roma children in assisting them to accept the school, feel more at ease and comfortable in the classroom, and be motivated for studying (Marada et al. 2010, Vincze 2010). Still, it would be simplistic to assume that the presence of ethnic minority teachers would solve difficulties of schooling of ethnic minority students on its own. The relationship is much more likely to be reversed. In comparison to the homogenous units, schools that employ ethnic minority teachers are more open towards "otherness" in a multiethnic society, and they are also more likely to adopt children-friendly pedagogical methods instead of disciplining, and such openness and inclusiveness gives rise to a friendlier atmosphere among students as well as among students and their teachers.

A very interesting – and tellingly important – finding of the analysis is the strong negative association between the "common sense" quality of the school and the general atmosphere as perceived by the students. As the data show, schools that rank the highest in the professional hierarchy provide the least comfortable environment in terms of peer-group relations, while the schools that rank lowest on the ladder cater the most to a friendly surrounding: two-thirds of the students who attend a unit that word of mouth in the community qualify as an "elite school" indicate that the atmosphere in the class is hostile, while only 25 per cent of those studying in schools that serve as a "last resort" for low performing and problematic children characterise their class in the same way; moreover, the corresponding ratios are 30 to 40 per cent among students studying in schools that are considered "standard". These findings cannot be interpreted other than indicators of a clear negative association between intense competition and the ambiance and quality of contacts among classmates. In classes where the students are exposed to permanent pressures for performing excellently, inter-group relations and feelings of comfort suffer greatly, while less demanding schools seem to provide a more relaxed environment for adolescents. The negative association is further supported by the strong negative correlation between students' performance and their perception of the atmosphere in the class: excellently performing students report hostility with a significantly higher frequency (42 per cent) than those whose achievement is assessed as mediocre (30 per cent) or poor (26 per cent).

Bullying

An eminent indicator of the disintegration of the school teaching and administrative team and the student body is the frequent occurrence of bullying. The questionnaire inquired about this

issue as well.[41] First, our respondents were asked whether have they ever come across bullying, and then, in case of a positive response, the particular forms and the content of such incidents were explored. Most of the students mentioned that bullying occurred frequently, more or less, and only 15 per cent mentioned that it did not happen. There were only insignificant variations along the lines of gender and ethnic identity. Black African and Muslim students seem to experience bullying most often (90 per cent) and adolescents with a mixed identity mentioned this less frequently (77 per cent). There are also massive differences between the countries involved in the research: less than 60 per cent of students in the Czech Republic and over 90 per cent of students in France, the United Kingdom, and Hungary reported about bullying.

The ethnic composition of the school is a factor at play here: bullying among pupils takes place less frequently in schools where the student body is ethnically homogeneous: in schools dominated by students from the majority, bullying is a less typical conduct (mentioned with 67 per cent frequency) than in schools where ethnic separation exists (80 per cent). Interestingly, the patterns depart along the line of the historical types of interethnic cohabitation when it comes to schools where there is a dominance of ethnic minorities within the school population: in the Central European countries, the frequency of confirming the occurrence of bullying in ethnically homogeneous environments is considerably lower when compared to other schools (the respective figures are 50 and 75 per cent), while in the West a similar environment provides the grounds for the highest occurrence of verbal or physical insults among the schools with outstandingly high or high rates of ethnic minority students (84 versus 64 per cent).

The types of the conflict that conclude in bullying among adolescents show clear patterns. Most often (in half of the cases), it is contravention between boys and girls and rivalry among parallel classes within the school that are at stake, and the latter is particularly prevalent in schools where the structures are ruled by intra-school separation of ethnic minority students. Bullying related to ethnic differences occurs with remarkable frequency as well; almost one-third of students reported such experiences.

Bullying seems to be the most common among adolescents in countries with a post-colonial past, while it is the school communities in the countries of post-socialist transformation where it is reported the least frequently. The patterns of bullying also differ among the regions: intimidating conflicts among peers from different ethnic or social backgrounds are reported twice as often from the schools in the West as from their Central European counterparts (33 and 25 per cent, respectively, as opposed to 19 and 11 per cent). However, one should not read these

---

[41] The proportion of missing responses was 4 per cent for this set of questions. When the cause for bullying was inquired about, the ratio of missing answers increased to 14 per cent.

departures as indications of differences in the *actual occurrences* of insults. Rather, they probably signal the different levels of awareness in the old, as opposed to the new, democracies. The community studies of our research project revealed that, in fact, ethnic bullying is rather frequent phenomenon among adolescents also in the "new" member states. However, the public (young people included) are inclined to take such events as a "natural" constituent of everyday life; thus, the inappropriateness of such conduct often is not even recognised. For example, in Slovakia or Romania, where hierarchical ethnic relationships are deeply rooted in the society, students take remarks with degrading content as "normal" and do not interpret the abusive statements as manifestations of hatred or improper opinions.

The composition of the school has a clear effect on the occurrence of ethnic bullying. Among students from families of the majority, it is those studying in schools where ethnic minority students are dominant who report suffering from such insults with the highest frequency. At the same time, among adolescents from ethnic minority backgrounds, it is primarily those in ethnically mixed or segregated school environments who experience similar insults.

Relations among teachers and students

Attitudes towards the schools are not only formed by peer relations. The quality of the relationships between teachers and students also play an important part. In this section, we will deal with the latter, relating what is known to essentially influence students' academic performance, their dispositions regarding education, and the general ambiance in the school alike. In broader terms, student-teacher relationships have a decisive importance in shaping general attitudes to learning, advancement, and future aspirations, and also influence how students sense the adult world around them. In this context, information about whether they have teachers whom they like and who also like them, or whether they have ever experienced insults, discrimination, or abuse, or contrarily, equal treatment and support, tell about those significant inputs that teachers contribute to the development of adolescents' personalities and their attitudes toward education in general.

The quality of teacher-student conduct is to some degree – but only partially – a function of the pedagogical culture that prevails in the educational system of a given country. These might be rooted in strongly hierarchical relationships – as in countries where the disciplining of students and transmitting lexical knowledge are core constituents of the educational tradition.

Such practices are rather typical in Central European schools, but the pattern is followed to some extent also by German educational institutions. Teacher-student relationships seem to be characterised by cooperation and mutual acceptance in countries with democratic pedagogical traditions, such as in Denmark or the United Kingdom. France is a case that stands out, for its pedagogical culture is founded on the philosophy of freedom and equality, while at the same time, the relationship between teachers and students are characterised by pronounced distancing and formal contacts. With all such differences in mind, the most important factor in shaping student- teacher relations is the character of the teachers' personality that is imprinted, in turn, by the surrounding, i.e., by the educational ethos of the school and its staff.

In the questionnaire, we posed several questions that inquired about students' relations with their teachers and their experiences about injustices or discrimination on the part of their schools' staff. As the issue was raised in Chapter II, there are some limitations to the interpretations of the results due to the uneven distribution of missing responses across countries (to which we will refer in each case). On the form filled out by the school administration, we gained information about the size of the school, its specialisation, the special programs that are run, and also about the ethnic composition of the staff and command of languages other than the dominant one in the country.

By analysing these data, we found that the vast majority (88 per cent) of responding students had at least one teacher whom they thought liked them, while 76 per cent assumed a teacher disliked them. Due to the large proportion of responses that indicate "uncertainty", especially regarding negative feelings (almost 40 per cent), the emerging distributions have to be taken with a great deal of caution.[42] At any rate, it is worth noting, that students in Central European countries, irrespective of their ethnic belonging or social status, reported less frequently about hostile teachers than their Western peers.

The questionnaire also inquired about their experiences with unjust actions by their teachers. In this case, the proportion of missing and uncertain responses remains at an acceptably low level[43], and is distributed relatively equally along the most important background variables. Thus, we may consider the statistics as reliable indications of students' experiences about their teachers. Seventy-two per cent of the responding students mentioned experiences about teachers'

---

[42] Especially if we take into consideration the actual circumstances of filling the questionnaire, in the course of which teachers were present in the classroom in many cases. As a result, we may assume that "I do not know" answers rather reflect hesitation to respond than the lack of such experiences.

[43] Twelve per cent did not respond, and 5 per cent indicated the option "I don't know". In fact, there was only one country (the United Kingdom), where there was a relatively high ratio of missing responses. With this exception, the respective figures were small, indeed.

unfairness, though, for the most part (70 per cent), they considered unjust occurrences an infrequent phenomenon.

There are significant differences in the ratios of affirmative responses among the historical clusters of countries. The lowest proportions of mentioning unjust treatment emerged in the two countries with a post-colonial past (59 per cent on the average of the investigated student-communities in France and 68 per cent in the United Kingdom[44]), while the corresponding figures were the highest in the post-socialist school environments (76 per cent in Hungary, 81 per cent in the Czech republic, and 89 per cent in Slovakia) (with Romania as an "exception to the rule" where the ratio was 45 per cent). The latter critical results are supported by the findings of several community studies in the region that gave accounts of very direct and open unfairness (even insults) by teachers towards ethnic minority students that often were motivated by students' ethnic "otherness" or low social status (Kusá, Kostlán, and Rusnáková 2010, Vincze 2010, Feischmidt, Messing, and Neményi 2010).

When the perceived frequency of unfair treatment of students by their teachers is examined according to the assumed influential background variables, it can be established that gender and social status are in close association with the responses to this question, though the relationship works in an unexpected way: in all the involved country groups, the social background of the students positively correlates with their experiences about teachers' injustices. This finding hardly can be interpreted other than as an indication of a higher degree of awareness and, simultaneously, of freedom to resist among students from better social positions than among their more defenceless peers with a lower social status. Gender differences confirm one's expectations: without exceptions, boys everywhere more often report about unfair teachers than girls do. However, it is an unexpected result that, in general terms, ethnic belonging exerts a very limited influence on the responses. Still, deeper breakdowns reveal that students' ethnic background matters in the two post-colonial countries where ethnic minority students reported unjust treatment more frequently than their majority peers.

Looking at the intersecting effects of ethnic minority background, gender, and the historical type of the country brings up some important associations. Although with different degrees in magnitude, an unambiguous trend can be established: it is ethnic minorities, and especially "visibly" distinguishable minority ethnic boys who feel significantly more frequently treated unfairly by their teachers than girls or boys from the majorities. Gender differences are prevalent in all of the countries and the gap between boys and girls is even greater among minority ethnic students than among their peers from the majority. An interesting case is

---

[44] Proportions are counted from answers with meaningful content.

provided by the countries characterised by recent economic migration flows where boys from the majority report less frequently about unjust treatment than girls from the majority, while 20 per cent more ethnic minority boys have such experiences than their female peers in the same countries. We may interpret this latter finding as a signal of unresolved tensions between two important claims for equality: in frequent cases, ethnic differences might override those along gender lines.

The ethnic composition of the school also makes a clear difference in the occurrence of unequal treatment. Students in the highly competitive schools that are dominated by the majority report about unjust treatment by teachers with the highest frequency, while students in either externally or internally segregated ethnic minority schools indicate such experiences with the lowest frequency. There is another important association that seems to prevail. In ethnically mixed schools, feelings about teachers' unfairness are much alike among majority and ethnic minority students, while in schools ruled by the ethnic separation of students, ethnic minority students feel the unfairness of teachers clearly more frequently than their majority peers. The only exceptions to this observation are those schools where ethnic separation has been the result of successful claims by ethnic minority communities for founding their own institutions (e.g., Muslim schools in Denmark and certain Turkish schools in Berlin). In these schools, students feel "at home" and the ethnic bias of teachers, many of whom themselves have an ethnic minority or migrant background, is largely lacking from the daily life. (Moldenhawer, Kallehave, and Hansen 2010).

The academic quality of the school and ethnic minority teachers' involvement in the staff seem to inform the experiences of students about teachers' unfairness. It can be established that the higher the school ranks on the ladder of academic performance, the more frequently do students report perceived unjust treatment – and the association is especially prevalent in the schools of the Central European region.[45] Much in line with what has been said above, the probable explanations can be identified partly in the high degree of competitiveness in "elite" schools, and partly in the fact that in such units are mostly attended by children of higher social status parents who, in turn, are more concerned about and more resistant to unjust treatment than their less privileged peers.

We assumed that students attending schools where the staff were open-minded and tolerant toward "otherness" would experience less injustice from their teachers. Of course, it is hard to find indicators that measure the degrees of "tolerance" and "openness" of institutions in

---

[45] This is also due to statistical reasons: the samples in these countries include a wider range of schools in terms of ethnic composition as well as academic quality than on the Western sites.

an objective way. In our survey, a variable that can be used, however, as a good indicant in this regard is the ethnic composition of the staff. Breakdowns, according to whether minority teachers are in employment or not, indeed revealed an important association. Students who attend a school where teachers from one or another ethnic minority group are part of the staff experience injustices significantly less frequently than those who study in units where the entirety of their instructors are from the dominant majority. It is important to underline that it is both majority and ethnic minority students who seem to profit in this respect – as both groups report about less injustices in such schools than their peers elsewhere. At the same time, the homogenous versus multiethnic character of the teaching staff in the unit that they attend brings about greater differences in the ratios of confirming injustices among ethnic minority students than among fellow students from the majority.

