

JULIA SZALAI, MARCUS CARSON, ZUZANA KUSA,
ENIKO MAGYARI-VINCZE AND VIOLA ZENTAI

Comparative Report on Educational Policies for Inclusion



The research leading to these results has been conducted under the auspices of the project EDUMIGROM: Ethnic Differences in Education and Diverging Prospects for Urban Youth in an Enlarged Europe, and has received funding from the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013), under Grant Agreement SSH7-CT-2008-217384-EDUMIGROM.

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

The first research phase of EDUMIGROM focused on background studies on education and ethnic relations in the domestic contexts of the project's target countries. During this phase, research teams gathered and processed macro-level data and information with three adjacent goals in mind: to supply the 16 comprehensive country studies on education and ethnic relations; to inform cross-country comparisons on minority ethnic youth in education; to provide ample information for the multi-level selection of samples for surveys, community and school case studies.

The second research phase of EDUMIGROM, by applying a cross-country comparative perspective, focused on exploring similarities and differences among the project's target countries in three broad topical areas: inter-ethnic relations, the educational situation of minority ethnic youth, and educational policies attaining inclusion. The three closely related comparative studies rely on the outcome of the 16 background reports that discuss these issues in the domestic contexts. Taking into account the decisive influence of the diverse historical legacies of inter-ethnic relations and the potentials and limitations that the prevailing welfare state arrangements put on shaping these relations, these comparative studies introduce meaningful variations in the situation and opportunities of minority ethnic youth within and beyond education. By putting the notion of citizenship into their focus, the reports address general issues of 'minoritisation' that affect indigenous Roma in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and second-generational migrants in Western Europe in a similar way, and bring up the differential clusters of responses that the project's target countries give to the surfacing challenges. On the basis of these analyses, the studies also draw out important implications with relevance to policies in the areas of minority rights, distributional justice, educational arrangements, and the broader perspectives of ascertaining equal opportunities for all. The publication of the three comparative studies is intended to provide valuable comparative knowledge and stimulate inter-regional and international discussions on issues related to the socio-political and economic situation, education, and integration of minority ethnic youth in Europe.

© EDUMIGROM

The EDUMIGROM Consortium holds copyright for the Papers published under the auspices of the project. Reproduction in whole or in part of this text is allowed for research and educational purposes, with appropriate citation and acknowledgement.

CENTER FOR POLICY STUDIES
CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY

Nádor utca 9
H-1051 Budapest, Hungary

info@edumigrom.eu
www.edumigrom.eu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	2
I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF POLICIES OF INCLUSION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WELFARE STATE	5
POTENTIALS AND LIMITATIONS FOR NEW POLICY DESIGNS	5
CITIZENSHIP AND SOCIAL MEMBERSHIP	6
SOCIOECONOMIC INEQUALITIES AND POLICIES OF REDISTRIBUTION	8
REPRESENTATION AND CULTURE	10
II. POLICIES FOR INCLUSION IN EDUCATION: TRANSLATING THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES INTO GOVERNING IDEAS IN SCHOOLING	12
MAIN IDEAS BEHIND COMPARING THE PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATIONAL POLICIES	12
FUNDAMENTAL CIVIL RIGHTS EMBODIED IN ACCESS TO AND ADVANCEMENT IN EDUCATION	14
COMBATING SOCIOECONOMIC DISADVANTAGES AND ATTAINING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IN EDUCATION	15
RECOGNITION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL RIGHTS IN THE CONTEXT OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION	19
III. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN SHAPING THE SITUATION OF MINORITY ETHNIC YOUTH	20
MANAGEMENT, FINANCING, AND CONTROL IN EDUCATION	20
DIRECTING AND TRACKING CHILDREN	22
CHALLENGES OF DIVERSITY IN SCHOOL PRACTICES	24
ATTAINMENT DIFFERENTIALS IN THE BROADER LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	27
MAJOR GENERAL TRENDS	29
IV. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION: A CROSS-COUNTRY OVERVIEW	30
PROBLEM DEFINITION	30
GOALS	32
MEANS	33
V. POLICIES OF INCLUSION: THE SCOPE FOR INITIATING CHANGE	46
LIMITS IN ASSESSING SUCCESS AND FAILURE	47
TOWARDS A CRITICAL POLICY DEBATE	51
REFERENCES	54

FOREWORD

In old and new EU member states, education on primary and secondary level is one of the oldest public services that states deliver, organise, or at least closely watch. Education concerns governmental (public) finance, requires a distribution of major human resources, and its management is anchored at various segments of public administration. Moreover, education articulates prime visions of social norms and order, and promotes dominant patterns of socialisation still dominated by the political structures and concepts of the nation-states. The educational system is an interface of schools, levels of governments, local institutions, and families motivated by different sets of interest and understandings of their authority to shape this interface. For the EDUMIGROM agenda, the educational system and its services are considered as embodiments of the *distribution of these authorities*, but at the same time they also demonstrate the *quality of equality thinking* in society and the strengths and weaknesses of its efforts for consciously *shaping its own institutions* towards increased social justice and ever improving integration.