Experiences of discrimination

The degree to which students sense equal membership in the community is seriously qualified by their experiences about being accepted or discriminated against in their school environment and in general. Such experiences greatly influence the daily life at school, their feelings about schooling, and the development of their adolescent identities. In our questionnaire, a set of questions were asked about experiencing various forms of discrimination.[46] To assist the discussions that follow, we provide the exact wording of the compound question that addressed experiences about discrimination: *"It sometimes happens that one feels discriminated against. Have you ever experienced discrimination because of the following?[47]… On whose part[48]?"* The question was thus a multilayered one that called for students' responses about the (1) occurrence of discrimination, (2) the actor engaged in the insult, and (3) the perceived cause of being discriminated. Given great variations in the vocabulary and the concepts of public and political discourse among our countries, we hypothesise correspondingly great variations in how the country-based questionnaires phrased and how our respondents translated for themselves the term "discrimination". In addition, we also have to keep in mind the substantial departures among the countries in adolescents' cognisance of discriminative behaviour. In some countries,

---

[46] In the two post-colonial countries, the proportion of missing responses was extremely high: 80 per cent in France, and 43 per cent in the United Kingdom. Therefore, indicators for this group of countries may not be interpreted as valid results. In the case of all other countries, the proportion of missing responses remained on an acceptable level, with a range between 2 to 14 per cent.

[47] A list of seven important personal traits/qualities was provided, as follows: gender, religion, social background, appearance, health status, ethnic origin, and other trait.

[48] A list of four important groupings of "actors" was presented, as follows: teacher, schoolmate, peer outside school, and other person.

a rather high degree of awareness is also reflected in the customary daily parlance, while in others "discrimination" is a legal and political term that appears only rarely in the news programs in relation to human rights issues. These differences and the reservations that follow from them put certain limitations on the discussions below.

Seventy-one per cent of the respondents mentioned that they experienced some kind of discrimination in their life, but they least frequently pointed to their teachers' engagement in such deeds. Most typically, it is peers who are reported behaving in a discriminative manner, followed in frequency by adult actors outside the schools. As to the distributions concerning the involved persons, minor variations could be observed among the historical clusters of countries.

At the same time, occurrences of experienced discrimination differ only to a small extent along the line of ethnic belonging. Minority students, especially those living in the "old" member states report such impressions slightly more frequently than their majority peers. Interestingly, the difference between majority and minority students' perception of the discriminatory behaviour of certain people with whom they are in daily contact is reported in the lowest proportions by students at our Central European sites. Probably owing to reasons that were discussed in Chapter II, these findings of the questionnaire-based survey sharply contradict to the results of the qualitative studies in countries of the region that revealed a wide range of accounts of Roma students in all four countries about regular and severe discrimination and openly prejudiced and racists remarks of teachers, peers, and others in their surroundings (Kusá, Kostlán, and Rusnáková 2010, Vincze 2010, Feischmidt, Messing, and Neményi 2010, Marada et al. 2010). The discrepancy in the results that the methodologically differing studies have brought about is attributed to two independent reasons. On the one hand, reporting about discrimination in the complex way that the presented set of questions implied might have been too much of a challenge for teenage students. On the other hand, the earlier indicated low level of cognisance about the unacceptability of unequal treatment and discrimination in the "new" member states as compared to Western Europe also had its contribution. Based on the community studies, we have good reasons to assume that Roma adolescents often do not interpret such behaviour as discrimination but as something that is a regular concomitant of daily life.

Table 4.3

Experiences of discrimination

Regional character	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of those who			
		Experienced discrimination by			Never experienced discrimination
		Teachers	Peers	Other adults outside the school	
Communities in Western Europe	Majority	21	32	19	45
	Minority	26	38	34	36
	Together	23	35	27	40
Communities in Central Europe	Majority	21	34	25	31
	Minority	22	33	30	27
	Together	21	33	26	30

Along the line of gender, we found significant differences: boys considerably more frequently report being unequally treated by their teachers than girls do (26 versus 18 per cent), while girls experience insults more often from their peers than boys do. Looking at the intersections of gender and ethnic background, our data indicate that it is boys from ethnic minority families who feel the most being discriminated against. A part of the explanation can be found in teachers' attitudes: according to the repeated "stories" of teachers (that are also supported by the research literature), male ethnic minority students often behave in challenging ways in the classroom, engage in creating a certain counterculture of resistance, and thus cause teachers to view them as "problem" students (Gilliam 2005).

By looking at the intersectionality among parents' educational attainment (as an important measure of the family's social status), students' ethnic background and gender, we find that it is ethnic minority students from poorly educated families whose reports tell of a great gender gap in terms of discrimination on the side of the teachers. While majority girls and boys from poorly educated parental backgrounds experience teachers' discrimination in similar proportions, the difference between boys and girls is truly remarkable in case of those coming from poorly educated ethnic minority families: the corresponding ratios are 39 per cent for boys and 15 per

cent for girls. Differences of such a magnitude do not appear either among students from higher educated backgrounds or between adolescents from majority and ethnic minority groups of adolescents in general. In summary, we may assume, in particular, ethnic minority boys from poorly educated families perceive teachers' discriminatory behaviour with the highest occurrence.

When experiences of unfair treatment by teachers are looked at in the light of students' school performance, it can be established that poor performance results often generate such feelings: it is primarily this group that gave frequent accounts of discrimination, and the association between one's assessed achievement and perceiving of discrimination was particularly strong at the Central European sites. This finding appears to be rather obvious: in countries where pedagogical traditions based on discipline, hierarchical relations, and frontal teaching prevail, teachers are more inclined to express their views about students with the "labels" of numeric grading than their colleagues working in more relaxed and – in general – more democratic conditions where numeric assessments are used to measure the test results of academic performance in the first place. The previously mentioned series of community studies carried out in the four Central European countries support the findings of the survey. The qualitative research found that teachers often do not make a distinction between academic performance and the other qualities of their students, but classify them by "holistic" grades that then conclude in a self-fulfilling prophecy: being assessed as "bad" reinforces that image and also one's self-image of being a "bad, undeserving person". Consequently, it is not very surprising that performance and feelings about discrimination and unfair treatment on the part of teachers are strongly paired in the case of the least successful groups.

By analysing the data about experienced discrimination in the context of the composite indicators of attitudes towards becoming integrated into the mainstream , traditionalism, and religiousness, respectively, we found that students who show clear intentions towards becoming integrated into the majority report somewhat below the average ratios about discrimination on the side of adults (teachers and other adults), while the corresponding proportions are somewhat above the average among those for whom keeping the traditions of their group is apparently important – however, the differences are minor. Religiousness is more significantly associated with experiences of discrimination by teachers: minority students who find that religion is an important aspect of their everyday lives report considerably more often about discriminating teachers than their less or non-religious peers (29 per cent versus 19 per cent).

Regarding unfair treatment by peers, girls feel more discriminated against than boys. The gender departure is particularly strong in the Central European countries where 37 per cent of

the girls and 29 per cent of the boys gave such accounts. The corresponding ratio is somewhat lower among respondents in the "old" member states, but the trends are similar. As to the compound influence of parental background and gender, the associations proved opposite to the ones regarding teachers' discrimination: without exception, it is the girls who feel more discriminated against by their peers than the boys, and with a rise in the level of the parental educational background, the gap between boys and girls' perceived discrimination increases, especially in the case of those belonging to the ethnic majority. In the case of students with poorly educated parents, the occurrence of perceived discrimination by peers is relatively low (33 per cent), and does not vary too much according either to students' ethnic background (33–34 per cent) or their gender (33–34 per cent). At the same time, children of highly educated parents report slightly more frequently about discrimination by their peers (38 per cent), and also the differences by gender and ethnic belonging are remarkable. In this group, the frequency of responses confirming occurrence is 33 per cent among the boys and 43 per cent among the girls, while the corresponding ratios are 36 per cent among adolescents from a majority background and 44 per cent among ethnic minority students.

The importance attributed to keeping traditions seems to be related to the frequency of insults from peers: those ethnic minority students for whom keeping traditions is an important element of daily life report about the experiences of discriminatory conduct by their peers in rates above the average. Religiousness, however, seems to provide a protective net against discrimination: those ethnic minority students, for whom religion is an integral part of their daily lives, report less frequently about insults in their peer group than those who do not have strong religious ties.

A further important aspect of variations in the perception of discrimination is revealed if we look separately at the response rates of "visible" and "other" minorities. The data show that members of those ethnic groups that are distinguished by the public as "visibly other" experience discrimination more frequently both inside, but even more so outside, the school than their peers. "Othering" seems to be an important incident that shapes their everyday lives inside and outside the school.

The questionnaire inquired also about one's traits that are considered as the cause for being discriminated against. The data demonstrate that students most frequently think that it is their gender and appearance (24 per cent and 28 per cent) that provides the "reason" for being looked down upon. We assume that this is an age-specific phenomenon: adolescents care greatly about their appearance and gender belonging and also about the conducts and attitudes related to these traits. At the same time, it should be noted that the mentioning of feelings of being

discriminated against because of where one comes from – both in terms of social and ethnic belonging – were relatively frequent: 17 per cent of all the interviewed students reported that they experienced discrimination because of their family's socio-economic situation or because of their ethnic background.

There are important differences by the country groups with respect to the reasons for being discriminated: in countries where migration has dominantly been supplied by labour needs and were most of the second generation migrants are from Turkish or other Muslim origin, ethnic minority students reported most frequently about discrimination due to their religion (32 per cent), while in the post-socialist region, Roma students brought up their looks (27 per cent), social background (20 per cent), and ethnic "otherness" (31 per cent) as the most frequent causes of being discriminated against. In assessing these frequencies, it has to be noted that the applied technique seems to matter significantly: while adolescents proved rather reluctant to report their experiences with discrimination in a written form, the vast majority of our "visible" minority interviewees gave some account of discrimination due to their ethnic background in the more informal setting of face-to-face communication during personal interviews and focus-group discussions.

Among the perceived causes, the only issue where, for obvious reasons, the frequencies of responses significantly differ between the two large groups of ethnic minority students and their peers from the majority is experienced discrimination because of one's ethnic belonging: these occurrences are four times higher among ethnic minority students than among their peers from the majority – and these relative magnitudes prevail across all the historical clusters of the participating countries.

The educational level of the parents is a variable that is also significantly associated with the perception of discrimination by students in all of the examined country groups. Irrespective of the type of discrimination – be it because of religion, social background, or ethnic affiliation – those students whose parents are on the lowest grade of the educational ladder most frequently report such degradation. It is not difficult to imagine the reasons behind this: these students usually come from families where parents are not capable of providing academic and financial support for their children's education – they cannot help them with studying, are probably considered unequal partners to the teachers, and are also unable to pay for extra or remedial classes.

Similar to the analysis of unjust treatment and the general atmosphere in class, we saw that presence of ethnic minority teachers at school provides protection against the occurrences of discrimination. Along the dimension of the ethnic composition of the staff, interestingly, the

greatest difference appears with concern to discrimination among peers: students studying in schools where ethnic minority teachers are employed report significantly less frequently about discrimination from their peers than those who attend schools where teachers are exclusively from the majority .

In an attempt to sum up the great many findings that were reported above, the prevalence of certain clear tendencies should be emphasised.

Despite the methodological limitations of our comparative sample that were already addressed at several points of this report, the analysis managed to identify certain factors that seem to influence the everyday lives of adolescents at school beyond the pure academic aspects of education. One of such factors is the site itself, and more precisely, the history and quality of interethnic relations, especially their hierarchical nature in the given country. Besides the composite data, this association was also confirmed when the situation of two of those ethnic groups was compared across borders whose members live in significant numbers in several of our countries (Roma and Muslims). With respect to all the analysed aspects (interethnic activities, preferences in choosing friends, experiences of discrimination), we saw that in countries with a colonial history contacts between minority ethnic and majority adolescents are more common and seem to be based more on mutual acceptance, while in countries where migration is due to more recent processes related to labour market needs, the gap between minorities and majorities is greater. Still, the largest ethnic distancing characterises the post-socialist countries where – despite century-long histories of cohabitation and the fact that Roma are natives – the relationship between majority and minority students reflects strong ethnic hierarchies. The findings tell a clear story: it is Roma adolescents who express their willingness to integrate (making interethnic friendships and bridging ethnic lines in more personal relationships), while their majority peers reject these overtures in nearly every circumstance (as indicated by their rare intentions of making interethnic friendships, frequent refusals to engage in interethnic activities, or widespread disapproval of entering marriage with a Roma partner). Additionally, Roma are those among all the ethnic minority groups in comparison, who are exposed the most to negative experiences of unfair treatment because of their ethnic origins.

Another factor that seems to significantly influence the everyday lives and contacts of adolescent students is the ethnic composition of the school and the class they attend. The linkage is particularly strong in the Central European countries. The association is not evident and not direct, but certain phenomena may be clearly distinguished. Interethnic friendships are most likely to develop in an ethnically mixed school environment and if ethnic differences are not intertwined with strong status differences within the peer group, and furthermore, if ethnic

hierarchies are not reinforced by teachers or adults. Undoubtedly, if students are distributed by their background into ethnically "clear" classes within an otherwise multiethnic unit, then the worst conditions for the atmosphere at school and the quality of relationships are established. Such an environment enhances the hostility between classes and, consequently, between ethnic groups as well. When the ethnically profiled divisions are visible among parallel classes, interethnic hostility is acute; at the same time, such everyday experiences of visible segregation may deeply and negatively impact individual students in their formative years of adolescence. Ethnic segregation of entire schools seems to have a more complex relationship with the everyday lives and interpersonal relations of adolescents. On the one hand, ethnic minority students generally feel more comfortable in such an environment, although interethnic contacts are naturally less frequent. On the other hand, the occurrence of bullying – though with mentionable differences across the historical clusters of countries – is rather high in segregated ethnic minority schools. (As to the noteworthy differences: in the post-socialist countries of Central Europe, an ethnically homogeneous environment results at a considerable lower rate of such abuses – 50 per cent – when compared to other schools (75 per cent), while a similar environment induces the highest prevalence of verbal or physical insults – 84 per cent – in the old member states of the West (against 68 per cent in other schools). Also, the causes for ethnic separation seem to play a role: in schools where ethnically homogeneous schools came into being as a result of voluntary separation, the general atmosphere and interpersonal relationships are friendly and experiences of discrimination are rare. At the same time, in schools where their ethnically homogeneous composition is a result of processes of "white flight" and exclusion on socio-ethnic grounds, discrimination is a frequent experience of ethnic minority students.

A further pattern that the analysis revealed is the potentially positive effect that the multiethnic character of the staff exerts on all the important aspects of life at school. It was brought up both by the survey and the qualitative studies at our sites that in schools where ethnic minority teachers or assistants are employed, all the students feel more relaxed and the acceptance and respect of the school generally are also higher, though it is primarily ethnic minority students who benefit. It is most probably not the sheer presence of ethnic minority teachers but some of its important implications that influence adolescents' attitudes. The multiethnic character of the teaching staff may be regarded as an indication of a tolerant and inclusive school philosophy and pedagogical approach that subsequently enhances tolerance and friendly relations among the students and between the students and their teachers.

V. IDENTITY FORMATION AND VISIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE THROUGH A COMPARATIVE LENS

As the preceding chapters of this study made clear, the composition of our comparative sample is very heterogeneous, especially if one considers the ethnic affiliation, social standing, and the size of the groups that constitute the category of "visible" minorities in the centre of this research and their proportions in the student body of the schools in the communities under examination. But heterogeneity is also significant in respect to the social, economic, cultural, and political features of the participating countries and the clusters that were formed from them for analytical purposes. For this reason, our data concerning students' own self-image, self-respect, and social/ethnic identity are not representative in a statistical sense; the collected data, rather, can be used for modelling the co-occurrence of the interlacing factors, effects, mechanisms, and processes contributing to the construction of the social identity of our adolescent respondents.

Structural dimensions in the construction of "otherness"

Considering the groups in the selected countries categorised as "visible" minorities with regard to the core aspects (appearance, mother tongue, religion) that provide the base for distinguishing them as "others", the data drawn are truly diverse; however, the identified patterns show certain commonalities. Almost everyone belonging to the category of the "visibly other" in the German and Danish samples (95 per cent and 93 per cent, respectively) speak other languages than the dominant one in the country; the ratio of "visible" minority students not using the official language of their country of residence is also high in France (79 per cent), Slovakia (71 per cent), and the Czech Republic (65 per cent). In the sample from the United Kingdom, the corresponding proportion is only a little above 50 per cent. In Hungary and Romania, however, only a tiny proportion of the respondents belonging to the "visible" minority (Roma) speak a first language other than the dominant one of their country (22 per cent in Hungary and 4 per cent in Romania).

The role of attitudes toward religion is also diverse according to the various groups of respondents.[49] Considering the entire sample, in comparison to peers from the majority or "other" minority groups, religion seems to have more weight in the life of the group of students with "visible" minority backgrounds. (The only exception is represented by Romania where the adherence to religion was the same – around 70 per cent – among those belonging to the majority and the Hungarian or Roma groups as the minorities in this country.) In total, the significance attributed to religion in everyday life is demonstrated by 38 per cent of the adolescents from the majority, 64 per cent of those belonging to a "visible" minority group, and 40 per cent in the case of members of "other" kinds of minorities. It is precisely in Denmark and Germany, with barely 25–30 per cent of majority respondents attaching great significance to religion, where the rate of students from "visible" minority backgrounds (Muslims for the most part) whose daily life is infused by religion is the highest. Though with somewhat smaller departures, in the French, Czech, and United Kingdom samples the difference in the importance attributed to religion is likewise significant between majority and "visible" minority respondents, the latter apparently being more determined by religious affiliation. Although religiosity of the "visible" minority group of Roma in the Slovak sample exceeds the rates observed in Hungary or the Czech Republic, it concerns less than half of the respondents in this group. In Hungary, in turn, all three ethnic categories are characterised by a relatively low degree of religiosity.

Data referring to the importance of religion in the German and Danish samples reinforce our impression that differing linguistically from the majority coincides with distinct religious traditions: at least, this connection is implied by the strong association between minority language use and higher than average religious commitment (according to 80 per cent of the Danish, and 74 per cent of the German samples, religion represents the most determining aspect of everyday life). Similar tendencies of association between the use of a minority language and religiosity can be observed, though to a smaller degree, in the other countries as well.

Differences in the use of the language of the family's origin or adherence to the dominant religion of the country of origin despite the profoundly changed circumstances of living in a minority (or, as in the Czech Republic, a high intensity of religiosity across different faiths) are heavily influencing the attitudes regarding the preservation of, or detachment from, existing traditions. This observation is confirmed by the attitude of "visible" minority students in the

---

[49] This attitude was measured with a compound variable containing information about whether religious education represented an important factor in selecting a school for advancement, whether the choice was influenced by someone representing the church in question, and moreover, whether religious identity was an important criterion in the making of friendships and partnerships as well as in the imagined choice of a partner in adulthood.

samples of individual countries towards traditions as opposed to attempts at becoming integrated into the mainstream. The rate of those considering the preservation of the culture of their group of origin and following its traditions as important constituents of their everyday life is remarkably higher than the average in the German, Danish, and Slovak samples, and though not as high, it is also significant among "visible" minority respondents in the United Kingdom.[50] Ethnic minority respondents in the Hungarian sample, in turn, stand out because, measured by an earlier compound variable, a quarter of them show a strong indication to becoming integrated into the majority.[51] Besides Hungarian Roma, it is only among "visible" minorities in the United Kingdom that the ratio of those revealing clear intentions for becoming integrated is relatively high (15 per cent).

Table 5.1

Dimensions of recognised "otherness" of students belonging to a "visible" minority in the participating countries

Country	Proportion (%) of students from "visible" minority background who are characterised by:			
	Different mother tongue	Religion has importance in daily life	Inclined toward keeping traditions	Inclined toward becoming integrated into the mainstream
Czech Republic	65	55	7	1
Denmark	93	80	13	3
France	79	57	3	8
Germany	95	74	17	3
Hungary	22	35	2	24
Romania	4	70	0	9

---

[50] This was measured with a compound variable that included the significance of the mother tongue differing from that of the majority as well as the same ethnic origin of friends, partners, and future spouses.

[51] To a certain degree, these latter findings can be considered as the complement of the phenomenon of ethnic distancing (see Chapter IV): in response to the widespread refusal of contacts on the part of the majority, Roma adolescents seem to put an accentuated weight on behaviours and strategies of striving for becoming integrated into the majority that they see as the only path toward acceptance.

| Slovakia | 71 | 46 | 16 | 3 |
| United Kingdom | 54 | 61 | 11 | 15 |

In interpreting the data not by individual countries but based on country clusters by commonalities in history, it turns out that the differences presented above with respect to mother tongue, religiosity, and efforts to keep or disregard traditions form characteristic patterns. In the cluster of countries of economic migration, students from the "visible" minority groups show the greatest difference compared to their peers from the majority and "other" national/ethnic minorities in the country, and their outstanding position is also held in comparison to the two other country clusters. Almost all of the adolescents in question have preserved and still use the language of their country of origin as a mother tongue, religious belonging is important for about 75 per cent, and the ratio of those committed to following traditions stands out as the highest, while the rate of those choosing, instead, a strategy that points toward becoming integrated into the majority remains the lowest. Post-colonial countries are also characterised, at somewhat lower rates, by their attachment to linguistic and religious traditions; however, the ratio of those being inclined to become integrated into the mainstream is exactly the double of those wishing to follow traditions. On the basis of these data, it can be assumed that ethnic minority groups of the communities in the research occupy a middle ground between maintaining difference and wishing to melt into the majority society. However, in post-socialist countries neither one's mother tongue that is distinct from that of the majority nor religiosity has the same weight (nor is the degree of difference in comparison with the characteristics of the majority or "other" minorities as important) as in the other two country clusters. In the countries in question, the wish to become integrated into the majority society is also stronger than the attempts to keep traditions (at least in the examined communities).

A glance at the situation of the families of students from "visible" ethnic minority backgrounds in the individual countries reveals whether smaller or larger departures in living conditions in comparison to other cohabitating ethnic groups are influential factors in shaping interethnic relationships, especially relating towards the majority. Based on the entire sample, it is perceptible that belonging to a "visible" minority group involves disadvantages in terms of living conditions: the proportion of those living in genuinely good or average circumstances is lower in these groups, while about 25 per cent of them qualify as poor, as compared to the 17 per cent ratio in the case of those from the majority and the corresponding 13 per cent of similar occurrences among families of "other" minorities. Adolescents living in real hardship also

belong mainly to this group. At the same time, differences among countries also show that the data concerning the disadvantaged situation of "visible" minorities and their growing distance from the majority society are based primarily on the living conditions of Roma families in the selected community samples of post-socialist countries: 56 per cent of the children at the Romanian sites, and 52 per cent in the Slovakian communities come from poor families, and 19 per cent of the latter, while 13 per cent of the families in the Hungarian sample, live in utter destitution.

Breaking down the data, again, according by country clusters, the distributions reveal that in countries of economic migration both the majority and the distinctly defined ethnic minority groups enjoy higher living standards and better circumstances than their respective counterparts in the other two clusters. Furthermore, in this country group composed of the Danish and German communities, one cannot identify significant differences between the majority and minority groups either. There is no great departure in the proportions of families from majority and minority backgrounds living at a medium level – the ratios are around 75 per cent in both groups. However, the ratios of those in affluent and poor conditions, respectively, show meaningful differences to the detriment of those from "visible" minority backgrounds. The ratio of affluent families is twice as high among the majority as in the cohabitating "visible" minority groups, and almost a quarter of those belonging to the latter are classified as poor.

Table 5.2

Dimensions of presumed difference according to country clusters

Historical cluster of countries	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of students from "visible" minority backgrounds who are characterised by:			
		Different mother tongue	Religion has importance in daily life	Inclined toward keeping traditions	Inclined toward becoming integrated into the mainstream
Countries of post-colonial migration	Majority	–	39	–	–
	"Visible" minority	72	58	5	10
	"Other" minority	44	32	3	23
Countries of economic migration	Majority	–	27	–	–
	"Visible" minority	94	76	15	3
	"Other" minority	64	42	6	20
Countries of post-socialist transformation	Majority	–	41	–	–
	"Visible" minority	39	51	6	10
	"Other" minority	43	40	6	9

However, in post-socialist countries, there is a sharp difference between Roma and majority groups in their respective proportions across the entire scale of living standards. While two-thirds of the majority and more than three-quarters of those belonging to an "other" minority group are characterised by at least a mediocre standard of living, the corresponding proportion among the families of our Roma adolescents is only 45 per cent. At the same time, more than a third of them are poor, and 12 per cent live in utter destitution, which indicates a strong difference from the majority and "other" cohabitating minorities.

Furthermore, this latter country cluster shows significant peculiarities as compared with the other two. Apparently, the studied "visible" minority group of post-socialist countries – the Roma – live in conditions that sharply differ from the rest of society, while the same cannot be stated about "visible" minority groups in post-colonial countries or countries of economic migration. The substantial departure among the country clusters to the detriment of the post-socialist region also supports the assumption that the conditions of maintaining one's own culture, traditions, and religion, without risking becoming excluded from the socio-economic structure of society-at-large, are better in the established democracies of Europe than in the "new" ones, and – at least on the scale of communities that are represented in our research project – seem to be the best in the countries of economic migration. (The situation of "visible" minority groups in the post-colonial countries seems somewhat worse: it is by no means a coincidence that the wish for becoming integrated into the mainstream is stronger among them.) The living conditions of Roma students in the post-socialist countries, so much worse than those of their majority peers, in turn, evidently reinforce their desire to become integrated into the majority, as belonging to the Roma ethnic group less involves having a language, culture, or religion of their own; instead, it has become synonymous with genuinely disadvantaged situation and social status.

Table 5.3

Living conditions of students with distinct ethnic backgrounds, according to country clusters

Historical cluster of countries	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of those living in			
		Affluent	Mediocre	Poor	Destitute
		conditions			
Countries of post-colonial migration	Majority	17	69	13	–
	"Visible" minority	8	68	22	2
	"Other" minority	9	85	5	1
Countries of economic migration	Majority	8	79	12	1
	"Visible" minority	11	69	18	2
	"Other" minority	5	81	13	1
Countries of post-socialist transformation	Majority	13	66	18	3
	"Visible" minority	6	45	37	12
	"Other" minority	7	77	13	3

It can be concluded that the social standing and respect in the community that are associated with the manifestations of one's living conditions and way of life importantly influence adolescents' attitudes toward their own origins and ethnic belonging. Considering the entire sample, it seems that the better the family's financial conditions, the more will the family's own ethnic background be considered an asset. This is especially true for members of the majority: the rate of those perceiving their origins as an advantage is almost twice as high among well-off students as among their utterly deprived peers (40 and 22 per cent, respectively). Likewise, feelings of students from "visible" minority backgrounds concerning their own origins are affected by the social position of their families, although the rate of those considering their origins a valuable quality is much lower in this group, even among the most well-off students, than in the case of majority ones.

Apart from the affirmative responses, another clue is provided by the data, suggesting that ethnic origins have no significance whatsoever in one's life. Almost 40 per cent of those belonging to the majority or to distinct ethnic minorities, enjoying the best living conditions, think that origins do not play a role in their life. At the same time, for those living even in truly good conditions among the members of "visible" minority groups, hardly every fourth student shares the same opinion.

On this basis, it can be assumed that the relationship of the interviewed students towards their own ethnic origins probably is not simply affected by the differences in the distribution of material goods, or by direct interests. At least, this is what data regarding their feelings towards origins reveal. Thus, even though the rate of those for whom ethnic belonging carries altogether positive implications is higher among majority students as compared with minority groups, especially "visible" minorities, their families' material conditions are not a determining factor in this situation.