Educational systems have been exposed to a number of important changes in European societies in the past two decades. Discontents and challenges concerning welfare state models in the old Western states, and the abnegation of former state socialist practices in the new member states resulted in new concepts on the cooperation between states and citizens. Efficiency, choice, and quality questions have come to the fore to challenge notions of equality, wide coverage, and accessibility of basic services. By now, the role of knowledge in social and economic progress is discussed throughout Europe in the context of competitiveness as often as in that of social inclusion. The growing role of the market, diversified and customer tailored services, and control of spending converge in new public management concepts. All this comes about when due to global currents as well as expected and unexpected political changes, people move across borders more intensively than before and new types of social inequalities emerge that sharply divide national and ethnic minorities, settled migrant communities, stateless people, and undocumented newcomers around their remarkably different possibilities and choices for assimilation, adjustment to, or inclusion into societies still dominated and ruled by and in the interest of their “hosting” majorities. The arising conflicts conclude in intense domestic political and policy debates on how to compromise the often sharply clashing claims of increased competitiveness and improved social inclusion. In addition to them, international and technical assistance organisations also take major part in articulating new social policy and public service paradigms in response to new societal needs and economic pressures. Educational competition, decentralisation, efficiency, equity, and equality in schooling, and a new share of public vs. private responsibility in the arena of knowledge distribution are important cases in point.

Educational systems, shaped and reshaped by the wider transformations, do not simply deliver their services to a homogenous body of citizens. Old and new member states in the European Union embrace differently structured societies allowing various patterns of inequalities. Furthermore, they face historically departing trends of ethnic/national heterogeneity that manifest themselves in different degrees of inter-ethnic inequalities and that give diverse shapes to the interplay of forces of class and ethnicity. Despite these variations, social, economic, financial, political, and cultural inequalities working to the detriment of minority ethnic communities urge reforms along similar lines all over the place to enhance distributional justice while recognising yet unacknowledged rights. As follows, across the continent, educational service providers encounter partly similar and partly different problems related to improve the participation of minority ethnic youth in education. As for the major deviations, they arise from the diverse traditions and institutionalisations of citizenship and their varied translations to access to schooling as well as from the differing notions of equal opportunities within and beyond education. In turn, these differences are

informed in the old member states by the wide processes of labour migration that challenge the long established framework of the ethnically homogenous welfare states, whereas in the new member states the issues at stake are put forward by the need for repositioning their indigenous Roma minorities by inclusion into the new democratic concepts of citizenship. In all countries concerned, minority communities are divided by socioeconomic status and cultural traditions among and within themselves that further differentiate the needs and claims for equity, equality, and recognition. The EDUMIGROM research community conceives of the access of these varied minority groups to good quality education as a basic human rights and social justice issue conducive to social integration in Europe – in both economically more progressing and rather distressing times.

This report puts into its focus the state of human rights and social justice by reviewing those recent endeavours in the arena of policy design and -making that the nine countries represented by the EDUMIGROM project¹ have taken to improve social inclusion of minority ethnic youth within their national educational systems. As it will be shown, these policies are not shaped at will. Educational systems are deeply embedded into the working of the welfare regimes of the given nation-states that are founded, in turn, on historically diverse principles, traditions, and institutional arrangements. Accordingly, educational policies of inclusion reflect on, and at the same time, inform the prevailing welfare regimes – their degree of manoeuvring is largely set within the existing orders. Furthermore, policies of inclusion do not come into being in a socio-political vacuum: the given power relations, the traditions of how societies perceive and handle their inter-ethnic relations, the prevailing forms of interest representation and the positioning of minorities in them, and last but not least, the strength of class relations in the background highly determine the scope and depth of what professional and lay policy-makers can attain in a given place at a given time. All these factors bring about a large degree of diversity in the roles of the central versus the local states, along the lines of universalism versus selectivity, further, also in placing collective (cultural) rights versus issues of equity and equality into the focus of their policies. Despite all the diversities, there are, however, striking commonalities across countries. They predominantly follow from the basic functions of education that are taken as cornerstones of all the European educational systems: access to education is a precondition of participation in the polity, and the knowledge provided by schooling gives entrance to work – these two aspects being the twin foundations of all modern societies. From this perspective, inclusion of minority ethnic people is an issue of citizens' rights in the broadest sense of the term the quality of which reflects, in turn, the working of democracy. In this sense, policies of inclusion touch upon the core issues of politics all across – in old and new democracies of the continent alike.

Given these broad implications, the report approaches its subject through different lenses ordered in concentric circles. The first part gives an overview of how the foundations of policies are formulated in the contexts of the existing welfare states and how the different emphases put on citizens' rights, issues of equality and recognition of cultural diversity, respectively, are translated into guiding principles of policies on the terrain of education. Chapter I relates the shifting accents of the three founding principles to the major trends of changes in inter-ethnic relations in the countries with colonial past, in those with historically new waves of labour migration, and in societies where new tensions between the majorities and the Roma minority have been produced partly by the failures of forced assimilation under socialism, partly by the swift socio-economic processes of social exclusion during the times of post communist transformation. Chapter II introduces the varied translations of the focal principles into baselines of educational policies by showing how the general claim on equal access to education is differently meant in the light of more or less encompassing

¹ The countries involved in the research project are the following: Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

understandings of citizenship; how the welfare functions of education are perceived in the contexts of universal vs. selective notions of redistribution and amidst the varied degrees of socio-economic segmentation by class and ethnicity; finally, how the principal value of cultural diversity is understood in multiculturalist vs. assimilationist approaches to education.