Therefore, we were interested to find out whether certain feelings contributing to students' attitude towards their origins, targeted in our questionnaire, show any difference according to ethnic background or the families' socio-economic situation.

It turned out that feelings of pride with respect to origins were not affected at all by the socio-economic background of families among the majority (as suggested by about 55 per cent of the affirmative responses in every group on the scale of indicated living standard). However, the material condition of the family played a more significant role among students from minority backgrounds, especially among those in the "visible" category. The average ratio of 77 per cent of positive responses regarding pride among all those from minority backgrounds confirms such an association, in general, which is particularly underscored by the corresponding 83 per cent proportion among those from such groups who live in affluence. Feelings of solidarity towards people from the same ethnic background characterise students affiliated with distinct ethnic minority groups to more or less the same degree. And the same also holds for the poorest among the "visible" minorities, Roma adolescents, who expressed solidarity – though it is also this group that considers ethnic belonging a disadvantage. With respect to unpleasant experiences having to do with ethnic belonging and incidences when adolescents intended to hide their origins, the material condition of the family appears to be relevant to all the groups classified by origin. It seems that the worse one's living conditions are, the more unpleasant experiences are collected in association with ethnic belonging, and the more often origins are felt to be embarrassing.

In considering the responses regarding feelings about origins according to the participating countries, some important points are lacking that greatly influence the aggregated data. Thus, it should be noted that the sample from the United Kingdom provides no information at all about whether there is anyone for whom ethnic origin has caused inconveniences or embarrassment. On the same token, there is a high proportion (about 30 per cent) of missing information in the Danish sample with respect to all the related questions, especially regarding members of the majority. Hence, observations concerning similarities and differences in feelings about origins of the various ethnic groups according to country clusters can only be tentatively interpreted when using our compound variables.

Table 5.4

Feelings about own ethnic belonging in the historical clusters of countries

Perceptions	Countries of								
	Post-colonial migration			Economic migration			Post-socialist transformation		
	Percentage ratio in the group of								
	Majority	"Visible" minority	"Other" minority	Majority	"Visible" minority	"Other" minority	Majority	"Visible" minority	"Other" minority
	ATTITUDE TOWARD OWN ETHNICITY								
Positive	15	10	7	48	43	42	37	21	23
Negative	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1
Mixed	71	89	93	51	57	57	61	76	73
Neutral	12	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3
	PERCEIVED AFFECT OF ETHNIC BELONGING								
Mostly advantageous	17	31	35	40	38	37	40	25	31
Mostly disadvantageous	0	3	2	0	3	4	1	6	3

Varying by occasion	10	22	10	7	19	17	12	25	16
Uncertain assessment	12	5	3	19	17	14	15	21	17
No affect at all	42	21	42	24	18	23	30	20	30

Since it is the samples from the post-colonial countries and countries of economic migration that contain particularly high proportions of missing responses, it can be assumed that this has to do with indifference regarding this question on the part of students from majority backgrounds in the involved communities, or, with respect to responses that indicate uncertainty ("I don't know"), that origins seem to be a "natural" issue for these adolescents. In other words, the majority students are not inclined to attribute any significance to ethnic origins as it were, if not in comparison to fellow ethnic minority students. However, the positive relation towards origins is noticeably more frequent among "visible" minority groups in countries of economic migration, as compared to the two other country clusters. It is also striking that the difference between students of majority and "visible" or "other" minority backgrounds in their feelings towards origins is sharper in post-socialist countries than elsewhere. While only a quarter of students from a "visible" minority background indicate that ethnic belonging is an advantage for them, the corresponding proportion is 40 per cent among their majority peers. At the same time, in contrast with the other two kinds of groups of ethnic belonging, the life and daily experiences of Roma are importantly infused by the significance of ethnic belonging, and thus it is they who feel the least among all groups that their origins are insignificant in shaping their lives. The greatest difference was found between responses given by students from majority and Roma backgrounds in the Slovak and Hungarian communities: just over one-tenth of Hungarian Roma and less than one-fifth of Slovakian Roma thought that their origins involved some advantages. These finding are also supported by the previously introduced results that show the major affect of the countries' history of multiethnic relations on the intensity and quality of interethnic communication and interactions (see Chapter IV).

Difference and self-image

It was assumed that one's relation to one's group of origin influences our adolescent respondents' self-image, while their self-image is reflected in their attitudes toward their origin. Society – represented for the age group who is the subject of this study mainly by the family, kin, teachers, peers, and friends at school and in the community –, may have different kinds of relationships with the various groups of adolescents and the members of each group, who build up the image of themselves more or less based on such influences. Outward characteristics and inner qualities are interpreted in terms of social comparisons for fitting in: good abilities, an attractive outlook, degrees of recognition, and respect or its absence are all built into teenagers' self-esteem. The psychologically reinforcing effect of in-group dynamics occurs precisely to provide a feeling of familiarity and recognition to members, thereby contributing to their positive self-respect. However, those considered "others" in the eyes of the social majority can easily become the target of stereotypes, schematic judgments, or even prejudices, evidently affecting the way an adolescent minority student relates to the group he or she happens to be a member of, by origin. Therefore, it is a question whether it is the positive acknowledgment of the in-group, or that of the out-group – in the case examined in our research, this was represented by the social majority and its institutions, like the school – that has more importance in the formation of the self-image and self-respect of adolescents. Given that our research is focused on "visible" minorities – who have lived in countries where, because of the colonial past, people have become used to the presence of "visible" differences during the centuries, or in countries that first faced the phenomenon of mass migration only a few decades ago, or alternatively in the "new" member states that, despite the continuous presence of Roma for hundreds of years, fail to recognise otherness and are overloaded with nationalistic grievances – we presume that majority and different ethnic minority groups would show distinct patterns in terms of self-respect, based on differences in the given social environment and atmosphere.

Considering the groups with different ethnic backgrounds in our sample, independently from their countries of residence, there are significant differences in the self-esteem of students according to ethnic belonging. Although representing a small group in terms of their number in the sample, Black African and Caribbean students show the most positive self-esteem: more than three-quarters of them, far more than the 34 per cent average characterising the entire sample, feel recognised and valued by others. With respect to self-esteem, the group that come the closest to them is represented by Muslim students (Turkish, Kurdish, Arab, and North

African), more than half of whom have a strongly positive sense of self-worth. The relative majority of Asian and other minorities coming from developed countries is also characterised by a high level of self-esteem.

By contrast, it is striking that only 30 per cent of the majority students in the participating countries show positive self-esteem, while 6 per cent of them have an utterly negative image of themselves. Considering the entire sample, the lowest rate of strongly positive self-esteem (16 per cent) and the highest rate of negative self-image (7 per cent) are manifested among Roma students. Most probably, the latter indications of rather widespread disturbances in identity formation are not independent from the frequent experiences of Roma adolescents with injustices and discrimination owed to their ethnic "otherness". As presented in Chapter IV, it is exactly they who most often suffer from ethnic discrimination within schools, and even more typically, who regularly face refusals and degradation outside the walls of the institution, in the wider community.

Examining the self-esteem of respondents from majority, "visible" minority, and "other" minority backgrounds in the entire sample, it can be concluded that it is not the differences of ethnic groups *per se*, but the characteristics of the communities in the sample that are divisive with respect to the responses of students from different backgrounds. With the knowledge of the above, it looks somewhat paradoxical that, considering the entire sample, it seems that "visible" minorities have the most positive self-esteem, overcoming in large proportions "other" minorities as well as majority respondents.

The quantitative research is unable to answer the question why it is precisely the members of "visible" minority groups whose self-image is more positive than the rest. However, it can be assumed that, in the examined age group – i.e., adolescents – the family still plays a major role in the development of self-respect, compared to other influential agents of socialisation. Also, belonging to a "visible" minority in a majority society may involve investing greater importance in the tightly woven net of one's own community, and its power in opinion formation, than in the case of those belonging to the majority – for one thing, because "visibility" is not a matter of choice. At the same time, it is unknown to what extent the results were affected by the characteristics of the various fields and schools, selected according to different criteria for research purposes in the participating countries: in particular, with reference to the rate of persons with minority backgrounds in the sample, the kind of educational and pedagogic methods, interethnic relations within and outside the school, etc. (The qualitative part of the EDUMIGROM research attempts to provide a more in-depth analysis of these issues, including

the exploration of a range of cultural and social-psychological aspects in informing adolescents' self-image and contributing to the construction of their identity.)

For a more refined analysis of the sample, we examined how the position of families in the social structure impacts the self-image and self-respect of students. Regarding the responses given by students belonging to "visible" minorities, it is clear that a sense of positive self-acceptance, discovered in analysing individual countries and country clusters, characterises only those who live above or near the average living standard. At the same time, a disadvantaged social background has a greater impact on the self-image of majority students than on that of minority students: more than a quarter of those belonging to the former category indicated dissatisfaction with their selves and also claimed more social recognition. It is probably appropriate to use the concept of relative deprivation in approaching the kind of self-respect characterising this group. Despite the fact that the social standing of the majority students' families in the sample tended to be worse than in the case of the social majority of the given countries in general (since the significant presence of minorities was an important criterion in the selection of schools, which involves, at the same time, the relative marginalisation of majority students attending the same schools as well), the reference group in their case is provided not by migrants or ethnic minorities in their environment but by the well-off social majority into which their family failed to become integrated the way they wanted to be.

Table 5.5

Students' self-esteem according to ethnic belonging and social status of the family

Ethnic belonging	Family's social standing	Proportion (%) of students' whose self-esteem is		
		Positive	Mixed	Negative
Majority	Upper status	74	6	20
	Mediocre status	72	6	22
	Lower status	69	6	25
Minority	Upper status	78	3	19
	Mediocre status	83	3	14
	Lower status	74	6	20

The cross-country comparison of students' responses concerning their self-esteem allows us to register a few important deviations from the main tendency. The case that most sharply departs from the rest of the countries is that of Slovakia, where the responses given by students of distinct ethnic backgrounds do not show significant differences: the lowest rate of those having positive self-esteem in all three ethnic groups, in comparison to the other countries, was found here. What is more, regarding the majority and "other" minorities (mostly Hungarians), the ratio of those having a negative self-image exceeds that of students accepting themselves and having a positive sense of self-worth. At the same time, more than a third of "visible" minority – Roma – students in Slovakia gave accounts of negative self-esteem, an outstandingly high rate considering the overall average of "visible" minority groups in the entire sample. Apart from this group, Roma students in the Czech sample were characterised by lower self-esteem and a lack of social respect in comparison to "visible" minority groups living in other countries. Their responses remain outside the general trend characterising their country in terms of self-esteem, indicating a significant departure from both majority students and those belonging to "other" minorities. Yet it would be too hasty to conclude that being Roma (or living in neighbourhoods or attending schools with a strong Roma presence, while belonging to the social majority) is coincidental with the lack of a sense of self-worth, since this is refuted by the Romanian and Hungarian data. In these countries, there is no significant difference in the self-image of the majority and the two kinds of minorities, regarding either the positive or the negative variants.

Two other participating countries – Denmark and Germany – stand out from among the other countries, in turn, because the students, belonging either to the majority or to any of the minority ethnic groups, feel secure and accepted by others, and have positive self-esteem, to a far greater degree than the average of the sample, while the rate of those not sharing such feelings is negligible.

Table 5.6

Self-esteem of students from different ethnic backgrounds in the participating countries

Countries	Majority			"Visible" minority			"Other" minority		
	Proportion (%) of those whose self-esteem is								
	Positive	Mixed	Negative	Positive	Mixed	Negative	Positive	Mixed	Negative
Czech Republic	69	5	27	67	2	31	72	3	25
Denmark	90	2	9	82	5	14	91	0	9
France	74	0	26	81	0	19	73	0	27
Germany	89	4	7	91	3	6	90	3	8
Hungary	70	8	22	75	9	16	62	8	31
Romania	77	5	18	78	11	11	77	0	24
Slovakia	42	12	47	54	9	37	46	7	47
United Kingdom	75	5	20	66	10	24	75	0	25

The examination of data referring to self-image and self-esteem according to country clusters as opposed to individual countries, provides an additional perspective on the presumption that lacking recognition and respect may curtail one's self-worth. It is obviously not a coincidence that the proportion of those claiming more respect is higher in post-socialist countries in all three ethnic groups than in the two other country clusters. It is also not by accident that the ratio of students complaining about the lack of recognition exceeds, by 3 or 4 times, that of those who indicated being satisfied with the degree of social respect conferred to them. In particular, the most conspicuous rate among those lacking in recognition was represented by Roma as a "visible" minority (44 per cent).

The compound variable measuring self-respect by the coincidence of positive characteristics offered in the questionnaire also supports the above statement. The category that

stands out for its most balanced and satisfied feelings about themselves is represented by students living in countries of economic migration: the highest rate of positive self-respect among members of different groups of origin, showing no mentionable departures among the ethnic communities involved, was found here. Positive self-image is less characteristic of students in post-colonialist countries – to be sure, no significant differences were seen among the three ethnic groups here, either – and the ratio of those having an utterly negative self-regard is also greater in these countries. However, respondents from the post-socialist region are less satisfied with their talents and abilities than those belonging to the other two country clusters, and almost 10 per cent have formed an utterly negative self-image.

The variable representing traits that refers to negative self-image in a complex way, thus suggesting some degree of self-hatred, also has the highest occurrence in the communities in the post-socialist countries. However, it is not so characteristic of "visible" minority groups as to students belonging to the majority or "other" minorities. The explanation of this phenomenon probably lies in national grievances, deeply ingrained in society and apparently internalised by our adolescent respondents as well.

Table 5.7

Self-esteem and self-image by country clusters

Historical cluster of countries	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of those characterised by:					
		Claims for more	Satisfaction with degree of	Positive	Negative	Mixed	Indication of self-hatred
		respect		view of the self			
Post-colonial migration	Majority	16	15	75	7	19	8
	"Visible" minority	20	15	78	3	20	5
	"Other" minority	33	25	74	6	21	8
Economic migration	Majority	14	23	89	1	10	3
	"Visible" minority	21	25	88	3	9	2
	"Other" minority	20	23	90	1	10	3
Post-socialist transformation	Majority	34	9	66	8	26	13
	"Visible" minority	44	9	70	8	23	7
	"Other" minority	38	19	62	10	28	15

At this point, a compound variable interpreting the negative self-image of students as the manifestation of self-hatred (i.e., when one feels devoid of positive outward and inside traits, thus being worthless in the eyes of others, and this negative image is built into the person's self-esteem) was examined more thoroughly.

According to their ethnic background, a sharply defeatist self-image is the least characteristic of Muslim students: barely three per cent of them feel to be worthless and dissatisfied with themselves. The children of immigrant families living mostly in our two countries with a post-colonial past – Asians, Black Africans, or Caribbean, and those coming from developed western countries – also show a relatively low rate (5 per cent) of negative self-respect. In comparison to these groups, the corresponding figures among Eastern European immigrants living in Western Europe, students from mixed ethnic backgrounds, and Roma respondents signal, however, a rise in the occurrence of extremely negative self-image: the ratios in these groups are around 7 per cent.

In contrast, it is, in fact, the students belonging to the ethnic majority of individual countries whose self-image turns out to be the least positive: about 10 per cent of them relate in an utterly negative way to the self.

This result may reinforce our concerns formulated above with respect to the impact of the peculiar composition of the sample (see Chapter I) on the picture that can be drawn about different aspects of adolescent identity on the ground of our survey. As has been pointed out several times in this study, the ratio of majority respondents in the country samples in the post-socialist cluster is remarkably higher than in their Western counterparts. Hence, a significant percentage of the responses of students from majority backgrounds actually represent the post-socialist region, while only a smaller part comes from the Western communities where, in terms of their ratio in the respective samples, they are in the minority– especially when the country samples and not only the distribution of respondents within the individual school communities is considered. This is important because, as has already been discussed, when majority adolescents happen to be in a "minority" position, in terms of their number or in a socio-cultural sense, their frustrations and aggression can be quite common, occasionally manifesting in self-devaluation, self-hatred, or even in becoming hostile toward the "genuine" minorities in some cases.

Considering their material conditions and living standards, it looks like the disadvantaged and the poor manifest signs of self-hatred much more often than those in better circumstances – and this is particularly the case with students from majority backgrounds. Almost a quarter of

those living in deprivation despite their majority belonging express extremely negative self-esteem, while the corresponding ratio is only 7 per cent among those living in (relative) affluence. By contrast, considering members of the "visible" and "other" minorities, only 13–14 per cent see themselves in such a negative light, even among the poorest, though, to be sure, these rates also exceed the ones observed among those who come from better living conditions.

Since their individual capabilities (or the lack of them) proved to have strong associations with whether or not adolescents manifested self-hatred, the question arose as to what degree do the educational results of adolescent respondents affect their self-image. It turned out that, in general, school achievement has a limited influence on self-hatred. Admittedly, the comparison of the two groups of majority and minority students suggested, again, that weak educational performance had a greater impact on the self-image of majority students than on that of their "visible" or "other" minority peers. The rate concerning self-hatred represented by those majority students who have bad school results is twice as high as the corresponding proportion referring to poorly performing "visible" minorities.[52] It was assumed that various experiences of discrimination also influence students' self-image, and thus the manifestations of self-hatred as well. However, all our attempts at making comparisons among the manifestations of certain aspects by taking into account two or three dimensions at the same time have failed. The major methodological reasons behind the failure were spelled out in Chapter IV: the high proportion of missing responses and the experienced variations across countries in interpreting the notion of "discrimination" put limitations on the depth of allowable breakdowns of what is meant by "discrimination". . Furthermore, our aggregated database – due to the outlined concerns about the selection of samples – is inappropriate for an analysis of multiple variables that could ensure, on the one hand, the simultaneous acknowledgment of the material conditions and ethnic affiliations of the families as well as the degree of self-worth and the extent of discriminatory influences, and that would, on the other hand, allow for the establishment of causal relationships among the relevant constituents. Thus, it remains for the qualitative research to answer the question whether the relatively high rate of self-hatred among the subjects of ethnic

---

[52] The discussion of performance in Chapter III as well as some important findings of the qualitative research offer a more in-depth understanding of the factors behind the relatively low importance of school results in informing adolescents' self-image in certain ethnic minority groups. In the case of some self-contained communities that provide jobs, occupations, and clear patterns of the adult way of life within their own frames of reference, achievements in the outer world matter less than preserving the traditions that many young members of the community consider the decisive goal for their future lives (e.g., Pakistanis, certain Turkish communities). Furthermore, young people who live in desperate poverty and social exclusion and who have literally no chances for meaningful upward mobility develop a degree of disinterest: since they realistically cannot change the situation with increased personal efforts, they are inclined to give up and thus school performance becomes a marginal issue in their lives (this is frequently the case with Roma adolescents in Central Europe who react upon exclusion with apathy toward the school and schooling in general).

discrimination in destitute circumstances follows primarily from their deprived condition or the experiences of discrimination. A similar issue to be left for subsequent qualitative analyses would be to reveal the degree of influence that differentiation and marginalisation in the case of often disadvantaged "visible" minorities exerts on internalising a sense of worthlessness and a lack of respect as part of the self-image of the affected adolescents.

Visions about adult life

Existential aspects of the future

Concerning the set of themes about our students' ideas of the future, let us first see the responses given by adolescents regarding their existential perspectives: where one will live, what one will do, and whether one will have a family and children. These questions will be examined in terms of the present conditions, that is to say, the expectations of students will be analysed in terms of their living conditions, mobility trends, and places of residence. However, the relevance of our statements is limited due to the significant lack of responses with respect to such questions, and also because the subjects of research – adolescents – do not yet have mature ideas of these themes, which increases the frequency of uncertain responses in this age group.

No significant differences have been found among the various categories of respondents with respect to the questions regarding their future places of residence. Comparison based on gender shows that boys, especially those belonging to the majority, are a little more inclined to stay where they currently live than girls. Desires for mobility within the country are somewhat more characteristic of girls, independently from their background, than boys. Respondents belonging to the group of "other" minorities are somewhat overrepresented among those wishing to live abroad, whether in the place of origin or some other country.

A more detailed analysis of the comparative sample allows for shedding some light only on a few differences that cannot be easily interpreted based on the quantitative sample. Comparison of the samples of the participating countries reveals that Romania is outstanding for having the highest proportion of students, both pertaining to the majority and the "visible" minority, who as adults would prefer to stay in their own country. At the same time, in the Hungarian, Slovak, and – to a smaller extent – the Czech samples the ratios of those wanting to live abroad are higher than average. What is more, in the Hungarian sample there are no significant differences in this respect between the responses of the majority and Roma students.

A comparison based on ethnic background leads to the superficial observation that the desire to stay in the given country is slightly stronger among majority students than in other groups (about one-third of those belonging to the majority declared this wish), and there is no significant difference based on ethnic background between those intending to move to another settlement within their now home country and those wanting to live abroad (a little more than a fifth of them would like to stay in the country and slightly less, about 18 per cent, would prefer to live abroad).

At first sight, only commonplace statements can be made with respect to the students' plans regarding their future profession. In total, considering the entire sample, those wishing to obtain a white-collar job – if they have any ideas whatsoever – represent a majority. Taking into account the well-known data concerning the gendered structure of employment, it is not surprising that boys outnumber girls in envisioning some kind of blue-collar occupation, and relatively fewer imagine themselves in white-collar jobs. In this respect, there seems to be no difference between the respective proportions of responses given by students from majority or minority backgrounds.

However, the social status and/or educational degree of parents do affect the ideas of adolescents regarding their future careers. As one would expect, the research also confirmed that the higher their parents' educational attainment, the more likely would adolescents be to envision white-collar occupations in adult life. With the increase of the educational level of the parents, the rate of those supposing to have blue-collar jobs in the future becomes smaller: only 10 per cent belong to this group, while almost half of the students would like to have some professional position. This difference proves to be less sharp in the career ideas of children of uneducated or poorly educated parents: about one-fifth envision blue-collar jobs, and only one-third visualise white-collar occupations.

In comparing the rates of responses of adolescents along the line of ethnic belonging, a few differences can be discovered that, although not deviating from the main tendencies, are conspicuous because of their dimensions. The students belonging to "visible" minority groups, in cases where one of the parents has a university degree, imagine their future jobs as some kind of white-collar occupation in a proportion much above the average (59 per cent). This difference follows from the respective responses given, primarily, by students with a mixed or Black Caribbean ethnic background and also, though to a smaller degree yet still more likely than average, by children of Asian and Eastern European immigrants. The parents' educational degree also affects the responses of Roma students concerning their future occupation; however,

given the disadvantaged social background of most families and the usually low educational level of parents, the majority of them – though in inverse relation to the increasing education of the parents – think they will have blue-collar jobs in the future.

It seemed reasonable to compare students' plans regarding their future occupation with their parents' jobs and the social status of their families. As data referring to social mobility in the sample as well as regarding the actual social status of both the father and the mother are often insufficient – in the case of about 75 per cent of respondents, it is impossible to ascertain any trend of mobility, chiefly due to the complete absence of adequate responses in the German sample and also to the lack of responses in almost three-quarters of the samples in France and the United Kingdom – the valid data come, principally, from post-socialist countries, in particular, almost exclusively from the Czech, Hungarian, and Slovak samples. Nevertheless, the results concerning the mobility trends of boys and girls and, in the case of post-socialist countries, of the different minorities were examined as reflected by the existing data.

Taking into account the data relevant to this issue, students' intentions to reach a higher status compared to that of their original families' is stronger in the case of girls than boys, as suggested by ideas about future occupations. The highest aspirations for mobility characterise the Danish and French respondents, among them more girls than boys. While only slightly more than half of the boys targeted future occupations that may be instrumental in overcoming the present status of their families, this rate among girls was almost two-thirds in these countries. It was only in the Romanian sample that the desire for upward mobility was less characteristic of girls than boys: while half of the boys envisioned occupations ensuring higher status than that of their parents, the respective proportion was only 39 per cent among the girls . At the same time, valid responses in the United Kingdom show that there, among both boys and girls, the wish to overcome the social status of their parents is much weaker compared to the average of the entire sample (13 and 16 per cent). Data referring to mobility in the post-socialist countries reflect that adolescents from the "visible" minority group – the Roma – assume in greater proportions than their peers from the majority or "other" minorities that their future jobs will enable them to surpass the present status of their parental families (the rates are 50 per cent in the Roma group, while 41 and 39 per cent among students from majority and "other" minority backgrounds, respectively).

For the sake of outlining an aggregate picture, the assumptions and expectations referring to prognoses for the future based on the present circumstances were examined from the respondents' subjective point of view. Almost all groups – whether classified according to

country clusters or along ethnic lines – have an optimistic view of the future: the proportion of those envisioning a happier future than the present is almost twice as high as the rate of those imagining their future state to reach the level of their present living conditions, at best. The only exception to this rule is represented by the group of majority students living in countries of economic migration, where the respective rates of those with expectations for a brighter future and of those wishing to preserve their present conditions are identical. This difference is probably due to generally better starting conditions, suggested by multiple experiences. In other words, the already higher social status of their parental families is the basis of comparison for the students in these countries. The other striking deviation from the entire sample consists in the future visions of "visible" minorities. The respondents belonging to these groups, especially in post-colonial and post-socialist countries, are more eager in hoping for a change in their social situation and status for the better, as compared to those belonging to the majority or "other" minorities. However, it is impossible to infer from our data as to the factors behind this relatively more optimistic vision of the future characterising "visible" minorities. One possible explanation is that, at this age, adolescents do not necessarily have a realistic concept of the future, that is, they believe that they will be able to overcome the starting conditions – which, in their case, are worse than those of the rest – using their own resources, thus by studying and adapting to circumstances. A more positive presumption is that their optimism has to do with the political efforts in the given countries/societies to integrate minorities and prevent their marginalisation. These efforts may be transmitted to students by their schools, for instance, through the curriculum or the commitment of the school towards integration, but the quality of interethnic social and peer relations within and outside the school may have a similar impact on future visions. However, based solely on our survey data, these hypotheses can only be signalled and not properly verified: thus, these questions can only be answered to a satisfactory degree by qualitative analyses.

Table 5.8

Expected level of living in adult life in comparison to the present

Historical cluster of countries	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of those expecting		
		Better	Same	Worse
		future level of living in comparison to the present		

Post-colonial migration	Majority	65	31	4
	"Visible" minority	82	16	2
	"Other" minority	67	26	7
Economic migration	Majority	45	47	8
	"Visible" minority	77	19	4
	"Other" minority	65	30	5
Post-socialist transformation	Majority	65	33	2
	"Visible" minority	82	16	2
	"Other" minority	67	30	3

Aspects of future private life

As adults, the majority of our teenage respondents see themselves living in marriage or on the side of a partner. This statement seems to be valid despite the fact that about 20 per cent in the sample were unable to give a definite answer to this question. Thus, our analysis is limited to the actual responses in examining what qualities our respondents find important in a partnership. Seeing that social background and sometimes religion and ethnic belonging were clearly divisive factors in the sample regarding certain questions, both when examined by countries or based on ethnic belonging, we decided to select claims on the sameness of a would-be partner in the qualities that were offered in the questionnaire. (As described already in this chapter, one of the important criteria regarding strong religious devotion is precisely the prioritising of future partners with the same religious affiliation; thus, it should not be surprising that analysing this aspect involves a more detailed reiteration of some points made earlier.)