The second part of the report looks at educational policies from a different angle. It asks questions about the contingencies that limit the scope of intervention by the drawbacks of the given school structures and long established practices and reviews how the general principles are ultimately operationalised in certain sets of measures amidst the given conditions. Chapter III outlines three major areas where the prevailing systems produce and reproduce major inequalities to the detriment of minority ethnic youth: access to quality education in terms of admission, attendance and completion; school performances and opportunities for advancement; mobility chances beyond schooling, that is, in employment and further education. By reviewing the highly varied patterns of tracking, the different practices of separation and segmentation along the intermingled dimensions of socioeconomic background, ethnicity, culture, and performance, the changing degrees of pressure that better-off parents put on the schools for increasing competition and selection, this chapter brings up the diversity of conflicts that policies of inclusion have to face across the continent. In this sense, it gives the empirical backing to Chapter IV where the reader will be faced with the multiplicity of schemes and measures that educational policy-makers and schools in the nine countries have recently introduced to mitigate inequalities and injustices along the dividing lines of ethnicity. As it will be shown, the threefold principles of equal citizens' rights in access, increased equality in distribution of services and knowledge, and fair recognition of cultural differences are put into the practice of goal-setting and implementation in a highly diverse manner. Beside the role of varied histories and traditions, this great diversity follows partly from the limitations that the prevailing educational structures set, and it partly reflects differential perceptions of the most burning conflicts and also the changing willingness of the ruling majorities to respond with deliberate interventions to extend and intensify inclusion.

The closing Chapter V attempts to draw some general conclusions. In light of the lessons of the earlier discussions, it outlines the complexity of factors and conditions that make certain policies more successful than others, and enters an inquiry into the potentials of broadening the scope amidst the given circumstances. In this context, the chapter raises issues of cross-border learning in an increasingly international environment, and tries to realistically assess the possibility of adapting "good practices" in the area of inclusion.

This report is the outcome of a year-long work of the EDUMIGROM collective. As part of the design of our research project, the country teams compiled two background reports: one on the educational system of their country with a focus on the situation and opportunities of the respective minority ethnic youths in them, and another one on the state of inter-ethnic relations, issues of political and cultural representation of ethnic minorities, and the main trends of the working of their welfare states concerning ethnically informed inequalities and injustices. This report relies on these two sets of background reports, but due to its specific topic, draws mainly on the background reports on education². Empirical evidence and details on country-specific educational policies of inclusion are derived from this latter set of accounts. In addition, general trends in Europe's educational systems and some remarkable recent findings on inequalities in school performance and opportunities are

² Educational systems and policies in the nine participating countries of the EDUMIGROM research project are covered by seven country-reports and a "mini-comparative report" on the two Nordic countries, Denmark and Sweden. The reports are, as follows: Armagnague et al.: Country Report on Education: France; Drál et al.: Country Report on Education: Slovakia; Harbula, et al.: Country Report on Education: Romania; Law, Swann et al.: Country Report on Education: United Kingdom; Marada, Katzorová et al.: Country Report on Education: Czech Republic; Miera: Country Report on Education: Germany; Moldenhawer and Kallehave: Country Report on Education: Nordic (Denmark and Sweden); Molnár and Dupcsik: Country Report on Education: Hungary.

introduced below on the grounds of the all-encompassing two recent PISA surveys and OECD's regular studies on education.

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF POLICIES OF INCLUSION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WELFARE STATE

POTENTIALS AND LIMITATIONS FOR NEW POLICY DESIGNS

The claim for attaining high levels of inclusion in all major domains of social life has undoubtedly become one of the primary concerns of European-level policies in recent times. Due to the importance of schooling as well in early socialisation as in shaping access to labour market and, via one's work, also to social positions, the issue of education occupies a central role in these policies. While such a pronounced placement of the principle of inclusion in education expresses commitments to the European values of universalism and equality, it also reflects the amassing experience that the established structures of schooling and the customarily applied methods of instruction can only imperfectly tackle those deep-going changes that societies of the continent have undergone during the past two-three decades. It is widely recognised that these structures and methods were born in an era when European states displayed a relatively high degree of internal ethnic/cultural homogeneity and experienced low turnouts of cross-border moves. However, massive flows of postcolonial and economic migration as well as high rates of Roma intra-country mobility due to industrialisation and urbanisation have fundamentally changed the initial conditions, challenging the systems of education with new needs for multicultural responses and intercultural recognition (Nagata 2004; Bleszynska 2008; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). The prevailing institutional arrangements and the customary routines of instruction are but sluggishly responding making education this way a terrain of frequent conflicts of cultural misunderstanding, clashing behavioural principles, and what is more, of a system that, instead of mitigating, intensifies otherwise existing socioeconomic inequalities by adding ethnicised aspects and interpretations to them (European Commission 2008; Szalai et al. 2008).