As expected, the data confirm that ethnic background also contributes to the choice of a future partner. Considering the entire sample, for majority respondents the most important criteria was the future partner's same ethnic belonging, while in the case of most minority respondents it was the sameness of religion. Regarding both categories, a partner's similar social status and circumstance remained secondary when compared to identical origins and religion, although among the majority there were more respondents claiming that this also was not an irrelevant precondition.

In examining the respective responses by countries, some peculiar patterns are found that remarkably deviate from those represented by the aggregated data for the sample as a whole. The most determined view about the sameness of ethnic belonging as an outstandingly important criterion, closely followed by the sameness of social background, was expressed by the Hungarian and Czech respondents. These two characteristics proved less important for Danish and French students, while it was here that identical religious belonging of the partner represented the most decisive requirement. For adolescents in the school communities in the United Kingdom, none of these criteria seemed important.

Further examination of the criteria in selecting a future spouse, taking into account country clusters as well as ethnic background, reinforces the impression that identical religion is important in the eyes of students primarily among "visible" minorities, especially in countries of economic migration (67 per cent), and also significantly, though to a lesser extent, in post-colonial countries (57 per cent). In these two country clusters, claims for a spouse coming from the same ethnic background are also relatively frequent among adolescents from "visible" minority backgrounds (48 and 32 per cent, respectively), especially when compared to their peers from the majority or "other" minority groups. However, the post-socialist country cluster showed a very different pattern. Here, distance – or even refusal – was manifested not by minorities but, in a pronounced way, by majority students towards those belonging to other ethnic groups or social layers. Choosing a partner of different origin in the future is out of question for more than half of the majority respondents, and one-third of them regard social background also as a decisive criterion of finding a partner.[53]

Table 5.9

Considerations in selecting a future spouse

Country	Proportion (%) of those for whom		
	Same social background	Same religion	Same ethnic origin
	matters in choosing future spouse		
Czech Republic	40	15	50
Denmark	30	47	35

---

[53] These findings show a high degree of consistency with those that were introduced and discussed in Chapter IV. Apparently, in the post-socialist societies, ethnic distancing is a deeply ingrained attitude of a substantial group of adolescents from the majority who consider it a "natural" and "self-evident" driving principle as much in the present as in their future lives.

France	12	44	27
Germany	25	35	29
Hungary	41	12	58
Romania	23	36	36
Slovakia	19	18	37
United Kingdom	18	27	20
Total	27	28	38

Social background also involves a perceptible impact on responses regarding the future partner. Concerning social status, among parts of the majority whose families are in a mediocre or explicitly good situation, sameness by both social and ethnic belonging carry more importance than in the case of those adolescents who come from less fortunate backgrounds. However, the inverse is true for their peers belonging to "visible" minorities. In this group, it is the most disadvantaged who attribute pronounced importance regarding the social background of their would-be partner. The importance attached to religious identity manifests an opposite tendency. This criterion is found more important by "visible" minorities, in particular, those from families in mediocre or upper positions, than by those belonging to the majority. In this latter group of ethnic affiliation, however, it is those in a disadvantaged situation who refer more frequently to the subjective importance of the same religious belonging of the future partner.

Table 5.10

Factors affecting the choice of partner according to country clusters and ethnic background

Historical cluster of countries	Ethnic background	Proportion (%) of those for whom		
		Same social background	Same religion	Same ethnic origin
		matters in choosing future spouse		
Post-colonial	Majority	14	19	18
	"Visible" minority	16	57	32

migration	"Other" minority	5	21	15
Economic migration	Majority	25	17	19
	"Visible" minority	32	67	48
	"Other" minority	19	29	22
Post-socialist transformation	Majority	32	20	51
	"Visible" minority	24	20	32
	"Other" minority	27	17	26

The majority of students project that their future lives will take place within a family, in particular, in a nuclear family. Their expectations hardly ever involve deliberate childlessness while living in a partnership, a single lifestyle, or the choice to live in an extended family. As this question was not raised for French respondents, and about a quarter of the interviewed students in the United Kingdom did not disclose their plans regarding their future family, the comparison of relevant answers covers only the remaining countries in the study, according to the students' different backgrounds and gender. At the same time, there are no significant differences among the various categories of students. Slightly more boys than girls said they wanted to live in a nuclear family with their partner and children, and this response was relatively more characteristic of the members of the majority and "other" minority groups. The somewhat distinct distribution of responses among "visible" minority students, as compared to the other groups, mainly follows from the more frequent mention of a vision to live in an extended family in adulthood. It is the members of Danish "visible" minorities who show the greatest inclination to live in an extended family – more than 10 per cent of them would choose this kind of lifestyle – followed by "visible" minority respondents in the Czech, Slovak, and the United Kingdom samples. Gender belonging also has an impact on the frequencies of ideas about living in an extended family among "visible" minorities: it looks like boys are more attached to family and community traditions than girls.

More than 75 per cent of the entire sample intends to have children. This desire was more frequently expressed by girls than boys, whether belonging to the majority or to "visible" or "other" minorities. What is more, girls are more determined in having children, and they want more children than boys. With respect to the projected number of children, there are differences,

forming distinct patterns, according to country clusters as well. Although the most attractive family formation appears to be a family with two children in the three country clusters, the intention to have three or more children is also frequent among the respondents from "visible" and "other" minorities in post-colonial countries (17–18 per cent). In countries of economic migration, too, slightly more want to have three or more children in the mentioned groups, as compared to the majority, although this plan is assumed only by 12–13 per cent of the students. In post-socialist countries, however, the two-child family model has so much appeal that more than half of the respondents, irrespective of their ethnic background, would prefer to follow this otherwise dominant model in the region. The characteristics of one's parental family or the number of siblings do not exercise a significant influence on family planning either, although "visible" minority students living in single-parent families seem to be more inclined to opt for a single lifestyle or a partnership deliberately without any children. However, as the number of those hesitating or refusing to answer is high with respect to these questions, only tendencies can be inferred, while substantial conclusions cannot be drawn from the results.

Desires and fears regarding the future

The closing questions of the questionnaire allowed students to formulate, in a free and open style, their hopes and concerns regarding the future. Responses were then categorised according to the fields of life that their desires and fears referred to: employment, subsistence, private life – i.e., family and social relations – some kind of general vision of the future, or any combinations of these elements. In light of the emerging categories, the different groups of respondents were compared, using the previous breakdowns, in order to see, at least at a statistical level, the impact of gender, origins, social situation, and the surrounding social environment on students' visions of the future.

Regarding the occurrence of distinct desires and fears, and with respect to the complex categories summarising these sensations, there are a few typical differences between boys and girls that are in accordance with prevailing gender stereotypes. For instance, a greater percentage of girls than boys expressed desires concerning their future family, and more of them gave manifestations of fears and anxieties with reference to their personal and social relations. At the same time, both girls and boys, almost to the same extent, mentioned primarily their ideas and worries regarding employment and subsistence. This was not surprising, since, as already seen, girls as well as boys intend to work in the future: the rate of those who imagine adult life staying

at home and being busy with domestic duties is insignificant and, irrespective of their gender belonging, students assume their future partner will also be engaged in gainful employment.

When, in turn, ethnic background is also taken into account besides gender, it looks like the joint effect of gender and ethnicity – at least in a significant part of the cases – results in attributing greater significance to compliance with the traditions of the minority group of one's own than to living according to the expectations represented by the social majority, as far as the future visions of both girls and boys are concerned. In these cases, the system of norms held by students tends to be affected not so much by the "emancipated" majority model but by the gender norms of the group itself. While there were no gender differences among majority students in the occurrence of references to desires about employment and subsistence, among their peers from minority backgrounds – especially "visible" minority groups – it was boys who had a stronger tendency than girls to attach central significance to this issue in their future visions. However, when data referring to the future were examined according to country clusters and based on ethnic belonging, no significant differences were found among the various categories of respondents.

Identity strategies

Finally, on the basis of the data presented in Table 5.11, let us try to summarise the identity strategies and identity categories of our ethnic minority respondents, by using some compound variables.[54]

The majority of students from minority backgrounds in the aggregated sample – irrespective of their gender – are located somewhere halfway on the axis of drives toward becoming integrated/keeping traditions. One part of them is able to realise integration into the majority society through intimate interethnic relationships, while another part is almost devoid of such relations. However, the process of integration into the majority society – occasionally involving, especially for children of families keen on preserving traditions, conflicts with their own communities and refusing their traditions, culture, and family customs – necessarily affects the self-evaluation and self-image of the adolescent in question. The ways and forms of distancing oneself from one's own group and approaching the expectations of the majority society that influence self-esteem are obviously greatly determined by the degree of openness of the immediate environment, peers, friends, and the surrounding society in accepting people who are "visibly" different. As seen above, attempts at becoming integrated into the majority may be supported by friends and relations at school – whether belonging to the same or other social layers and religious or ethnic groups – by demonstrating acceptance of the "other" with all his/her personal givens, thus enabling representatives of "otherness" to see themselves in a positive light. However, in the case of another well-definable group of students, the lack of recognition or explicit refusal and exclusion frustrate their self-esteem. In extreme situations, the loss (or original lack) of a familiar environment provided by one's own community, as well as experiences of refusal and marginalisation by the social majority regarded as the reference group, lead to self-hatred and a negative identity. (Obviously, we are aware that many other conditions, important in a person's psychological makeup but unknown to us, also contribute to self-image and identity, determining the various identity categories and the related identity

---

[54] For making the content of the statistical analysis clear, let us reiterate here the build-up of the variables that we use in the discussion of strategies and identity categories. Attempts at becoming integrated into the majority or the maintenance of traditions were measured by two compound variables highlighting the ignorance or, in contrast, the central importance of mother tongue, that is distinct from that of the majority, and of the same ethnic background in the selection of friends, partners, and future spouses. Positive or disturbed identity was ascertained by categorising those who were satisfied with their outward and inside characteristics alike and who received sufficient respect from their peers as to their positive identity, while those giving a negative response to all or most of the questions relevant to this issue were qualified as having troubled identity.

strategies of adolescents; however, these more subtle factors can hardly be revealed by the methodology of a questionnaire-based survey.)

The more detailed analysis has also shown that a positive self-image influenced by existing interethnic relations is characteristic, especially of ethnic minority groups where the need to maintain traditions is stronger than in the case of other ethnicities. The coincidence of these two tendencies is the most noticeable among our Asian or Muslim respondents, including "visible" minority groups in the German, Danish, French, and United Kingdom samples. It is in the Black African and Caribbean group, with hardly anyone wanting to be separated from the majority society in order to preserve traditions and truly close interethnic relationships, where the rate of balanced and positive self-image is the highest. The only "visible" ethnic group with an equal share of students having or lacking interethnic relations (43–42 per cent) and the smallest rate of members who are satisfied with, and have formed a positive image of, themselves are the Roma.

Table 5.11

Intra-group percentages of occurrences of different minority identity strategies and identity categories

Characteristics	Strong attempts at becoming integrated into the mainstream	Halfway toward becoming integrated, intimate interethnic relations		Halfway toward becoming integrated, no intimate interethnic relations		Strong attempts at keeping traditions
		Positive self-image	Insecure self-image	Positive self-image	Insecure self-image	
GENDER						
Boy	11	15	40	5	22	7
Girl	9	11	43	3	23	9
ETHNIC/NATIONAL BACKGROUND						
Roma	9	5	38	4	38	7
Eastern Europeans	18	11	38	3	22	8
Asian	2	18	48	5	14	15
Muslim	4	18	48	5	12	13
"Black" groups*	8	24	47	5	15	1
Developed country	14	21	40	5	13	8
Mixed identity	13	7	38	2	32	7
COUNTRY						
Czech Republic	4	3	34	7	47	6

Denmark	6	9	47	5	21	12
France	11	21	48	4	12	3
Germany	10	16	46	5	12	12
Hungary	25	5	32	-	36	1
Romania	9	9	39	3	38	-
Slovakia	3	3	30	5	46	13
United Kingdom	18	17	37	2	16	10

* Black Africans and all of the Caribbean.

In reviewing the parts of the analysis dealing with social identity, self-evaluation, and the vision of the future from several respects, it seems obvious that the effects of gender, social status, and religious and ethnic belonging are not separate factors but are exercised in conjunction, and become determining for urban youth, not just in a direct manner but also as they are mediated by society and realised in certain social conditions. Thus, for instance – at least as suggested by the students' samples in the participating countries – though being a member of a "visible" ethnic minority primarily encompasses both distinct traditions and religious belonging other than that of the majority, it does not entail the danger of simultaneous social marginalisation where the majority tends to be more tolerant towards minorities, and where minorities themselves try to maintain their distinctions that attaches them to their origins and family traditions, as is the case in post-colonial countries and countries of recent economic migration. But in post-socialist countries, particularly as shown by the Slovak, Hungarian, and Czech samples, a "visible" minority like the Roma are indiscernible from the majority either on account of religion or cultural otherness, but primarily because of their deprived condition. Here, the majority apparently does not promote their acceptance but rather rejects them, so that they are not only excluded from everyday life at present but also from any potential cooperation in the future. On the one hand, this exclusion is obvious, since the majority of Roma students in the researched communities attend segregated schools that select among the students – partly – on ethnic grounds. At the same time, as several examples have shown, exclusion is also realised in indirect ways, through interpersonal relationships and accompanying symbolic practices. The inverse relations in these countries, as compared to their Western counterparts – meaning that it is not the minority that strives to preserve its otherness but the majority that does not allow "others" to join them, refusing and excluding them from the intimate relationships and the relatively privileged life they enjoy – seem to confirm the results of research on prejudices conducted in these countries as well as the outcomes of investigations on values concerning increasing xenophobia and intolerance (European Social Survey 2009).

An appropriate interpretation of our data leads to the conclusion that our results are not so much about the characteristics of different ethnic minorities, or the efforts and attitudes of these groups, but the findings rather reflect the attitude of majority societies towards minorities, their readiness for acceptance, or inclination for refusal. We are aware that our survey cannot provide a representative picture of minority politics – and the educational policies from the perspective of the age group examined – of the participating countries as they were, thus insights of this

study are reduced to the interethnic experiences affecting the identity of students belonging to the communities and attending the schools under investigation. Valid statements about identity and identity strategies based on survey samples can only be made after summarising the results of background studies and community studies using qualitative methods.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has given an account of the conditions and the daily working of education by enquiring 14–17-year-old students attending schools in multiethnic working-class communities in eight selected European countries. By putting young people from ethnic minority backgrounds into the focus, the comparative processing of our data has revealed important differences as well as a range of overarching commonalities in how their relations in the school and the broader environment are shaped, what their ideas and actual prospects for the immediate future are, and how they envision their lives in adulthood.

Before summarising the main conclusions of the analysis, it is important to determine with due accuracy the frame of generalisations that interviewing adolescents in *selected classes* of *selected schools* in *selected communities* of *selected European societies* allows for. As has been pointed out during the discussion, the results are not representative in the strict statistical sense of the term: selection according to the principles of representative sampling was not the aim of this research. Instead, communities, schools, and classes were chosen for investigation with regard to some general shared qualities deemed relevant to the major questions of the comparative research project. In more concrete terms, this survey – as well as the qualitative studies that follow – has aimed to shed light on the factors and processes that – by being firmly embedded in larger-scale divisions in social structures, interethnic relations, and systems of schooling – are impacting the daily operation of education and the arising opportunities, personal relations, and identities of youths from different social and ethnic backgrounds in important ways. It was assumed from the outset that the involved relations and reflections are imprinted by the long dureé of the history of interethnic cohabitation and are deeply ingrained by the conditions and qualities of democratic polity as well. In other words, in addition to scrutinising micro-level structures and relations in order to reveal the prevailing patterns in communities at close proximity, the EDUMIGROM project has aimed, from the time of its conception, to engage in the simultaneous application of macro-level perspectives that allow for the observation of the involved issues in their broader historical and socio-political contexts.

In the forthcoming series of reports that will present the comparative analyses of our extensive quantitative and qualitative field research in the selected communities, this comparative study of our survey data provides the first opportunity to revisit the original ideas of the research design and critically examine their applicability and relevance.

In summarising the major results of our endeavour, we aim to point to a few important lessons that seem to carry implications well beyond just a clustering of schools and communities in four "old" and four "new" member states in the European Union.

Our data confirm two crucial aspects that earlier cross-country comparative studies in education have revealed (OECD 2006, OSI EUMAP 2007, Heckmann et al. 2008, Crul and Schneider 2009b). First, the children of "visible" minorities (be they of immigrant or Roma backgrounds) are continually exposed to conditions and daily practices in their schooling that conclude in remarkable relative disadvantages in their achievement and advancement. Moreover, these conditions and practices keep on to provide the base for an unceasing reproduction of ethnic inequalities with ever decreasing chances of individual breaking through the complex of obstacles to enjoy opportunities and prospects that are equal to those of their peers from the majority.. Second, among the intersecting social, economic, and ethno-cultural components that are at play beyond the sharply unequal outcomes, institutionalised selection among and within schools that is driven by socio-ethnic distinctions is a factor of outstanding importance.

Beyond confirming these facts, our results provide important additions to these two, partly interrelated, known aspects of the workings of European societies and schools.

First, the study revealed that despite the commonalities produced by relative deprivation shared in their now home countries, the broad category of "students from immigrant backgrounds" is far from being homogenous. It is commonplace to state that this large group is composed of people from different countries and cultures who carry extremely diverse private and collective histories and whose conglomerate is fractured by the time of their arrival and the length of time that has allowed them to adapt to their new surroundings. However, it is a new and important finding of our survey that meaningful *structural* divisions are appearing that sharply distinguish two large sections along an important trait: the immediate visibility of being "different".

Across the analyses, the differences between "visible" and "other" minorities came up with unmistakable clarity. The concept of "other" minorities is somewhat euphemistic: it comprises migrants (and members of so-called "national" minorities) who originate from countries that political philosophy would identify by their shared traditions, values, and principles of the trinity of Christianity, Enlightenment, and Modernity. In other words, the immigrant groups in question, for the most part, are from European backgrounds – these days mostly coming from Eastern and Central Europe – or have become "Europeanised" by mixed

marriages generations ago. In a somewhat simplified yet expressive way, we can denote them as "white" migrants, in contrast to those groups that make up the "visible" category.

Although our "white" migrant adolescents live in rather similar circumstances to their peers of "visible" migrant descent – who, incidentally, are not so far from the means and conditions of how adolescents from a "majority background" live in their proximity – there is an important aspect that significantly diverts their schooling and opportunities for advancement: this is their conditional acceptance by the surrounding dominant majority. In other words, while both groups are in relatively disadvantaged positions in and outside the schools, and while both have less freedom of choice in advancing toward adulthood than their peers from the majority, all our findings show that "other" groups from "white" immigrant backgrounds are better and more tolerantly accepted by their social environment and enjoy more opportunities than their "visible" counterparts. It follows that the former are less exposed to the overarching European phenomenon of "white flight", their opportunities to study and socialise with peers from the majority are apparently better, and their forwarding toward the valuable segments and units of the competitive secondary level of education is more supported by their schools, teachers, and the community-at-large than is the case with youth from the "visibly" different groups.

The promising signs for inclusion on the part of the dominant ("hosting") majority induce intense striving for becoming integrated among "white" migrant adolescents that further distance them from the groups whose members they – as well as the majority around – consider the "other" and to whom they frequently relate in ways driven by attitudes of supremacy and attempts at "othering". The remarkable differences and explicit inequalities between groups of young people who belong to "visible" and "other" minorities, to the detriment of the former, signal new tensions and new conflicts. Inspired by a set of troubling concomitants of the systemic changes upon the collapse of state socialism and driven by strong hopes for a quick change for the better in their everyday circumstances and the attainment of unconditional social inclusion, the recent and extensive influx of migrants from Eastern and Central Europe to the Western half of the continent (and to a lesser degree, within the post-socialist region) seems to have generated a heated rivalry among migrant groups for securing their share of the shrinking socio-economic pie. Additionally, fierce competition for diminishing jobs and placements is accompanied by the collective attempts of the "white" groups at "minoritising" the "visibly" different members in their community, whereby the old coalitions of migrant solidarity are fading away and the risks of marginalisation and exclusion on ethnic grounds are magnified.

At the same time, our study also revealed remarkable differentiation within the large and heterogeneous group of "visible" minorities. These differences are organised around powerful divides in the histories of interethnic cohabitation that have been at play in shaping the European welfare regimes and also the socio-political arrangements for representing the often conflicting interests of the "majority" and the "minorities". Among the participating countries in our research, three well-definable clusters could be identified: communities in societies with a post-colonial past; those where interethnic relations have been forged by an ongoing mutual learning about the social implications of relatively recent migration that has been motivated, in turn, by economic needs; and, finally, the communities of the post-socialist region where cohabitation between the majorities (and often: traditional national minorities) and Roma groups is characterised by deeply rooted anti-Roma prejudices, often aggressive attempts at separation, and manifold ways of institutionalised social exclusion.

Our survey data brought up remarkable differences in the life, schooling, and opportunities of young people – all "visibly" different from the majority of the social environment that they are part of – according to these three historical arrangements. However, the differences are not gradual. Instead, a clear line of demarcation divides these groups into two sharply distinguishable segments: the large conglomerate of "visible" minorities from immigrant backgrounds, on the one hand, and native Roma, on the other. The foundation of this partition is the traditional "East-West" divide, or if phrased in another way: it is the contrasting formations of interethnic cohabitation that are conditioned by clearly distinguishable institutions, rights, and ways and forms of interpersonal relations in the established old democracies and in their new siblings in Central Europe, respectively.

The differences in the qualities of the democratic polity between the "old" and "new" members of the European Union have far-fetched implications for departures in the socio-political implications of citizenship. As for the first set of countries, while young people from "visible" minority ethnic background often experience significant disadvantages that impact their conditions in schooling as well as their attainable achievements and furtherance that may end, in turn, in marginalised circumstances and positions, they are still protected by a set of rights and provisions, and especially, by certain elaborated forms of collective representation – whereby they remain parts of the prevailing socio-political arrangement that is founded on the thorough observance of the human, political, and social rights as the constituents of inclusionary citizenship. In contrast, there is little of the rights, provisions, and political institutions that would protect Roma in the post-socialist world: like their parents in the arenas of labour and welfare, Roma youth frequently face harsh exclusion and racialised "ghettoisation" in education

and beyond, and furthermore, such experiences have been accompanied in recent years by an open questioning of their citizens' rights by vocal and influential groups within the domestic majorities. Such abrasive attempts at exclusion (sometimes even at expulsion) have clearly left devastating marks on interethnic relations among classmates at schools and harmfully impacted the development of identity and the aspirations for the future of a large number of affected Roma groups.

In comparison to such a sharp "East-West" divide, differences in the conditions and opportunities of descendants of one-time migrants in the clusters of societies characterised by post-colonial and economic migration seem to be only gradual. Although the issue requires further research, we can say on the grounds of our survey data that, by and large, adolescents belonging to "visible" minorities in the post-colonial world consider themselves members of the society where they were born in a more "customary" manner than the respective groups in the countries of economic migration. The prevalent attitudes in the two large groups from second-generation migrant backgrounds leave their marks on their interethnic contacts within and outside the school and also on their longer-term aspirations considering adulthood. While mixing with peers from the majority and forming friendships across ethnic lines appear as routine practices in the post-colonial communities, young people from ethnic minority backgrounds in the countries of economic migration – especially Muslim youths – rather seem to make strong efforts to remain within the boundaries of their own group and confine all their intimate relations to the ethnic community. Likewise, while in the post-colonial communities, ethnic minority adolescents share, for the most part, identical plans for educational advancement with their peers from the majority in similar socio-economic positions, in the countries of economic migration, ethnic divisions play an important role on their own: separate education along a distinct curriculum in independent ethnic schools under the control of the Muslim community appears here as a widespread claim of both parents and children. The departing attitudes and aspirations point toward distinct ideas on adulthood. While strong strivings for becoming integrated into the mainstream society are prevalent among ethnic minority adolescents in the post-colonial countries, their peers in the countries of economic migration emphasise rather to protect their own ethnic groups through preserving the traditions of their ancestors and rely with exclusivity on the internal networks of the community. These distinguishing aspects have some implications on schooling: provided that their socio-economic and educational backgrounds are similar, children of "visible" migrant families in the post-colonial countries seem to face less risk of becoming severely marginalised within the school community than their peers in countries of economic migration, but even more importantly,

descendants of the "old" migrant groups living in the former historical cluster of societies appear to suffer less refusal from the cohabitating majority (and "other" migrants) than those in the "new" – mostly Muslim – migrant communities.

At the same time, our data testify to efficient protection of their historical and cultural roots by the cohesive ethnic communities. "New" Muslim groups in the countries of economic migration are not lagging behind their "older" ethnic-cultural kin in organising themselves in France, nor do they exhibit less commitment in their struggles for recognition than their counterparts (partly of non-Muslim faiths) in the United Kingdom. These strivings are reflected by manifestations of strong self-reliance and a healthy self-esteem often driven by ethnic pride among their children in our schools and whose commitment to be different, despite frequent aversion, is apparently respected by their peers, teachers, and neighbours from the majority.

Our survey richly demonstrates how schools are affected by the important divisions above and how they also can become agents maintaining, legitimising, and reproducing these very divisions. Against the complexities of the historically shaped and varying systems of schooling in the participating countries, our research rather revealed the general tendencies of attempts to select students by their socio-ethnic backgrounds. Such processes of selection are often givens for the individual schools: the educational units in question come into being as passive "sufferers" of larger-scale changes in the composition of the broadly defined community that are driven, in turn, by geographic and socio-demographic movements and the observance of rights for the free choice of school and tracks in schooling. At the same time, in a fierce competition that characterises the school systems in both halves of Europe, schools themselves often become active agents in the process of selection and justify such conduct by public pressure to raise achievement and productivity (that usually come in an irresistible way from the powerful groups of the local majority) .

Whether they should be owed to spontaneous processes or deliberate decisions, selection in the primary phase of compulsory education clearly works to the detriment of students from ethnic minority backgrounds – though their peers in disadvantaged homes from the majority seemingly share the same fate. The study revealed the vicious circles behind these developments. Driven by the prime value of marketable achievements from the start, schools and teachers usually do not have the time, energy, and knowledge to invest into reducing inequalities in knowledge (especially, in commanding the language of instruction) early enough; as a consequence, students from ethnic minority and/or deprived social backgrounds become undervalued, and their relatively poor school results then provide the grounds to separate them

from the better-achieving groups of schoolmates – and from here onwards, the process works in a self-perpetuating way. At the time of concluding the primary phase, students' school results function as a "base for exchange": the better one's grades are from an acknowledged school, the better are his or her opportunities to freely choose among schools for the next stage – and together with this, more or less, among the potentials for future life.