But beyond the inertia of the existing structures and routines, adaptation of the new policies of inclusion is further complicated by a set of limitations beyond education. These partly follow from the varied historical legacies of the welfare states with their embedded diverse school structures that usually allow only for gradual and partial modifications. At the same time, attempts at change are restricted also by the interplay of important economic, social, political and cultural processes that all intervene into education as the "own" terrain of the most powerful actors behind and thus put forth divergent principles and goals for the claimed adjustments. Amidst such a complexity of conditions it is no wonder that attempts at inclusion in education have not brought about any breakthrough so far: all across the continent, statistics indicate a rather high degree of inequalities in attendance, performance, and educational careers and signal a stability in the composition of the social groups worst affected – all to the detriment of the varied groups with minority ethnic backgrounds (Eurydice Network 2004; OSI EUMAP 2007; OECD 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008). While an all-round panacea for all the social diseases at play has not been found – and most probably cannot be found at all –, important advancements have been achieved toward inclusion by a number of countries in a number of arenas. Later chapters of this report give a detailed discussion of the many new initiatives and measures in welfare and within the prevailing educational practices that proved effective in combating poverty, self-degradation and marginalisation as the most widespread ills that hinder the affected groups of young

people to keep pace with their more fortunate peers. The discussions will also reveal that positive impacts – as well as failures in implementation – are not haphazard developments: success follows from the compliance of the given modifications with some broader streams of policy-making that, in turn, are guided by certain established values and sets of rules.

This strong interdependence between the attainments of educational policies of inclusion and the broader determinations of the prevailing welfare regimes makes it necessary to have a closer look at the major principles that guide the working of the latter. As it can be revealed, three well-defined foci can be distinguished that are present at varying degrees in the national arrangements. The first among them is the classical notion of citizenship that emphasises equal membership and the deliberate extension of social rights as the foundations of policies and measures (Titmuss 1963; Marshall 1964; Esping-Andersen 1990). In the second approach, it is a range of interventions in the broadly perceived area of redistribution that are designed to correct actually experienced inequalities in social rights by aiming at reducing socioeconomic inequalities, ensure fairness and enhance equal opportunities (Goodin 1988; Sen 1992; Fraser 1997). The third approach takes pronounced note of the ethnic/cultural character of the prevailing malfunctions in a range of social, political, and cultural institutions: by recognising the fact that it is people of minority ethnic background who are at the highest risk to suffer disadvantages and exclusion, it emphasises efforts in the arenas of political representation, culture and cultural exchange as effective policy tools (Williams 1989; Banting 2005). While all the three approaches are present in the policies that the nation-states apply in shaping their welfare regimes and the working of education, a deeper analysis can bring up remarkable differences as much in the emphases, as in the practical interpretations of the key concepts and, what follows, in the actual attempts at implementation. This makes it useful to go into some details and have a closer look at how countries “translate” issues of social membership, equity, equal opportunity, and the coexistence of cultures into their policies and organisational structures.

CITIZENSHIP AND SOCIAL MEMBERSHIP

The notion of citizenship has undergone important changes during the past half a century. While the legal translation of the concept has maintained its crucial importance in regulating full-fledged membership within the given nation-states, its content in the domain of social rights has developed in highly diverse directions across Europe. Much in accordance with new emphases that have underlined the post-war history of the welfare states, social rights nowadays embrace rights to participation in a wide range of social, cultural, and political spheres that provide equal opportunities for members of society to practice democratic rights and to express meaningful influence in the decisive relations of public life. Hence, citizenship rights are closely bound to the working of everyday democracy and civic relations, and their actual content depends to a large extent on their variations across the continent (Leibfried and Pierson 1992; Esping-Andersen 1996). No wonder that remarkable differences can be identified in this regard between the “old” and the “new” democracies of the continent with substantially weaker civil societies and more restricted contents of everyday civil practices – hitherto limited implications of the notion of citizenship rights – in the latter than in the former group of countries. But beyond such distinctions, the content of citizenship varies also according to the role it plays in shaping the welfare states in the Western half of the continent. For historical reasons, the social aspects of the concept have key importance in countries with colonial past – especially France and the UK –, and work as founding principles of universalism in the relatively late-comer Nordic welfare states. At the same time, it is more the initial legal interpretation of the term that is applied by a wide range of the continental states, while it is their pronounced focusing on socioeconomic and cultural differences that guide the working of their welfare regimes (Offe 2004).

These differences have direct implications on how one-time migrants and their descendants have been adapted in the host countries, how important the granting of legal citizenship has been in providing access to all what “born” citizens of the respective countries enjoy, and how they have become part of (or left out from) the gradual enrichment of the notions of social citizenship. There are rather substantial historical variations in these regards.

In the first post-war wave of mass migration, postcolonial migrants as one-time ‘subjects’ arriving from the former colonies were in a way received as “our” people in France and Britain, respectively: speaking the language of the host country, being educated in schools that had been established much in accordance with those in the country of domination, sharing much of the everyday cultural knowledge required in their new setting, those arriving to their new homes in the 1960s and early 1970s became legal citizens within a short while, and this way in principle shared rights much in common with those born there. However, the ever more stringent immigration laws from the late 1970s onward have induced substantial changes: the attainment of legal citizenship has become a lengthy and complicated process, and ever larger groups of new migrants have been left behind. Nevertheless, the notion of social citizenship still has remained in force: much in line with the French Republican idea of equal belonging and the British notion of equal social membership, respectively, policies of inclusion still maintain “citizenship” as the core driving principle of actions (Parekh 2006; Sen 2006). (At the same time, there has been a shift toward interpreting ethnic/racial differences in the actual content of experienced social citizenship along socioeconomic dimensions – the reasons and the ways how these new “translations” are implemented will be discussed below).

In the Nordic case, it is the deeply ingrained notion of universalism that has provided the framework for policies toward the newcomer groups. Attaining legal citizenship has remained a central aim, and has been considered as the key to share social citizenship to its full richness. (Korpi 1983; Esping-Andersen 1990) With this goal in mind, a rather lengthy and well-targeted transitory phase was designed to assist new migrants with a wide range of welfare provisions and linguistic, cultural services to acquire all the basic skills and knowledge that a “proper” citizen should possess. In this context, attempts at assimilation or at the preservation of cultural pluralism further refine the picture, however, the implied variations do not affect the core of the policies that are driven by universalistic considerations and the high priority of equality in matters of distribution. This way socioeconomic concerns become integral parts of policies for enriching social citizenship – the two aspects are more or less seen as two intrinsic parts of the same.

As mentioned above, social citizenship entails but limited importance in the continental welfare states without a colonial past. However, the notion has recently become important in the political discourse in the West and in Central and Eastern Europe alike.

As to countries with a recent history of the influx of vast groups of guest-workers who ultimately settled on their soil, issues of equal social rights and, especially, interpretations of multicultural rights became contested in reflections on the experienced increase in inequalities in education, labour market participation, and the general living conditions. This way a drive for attaining higher rates of socioeconomic equalities between people with “foreign background” and the ethnic majorities has become a focal constituent of policy making, and the accommodation of the concept of social rights has followed. In this sense, the curve of the discourses has adopted an opposite pattern to that in the Nordic countries: while the “discovery” of social rights grew out from unresolved problems of equality in the former group of countries, it is unsatisfactorily met social rights that have driven the discourses toward new emphases on equality in the latter one (Offe 2004).

The Central and Eastern European case represents yet another pattern. It is not cross-country migration but the deep-going and dramatic changes in the situation of the indigenous Roma population that has brought about certain issues of social rights. Due to the extremely high rates of unemployment and poverty among the Roma citizenry that is met by local-level

welfare provisions, it is their contested welfare rights that entered the central stage of recent political discourse. However, the context of the debates is the bifurcation of the welfare states themselves (Szalai 2006; Kusá 2008). The decomposition of universal rights and the turning of benefits and services into means-tested provisions (often delivered upon the discretion of local decision-makers) have led to the actual segmentation of social rights: rights in their true sense for those who cope, and provisions with highly limited civic implications for the poor – for Roma poor in the first place. This way ethnicised contents of welfare have taken over the domain in policies for social integration, and the notion of human rights has received priority over the social aspects of citizens' rights. As part of these developments, matters of socioeconomic equality have largely remained in the background: policies for inclusion attempt at eliminating the dangerously deeply implied ethnic differentiations in the first place, and consider reintegration of the notion of social rights a task ahead only in the distanced future.

SOCIOECONOMIC INEQUALITIES AND POLICIES OF REDISTRIBUTION³

As indicated above, whether as constituents of imperfections in granting social rights universally or as key aspects of the prevailing social structures, socioeconomic inequalities between the ethnic majorities and the minority ethnic groups of the nation-states have become a primary concern all across the continent. Despite great variations in the depth, levels, magnitude, and also in the actual manifestations of the problem, the patterns show remarkable uniformity. As statistics on educational attainment, labour market participation and the standards and conditions of living reveal, minority ethnic people are caught by the accumulation of disadvantages. They tend to have shorter education than the majority, and what is more, they attend schools that rarely provide advancement toward the higher echelons of the systems; they face substantially higher risks of unemployment than people of the majority, and if in work, they occupy positions with relatively low pay and conditions below the national standards; incidence of poverty and the occurrence of substandard housing is country by country higher among these groups than among the majority; finally, tendencies of residential and institutional segregation affect people of minority ethnic groups more than their contemporaries among the majority (European Commission – Eurostat 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008).

These strikingly uniform patterns have called but for highly diverse responses. Variations follow to a large extent from the conceptualisation of the problem: whether the ethnic character of the sets of socioeconomic disadvantages is perceived within the framework of social citizenship or is seen as one but important aspect of the prevailing inequalities in society; whether the framework for tackling the problem is built on universal principles or it is the local communities that are seen as being responsible and capable of responding; whether it is the individual who is assisted or certain groups are identified as the targets of action; whether it is primarily policies of redistribution or those focusing on labour market participation that are designated as the key areas of improvement; finally, whether the designed interventions are built on the involvement of those affected or aim at changing the surrounding conditions in the first place.