The patterns in the distribution of opportunities are clear: it seems that adolescents from "visible" minorities and their socially deprived peers face, with little variation among our societies, hardly correctable relative disadvantages in comparison to the mainstream. The prevailing inequalities are all the more unjust and irritating because commitment to long-term participation in education has become a dominant attitude among the contemporary generation, and children from minority backgrounds often even supersede their majority peers in the strength of their dedication to learn and advance.

While the described tendencies prevail in all the communities that are the focus of this survey and probably beyond, there are remarkable differences in the sharpness of selection and the implied manifestations of ethnic-social segregation. The arising patterns of difference by and large follow the above-indicated clustering of societies by the historically forged ways, forms, and institutional arrangements of interethnic relations. With variations in the Western democracies where selection – irrespective of being driven by forces of voluntary separation of certain minorities or by their dismissal on the part of powerful groups within the majority – also concludes in disadvantages regarding attained school achievement and advancement, yet again, the genuine demarcation line runs between societies on the two sides of the Elbe River. Selection both upward and downward is very strong in Central Europe: this is the only region where schools exclusively for the best-positioned groups of the majority are set up as "ordinary" parts of the *public* system, while segregating poor Roma into schools "just for them" is an even more customary and disturbingly widespread phenomenon. It is no surprise that, considering their standing according to measured achievement and opportunities for furtherance, Roma adolescents suffer irreconcilable disadvantages and prospects that terminate social exclusion en masse.

At the same time, our survey revealed that the current generation of socially and ethnically "othered" youth does not take the indicated "undisturbed" reproduction of inequalities, discrimination, and disadvantages as a "natural" or "acceptable" development. Claims for social inclusion in education are intense and widespread – and in this regard, Roma adolescents share attitudes (though not the voice) with their Western peers. In our reading, cognisance of the

nature of deprivations and claims for an alteration are the first steps toward engaging in struggles for recognition that, in turn, might (or at least, are hoped to) result in renegotiating the prevailing arrangements in schooling – and beyond – and implementing meaningful structural reforms that facilitate a shift toward more equality and true inclusion.

We are aware that such deep reforms will hardly come about in the near future. Rather, the current post-crisis state of the European economies and welfare states seems to set the grounds for fierce fights among the most powerful social groups to maintain the status quo of privileges, and it is not difficult to see that such a state of affairs does not favour generosity and solidarity toward those with certainly less power in both the economic and political sense of the term. In order to avoid the loosening of cohesion and the weakening of the democratic functioning of their societies, even the mentioned groups have, however, a good deal of interest to invest into a better, more just, and more inclusive system of education.

During the process of analysing the data of our survey, the cornerstones of such gradual reforms have taken shape before us. While an elaborated and comprehensive discussion of them will come in a future reflection on our insightful qualitative materials at a later stage, let us briefly indicate three of them here.

First, even without any fundamental change in the system and prevailing arrangements of schooling, important steps can be made on the level of communities toward reducing selection as the greatest evil of comprehensive compulsory education. Our survey revealed a truly complex picture in this regard. The data show that selection by ethnicity and social standing tend to go hand in hand and conclude in a high concentration of disadvantaged children – both from majority *and* minority backgrounds – in schools (often in classes) that are dominated by ethnic minority students. The cumulative impact of deprivations in these segregated units results in a marked lowering of achievements, strongly limited options for advancement, and deeply troubled interethnic relations (the latter tend to become particularly harsh in case of intra-school separation). At the same time, our results clearly show the advantages of ethnically and socially mixed schools in providing an inspiring environment for *all* their students, who not only perform better than those studying in an environment of ethnic and social separation but also develop a range of important social skills, rich networks of interethnic togetherness, and a remarkable degree of intercultural understanding. Although there are significant variations in this landscape according to the voluntary or involuntary (passively suffered) motivations behind separation and also in its intensity, the major trends are clear and speak for ethnic and social mixing among students and a multiethnic composition of teaching staff. In the light of these associations and,

concomitantly, in the hope of openness on the part of the involved actors, it should be a primary goal for municipal educational authorities to mobilise a wide range of incentives, regulations, and rewards to hinder ethnic and social segregation and invigorate commixing across all social strata. (It is a matter for further elaboration to consider those inducements that slow down the spontaneous moves of "white flight" and that can be of assistance to also make the initiated alterations attractive in the eyes of the powerful groups of the local majority.)

Second, in recognition of the fact that a substantial proportion of students enter the schools of compulsory education with a poor command of the language of instruction, the early equalisation and harmonisation of language skills among children from ethnic minority and majority backgrounds should be a primary concern in education. As our data show, extra language programmes at school usually come too late and are not of genuine assistance. As it is ever more frequently mentioned in the literature on this topic, proper development requires the appropriate conditions and targeted modules of education from the early nursery years onwards. Besides implementing such new programmes suggested by reform pedagogy, efforts should be made to observe the linguistic and cultural harmony also within the families and communities of the large groups of children involved. For sure, success would imply close cooperation with the affected ethnic community and also among representatives of a wide range of professions including linguists, nursery and school teachers, community activists, and social workers.

Third, the ways of acknowledgement, reward, and punishment should undergo profound changes in all our societies. Our survey data clearly demonstrate the "undeserved" power that grading enjoys. While we are aware of the strong bond between widespread interests for maintaining the system of "measured achievements" as the legitimising force in selection for advancement, on the one hand, and as an efficient tool in reducing the costs of distribution on the labour market, on the other, it is primarily youth from ethnic minority backgrounds who pay an unjust and high price in exchange. Due to the above indicated long-term implications of a weak command of the dominant language and also to prevailing "holes" in the cultural capital even among better educated families from such backgrounds, the achievements that schools acknowledge result in grades for their children that remain below those of the greater part of their majority peers. Since grades carry strong "gate-keeping" functions, disadvantages in furtherance and the freedom of choice regarding one's adult way of life are almost automatically assured to the detriment of children coming from ethnic minority communities. Obviously, simply the abolition of grading in early schooling would not bring about profound changes. Nevertheless, implementing new forms of assessment and adjusting them to the cultural diversities that are in place in contemporary European schools could make important steps

toward inclusion, also with significant implications for ethno-cultural recognition and enriched forms of interethnic cohabitation.

It is clear for us that the three aspects outlined above to make compulsory education more attractive and more efficient for Europe's fast-growing ethnic minority populations require very different degrees of change with remarkably different actors and forms of support in the background. After all, combating segregation presupposes the emergence of powerful new social and political coalitions across a wide social landscape; a greater focus on developing and equalising language skills is founded on the claims of the affected communities and the professional bodies in education; finally, attempts at reforming the ways and forms of performance assessment necessitate dialogue and cooperation along the educational hierarchy and among the schools and the stakeholders of the market. Furthermore, steps against segregation affect the structure of schooling with broad public involvement, while issues of students' language skills and those of performance assessment are mainly related to the content and processing of education and are largely considered as internal affairs of those who may be immediately affected.

Due to all these substantial differences, reforming the three arenas requires profoundly different strategies and very different lengths of time. It is not our task here to go into the implied details. However, the principle that may unite the indicated attempts toward a desirable change and that may turn them into mutually supportive contributions to the same ultimate goal is clear: it is the *principle of equality* as the foundation of inclusionary citizenship. The translation of this principle to the sphere of education brings ethnicity into the spotlight. Any serious attempts at modifying the prevailing status quo that is characterised by marked inequalities, inequities, and injustices on ethnic grounds would make necessary a first step: namely, to acknowledge that ethnic minority belonging currently proves to be a dangerously potent hindrance in attaining equal citizenship, and that the curtailments of the citizens' rights of minority youths largely follow from the reluctant adaptation of the structures, ways, and forms of schooling to the new conditions of marked ethnic heterogeneity. Looked upon from this broader perspective, new initiatives and reforms that address the needs of today's deprived ethnic minority groups do not only serve greater equality and increased efficiency in the education system but can also be considered as meaningful contributions in re-strengthening the working of Europe's democracies and welfare states. Taken in such a generalised context, the three indicated terrains of a generous educational reform could carry important implications well beyond their immediate scope of action and professional domain.

REFERENCES

Braddock, Jommils H. and J.M. McPartland (1982) Assessing School Desegregation Effects: New Directions in Research. *Research in Sociology of Education and Socialization*. Vol. 3, pp. 209–282.

Christensen, Gayle and Petra Stanat (2007) *Language Policies and Practices for Helping Immigrants and Second-generation Students.* Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Crul, Maurice and Jens Schneider (2009a) Children of Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands: The Impact of Differences in Vocational and Academic Tracking Systems. *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 111, No. 6. (Available online: http://www.tiesproject.eu).

Crul, Maurice and Jens Schneider (2009b) The Second Generation in Europe: Education and the Transition to the Labour Market. (Available online: http://www.tiesproject.eu).

Crul, Maurice and Mark Thomson (2007) The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How Is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 7, pp. 1025–1041.

European Commission (1998) *European Credit Transfer System. ECTS Users' Guide*. Brussels: European Commission, 31 March.

European Commission (2008) *Green Paper on Migration & Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Education Systems. (Communication COM (2008)0423*). Brussels: European Commission.

European Social Survey (2009) *Exploring Public Attitudes, Informing Public Policy.* (Available online: http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org).

Feischmidt, Margit, Vera Messing, and Mária Neményi (2010) *Community Study Report: Hungary* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Felouzis, Georges, Barbara Fouquet-Chauprade, Claire Schiff, and Evelyne Barthou (2010) Ethnic Differences in Education in France: Survey Report. *Edumigrom Survey Studies.* Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (Available online: http://www.edumigrom.eu/working-papers).

Fučík, Petr, Martina Haltufová, Radim Marada, and Michal Nekorjak (2010) Ethnic Differences in Education in the Czech Republic: Survey Report. *Edumigrom Survey Studies.* Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (Available online: http://www.edumigrom.eu/working-papers).

Gilliam, Laura (2005) "Det er os, der laver ballade": Etniske minoritetsbørns erfaringer ien københavnsk folkeskole. ["It is us who make troubles": Minority ethnic childrens' experiences in a Copenhagen primary school]. In: L. Gilliam, K.F. Olwig, and K. Valentin (eds.) *Lokale liv, fjerne forbindelser. Studier af børn, unge og migration.* København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Heckmann, Friedrich *et al.* (2008) *Education and Migration*. Brussels: European Commission.

Holdaway, Jennifer, Maurice Crul, and Catrin Roberts (2009) Cross-National Comparison of Provision and Outcomes for the Education of the Second Generation. *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 111, No.6. (Available online: http://www.tiesproject.eu).

Kahn, Alfie (1999) *Punished by Rewards*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Keesing-Styles, Linda (2003) The Relationship between Critical Pedagogy and Assessment in Teacher Education. *Radical Pedagogy*, Vol. 5, No. 1, reprint.

Kritikos, Elvira and Charlene Ching (2005) *Study on Access to Education and Training: Basic Skills and Early School Leavers*. London: GHK.

Kroneberg, Clemens (2008) Ethnic Communities and School Performance among the New Second Generation in the United States: Testing the Theory of Segmented Assimilation. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 620, No.1, pp. 138–160.

Kusá, Zuzana, Dávid Kostlán, Peter Dráľ, and Jurina Rusnáková (2010a) Ethnic Differences in Education in Hungary: Survey Report. *Edumigrom Survey Studies.* Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (Available online: http://www.edumigrom.eu/working-papers).

Kusá, Zuzana, David Kostlán, and Jurina Rusnáková (2010b) *Community Study Report: Slovakia* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Luciak, Mikael (2004) *Migrants, Minorities and Education*. Vienna: European Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).

Magyari, Nándor L. and Enikő Vincze (2009) *Survey Report: Romania.* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Marada, Radim, Michal Nekorjak, Adéla Souralová, and Klára Vomastková (2010) *Community Study Report: Czech Republic* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Messing, Vera, Mária Neményi, and Júlia Szalai (2010) Ethnic Differences in Education in Hungary: Survey Report. *Edumigrom Survey Studies.* Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (Available online: http://www.edumigrom.eu/working-papers).

Moldenhawer, Bolette, Tina Kallehave, and Sune Jon Hansen (2010) *Community Study Report: Denmark* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

OECD (2006) *Where Immigrant Students Succeed. A Comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2007) *PISA 2006 Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World.* Paris: OECD.

OECD (2008) *Education at a Glance 2008*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2009) *Education at a Glance 2009: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD.

Ohliger, Rainer (2009) *Survey Report: Germany.* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

OSI EUMAP (2007) *Equal Access to Quality Education for Roma*. *Vols. 1–2.* Budapest: Open Society Institute.

Schiff, Claire (2010) *Community Study Report: France* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Schofield, Janet W. (1991) School Desegregation and Intergroup Relations: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Research in Education,* Vol. 17, pp. 335–409.

Strassburger, Gaby (2010) *Community Study Report: Germany* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Swann, Sarah and Ian Law (2010a) Ethnic Differences in Education in England: Survey Report. *Edumigrom Survey Studies.* Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (Available online: http://www.edumigrom.eu/working-papers).

Swann, Sarah and Ian Law (2010b) *Community Study Report: England.* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Tajfel, Henri (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, Henri (1982) Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. *Annual Review of Psychology,* Vol. 33, pp. 1–39.

Thomsen, Jens Peter, Bolette Moldenhawer, and Tina Kallehave (2010) Ethnic Differences in Education in Denmark: Survey Report. *Edumigrom Survey Studies.* Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (Available online: http://www.edumigrom.eu/working-papers).

Vincze, Enikő (2010) *Community Study Report: Romania* (EDUMIGROM Report). Manuscript, Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.