³ This section is based primarily on the series of EDUMIGROM Background Reports discussing ethnic relations and welfare policies in an inter-ethnic context in the nine participating countries of the EDUMIGROM project. The reports are, as follows: Schiff et al.: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: France; Kusá et al.: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Slovakia; Magyari et al.: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Romania; Law et al.: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: United Kingdom; Laubeová and Laubeová: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Czech Republic; Ohlinger: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Germany; Kallehave and Moldenhawer: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Nordic (Denmark and Sweden); Vajda and Dupesik: Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Hungary.

It is worth recognising that these varying traits bring about a rather kaleidoscopic picture that just loosely corresponds to the above classification around the notion of citizenship. The fact of loose correspondence is but telling in itself. It indicates several things at the same time. Firstly, it reflects differential success in the various arenas of the welfare state: as it is often experienced, new inventions in income redistribution might be effective in improving the living conditions of disadvantaged minority groups, though they hardly bring them closer to meaningful and full-fledged social membership. With the promising short-term results in mind, such policies are designed and implemented everywhere, however, much in independence from their embedding into the more overarching philosophies of the respective welfare states. Secondly, conditions of residential and institutional segregation profoundly determine the focus and the scope of policies for reducing socioeconomic inequalities. Since these conditions are usually the outcome of specific long-term histories of industrialisation and urbanisation, their immediate impact on policy-making induces remarkable differences – though yet again largely independently of the respective philosophical foundations. Thirdly, it is the direct involvement of the state that is greatly colouring the picture: in line with the historically shaped division between the central state and its local representatives, even similar policies show significant differences according to their diverse addressees. However, the central/local divisions are again largely independent from the notions of citizenship: countries with great concern on social rights might designate the localities for implementation (like e.g. the UK does), while other nation-states with less focusing on the issue might find more effective to introduce central and uniform measures along defined legal aspects as efficient tools for reducing certain socioeconomic inequalities (Germany would be a powerful example for the latter case).

Along these variations, the clusters of the welfare regimes according to the ways they address socioeconomic disadvantages of minority ethnic people arrange themselves around three issues at stake in designing interventions: the centrality of ethnic/racial segregation in producing and reproducing the disadvantages; the character of poverty in relation to labour market participation of the minority groups; and the range of income inequalities in hindering socioeconomic participation of them.

Although minority ethnic people tend to live in high concentration all across Europe, residential segregation as a key source of multiplying their disadvantages is not playing an equal role in the countries. As the statistics show, the problem is especially deep in France and in the Central and Eastern European region. But while it is mostly an urban phenomenon in France, the case is just partially similar in Central and Eastern Europe, where the squeezing of large numbers of Roma into closed residential circles in remote and underdeveloped geographic areas is a region-specific severe manifestation of the old deep urban/rural divide. Segregation according to residence brings about a number of other ills: ethnic ghettos are hit by the lack of access to employment, high rates of poverty, and above all, high probabilities of the intergenerational transmission of destitution. In recognition of these facts, in these countries, policies of inclusion identify desegregation as a primary goal. With differing emphases on inclusive housing, integration in education, and new initiatives in job creation, they have the uniform aim to break up the vicious circles that segregation tends to maintain. However, the relatively low mobility rates of the affected people are indications of the persistence of the problem. As it is demonstrated by the literature, once in place, segregation has a tendency to reproduce itself, hence the newest initiatives put the emphasis on prevention by introducing new rules in distributing housing (France) or by setting up school communities in a deliberately controlled mixed way (Hungary).

Although the lack of work as a primary source of poverty is widely recognised, the centrality of work-related measures in policies of inclusion singles out the UK among the European welfare states. While it is mostly the tackling of unemployment as a welfare problem that is in the heart of anti-poverty programmes (concluding mainly in various forms of income maintenance services), job-creation along the differential experiences,

qualifications, and working patterns of ethnic minorities has been perhaps one of the most innovative inventions of the past decade of the British welfare state. At the same time, these attempts at inclusion go hand in hand with a more traditional approach to work that focuses on individual incentives for labour market (re)integration – much in accordance with the respective arrangements all over the continent. The widespread recent emphasis put on work as the route to social inclusion has created new challenges for education: in a more pronounced way than before, educational services – and training programmes in association with them – are expected to establish new paths for minority ethnic youth to enter the labour markets with greater success than their ancestors did. The emphasised strong connection between education and work has at the same time imbued educational policies with economic considerations, leading to new adverse trends of intensifying competition between the majorities and the minorities.

While income maintenance programmes are integral parts of the anti-poverty measures all across the continent, these programmes usually take their departure from a defined poverty line, and remain insensitive to the ethnic dimension of the disadvantages of their target groups. Even more rarely do they consider the form and level of assistance in the context of social membership: the primary task is to provide assistance, and social participation should be promoted in some other ways. A remarkably different conceptualisation of policies to assist decent living makes the Nordic case an independent “cluster” in this regard. Firstly, following from their universalistic approach and the strong commitment to keep income inequalities within limits, provisions of social security occupy a central role in their income policy with direct and positive inclusionary outcome for the working poor among their ethnic minorities. Secondly, the above mentioned transitory programmes for newly arriving immigrants have a strong income component also with considerations on inclusion. Providing housing and rather generous financial assistance for them is seen as an “entrance” to social membership. Through fairly granted participation in consumption it is assumed to integrate them by providing access to a wide range of goods and services that all accommodated people buy, and this way strong efforts are made to avoid segregation, while also to introduce certain cultural patterns of everyday life that people belonging to the majority share in a customary way.

REPRESENTATION AND CULTURE

‘Cultural diversity’ as a valuable asset of contemporary European democracies is recognised and highly appreciated all across the continent. While state policies without exception ascribe to it as a fundamental value, there seems to be great variation in the ways how the coexistence of different cultural habits, religious rules, modes of family life, dress codes, and diverse behavioural patterns are acknowledged, tolerated or, for that matter, penalised by legal and institutional arrangements (Phillips 2007). By the very nature of education, it is the sphere of schooling where these variations appear with high intensity. Thus, varying attempts at the incorporation of diversity through intercultural, multicultural, and multilingual teaching have become important constituents of the national policies of inclusion in the area – and will be introduced in details in later chapters of this report. Here it is some general aspects of cultural recognition that are worth for attention as further colouring the picture of state policies toward ethnicity with acknowledgeable implications for the interpretations of citizenship and social equality.

Though rights for association along ethnic lines are granted everywhere, the actual presence of organisations that consider ethnicity the ground of membership varies to a large extent. The variations largely follow from the strength of the civil sphere in political and cultural life. This creates a rather sharp divide between the East and the West (Vobruba 2003; Offe 2004). In the old democracies of the continent, civil organisations play an outstanding role in shaping cultural and religious life, what is more, they are considered important

partners to the state in policy making and legislation on the respective areas. Assemblies and associations organised along ethnic (and religious) lines rather easily find their place in these structures, and apply the customarily established rules and routines of participation. The relatively weaker civil societies of the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe have much less stable structures with remarkable uncertainties in functioning than their Western counterparts. Amid these conditions, the newly emerging organisations of the Roma minority hardly can reach strong and enduring positions. As it turns out, there is a high degree of fluctuation among them, while there are severe shortcomings in their recognition as genuine partners in legislation. Further, their relative weakness has great repercussions to the everyday content of citizenship that lacks civil participation as its integral constituent.

Issues of representation further differentiate and partly cross-cut this picture.⁴ In general, political democracies of Europe do not consider ethnicity an organising principle of political participation, though they do so with two notable exemptions among the countries surveyed in this report. One of them is the UK, where, in accordance with considering the right to ethnic self-identification as a recognised and publicly registered trait of citizenship, political organisation and representation along ethnicity is part of the working of democracy. The other exemption is Hungary where the recently established system of elected minority self-governments has developed regular organisational mechanisms for the representation of special cultural, social, and political needs of Roma in a continuous dialogue with the respective local and central state-bodies. However, amidst a rather hostile environment and the severe lack of resources, expertise, and often even militancy, the organisational potentials have but just sporadically been explored. As comparative studies within the Central and Eastern European region show, regardless of formal representation or the lack of it, the case of Roma has been less discussed and handled in the framework of cultural diversity than in terms of ethnicised conceptualisations of welfare policy.

.

As the above overview might indicate, the positioning along the three dimensions with outstanding importance in shaping policies of inclusion produces great variations among the countries of the continent. Varied notions of citizenship largely determine the frameworks in which ethnicity is perceived as an acknowledged constituent of public life; the divergent conceptualisations of ethnicity as a more or less decisive dimension of socioeconomic inequalities induces differences in the foci and measures of welfare policies; and last but not least, stronger or weaker civil and political representations of ethnicity bring about variations in the framing of public discourse and the shaping of actions for assisting cultural diversity, respectively. This colourfulness of the picture implies good as well as bad news for the policies of inclusion in education. On the one hand, it seems that there is no one to one relation among the various aspects of the given welfare regimes, whereby policies around citizenship and equality leave a rather large scope for manoeuvring in education. In this relatively flexible framework, a lot depends on how education defines its role with regards to ethnicity: whether it is the policy of equity, equal opportunities, or that of cultural diversity that gives the focus of deliberation and action. On the other hand, the colourfulness presented above is also a hindrance. It indicates that policies for inclusion in education might face a certain “solitude”: be they fully committed toward enhancing citizens’ rights and reducing inequalities in educational careers and beyond, much of the success in schooling might easily vanish in the outer world without strong partnerships in other arenas of welfare (especially, in employment and housing policies and in matters of income distribution). The acknowledgement of these potentials and limitations drove our hands in drafting this report.

⁴ These issues are extensively discussed in the EDUMIGROM Background Reports on ethnic relations. For details see Footnote 3.

We attempt at presenting the ways how educational policies frame their immediate and longer-term goals and how they choose among the available measures with an eye on the broader social, cultural, political, and institutional embedding of any such endeavours, this way hoping to arrive at an adequately nuanced summary picture of the honoured though still limited achievements that the European states have made in rendering inclusion for their ethnic minorities.

II. POLICIES FOR INCLUSION IN EDUCATION: TRANSLATING THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES INTO GOVERNING IDEAS IN SCHOOLING

MAIN IDEAS BEHIND COMPARING THE PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

The aim of this chapter is to explore the main principles of educational policies for inclusion in a comparative frame stressing the similarities and differences in the nine countries covered by the EDUMIGROM project, and most importantly against the broader conceptualisation of inter-ethnic relations of their contexts. The country reports⁵ show in a convincing way that public understandings of ethnicity and inter-ethnic relations and the related state policies shape the principles of educational policies regarding ethnic/national minorities and/or people with immigrant background in all of these countries. In each case, again, the latter – at their turn – may have an impact on the reproduction or transformation of the countries' legal and institutional arrangements regulating inter-ethnic relations and of the underlying cultural convictions objectified in policies. Developed in the context of a Europe of nation-states and later on in the frame of the European Union, differences in state policies regarding ethnic minorities and in particular their educational needs are not only resulting from the current socio-political conditions, but also from the different historical and geopolitical legacies of the countries under scrutiny (including colonialism, socialism, nationalism, and overt or covert forms of racism). These differences make it a rather complex task to find those bases of meaningful comparison between people of immigrant background in the West and indigenous Roma people in Central and Eastern Europe whereby one is able to reveal strong and persistent trends of “minoritisation” that seem to cross-cut historic and current differences.

The main ideas behind our comparison are the following:

In the context of the post-1990 Europe (that is the time frame of our research), among others related to the national/ethnic minorities and/or people with immigrant background, leading intellectuals, activists and politicians came to an agreement on certain guiding principles by which member states should address (policy) problems and solutions on the educational domain. These guiding principles are derived from the general principles of the welfare states (discussed in the previous chapter) and can be considered as purposeful “translations” of them into the specific societal roles of education. After the Norwegian anthropologist Gullestad we may call them in a generalised way as “overarching cultural categories” (Gullestad 1991). In our case, there are three sets of these categories with outstanding importance that at the same time also profoundly inform attempts at inclusion all over the place:

- fundamental civil rights embodied in access to and advancement in education;

⁵ For references of the EDUMIGROM Background Reports on education, see Footnote 2.

- combating socioeconomic disadvantages and attaining equal opportunities in education;
- the recognition of language and cultural rights in the context of multicultural education.

The above three are the so-called “European” frames of understanding, around whose importance the architects of social Europe have developed and maintain a common agreement. But this deal is a continuously contested and reopened result of a negotiation process marked, among others, by changing relations of power and influence among various actors and their varying coalitions like e.g. East and West, South and North, member states and accession countries, new and old member states, Roma and non-Roma, European and national stakeholders, etc. (Vobruba 2003). The varying national and international “translations” of the listed overarching categories shape the social actors’ minds and practices as taken-for-granted and shared cultural understandings, and usually are considered being the core elements of their collective identities (nationhood and/or Europeanness). Further, one may observe that – beside this shared aspect of categories by which the community of European peoples perceives today policy problems and solutions on our domain of study – they are having different meanings and significances in different countries. Our aim in this chapter is exactly to highlight the different (country- and/or region-specific) understandings of the universally accepted “European” principles of treating minorities and in particular their educational situation, and in this way to identify both differences and similarities across the countries under scrutiny.

The principles of educational policies described below have been developed in the context of the changing and broadening Europe that has faced historic changes during the recent past. Just to mention the most important events and dividing lines with a range of direct and indirect impacts on policy-making in general and in education in particular, one has to refer here to the collapse of socialism, the end of the Cold War and the legacies of the Western/Eastern divide; the simultaneous evolvement of novel distinctions between the old and the new member states; the unbalanced relation between the ideals of a social Europe that assures equal opportunities for all, and the predominance of neo-liberalism and the related marketisation of education; the increase of people’s mobility across national and continental borders; but also the strengthening of cultural and religious fundamentalisms, and even the challenge of and reactions to terrorism (Offe 2004; Sen 2006; Phillips 2007). Basically these processes and divides inform the two broader sets of politics with regard to minorities, that is redistributive and recognition politics (Fraser 1997). The former defines the problem of minorities as a legal and as a socioeconomic issue, and considers that unequal access to education is a result of the lack of proper equality legislation (and as such might be solved by legal means); and/or it is a product of socioeconomic factors, and as such necessitates social policies that intervene for compensating for spontaneous negative impacts. At their turn, recognition politics focuses the attention of stakeholders on the cultural and linguistic aspects of the minority situation, and it generates claims and initiatives for the development of the cultural identity of minority groups, while balancing between the demands and entitlements to cultural autonomy and intercultural dialogue (Kymlicka 1995; Parekh 2006; Sen 2006).

The similarity among the otherwise very different target groups of our research – that makes our comparative effort feasible – results from the way in which the EDUMIGROM project defines them in their relation with the (nation) state. In each country they are supposed to be groups of people residing there for generations (and mostly possessing citizenship of some other form of legal acknowledgement), but affected by processes of ethnic ‘minoritisation’ and historically perceived as the utter (often ethnicised or even racialised) Other. In this sense – and in the context of the general agreement about the “European” way of dealing with such minorities – they all are the target groups of policies

addressing social inequalities and cultural diversity (like policies of equal opportunities, anti-discrimination, multicultural education and linguistic rights).

All the countries involved into our comparative project recognise the fact that among their citizens (compared to a majority defined in a particular way) there are some “people of different background” who are at the highest risk to suffer social disadvantages and exclusion. But there are great differences among these countries in terms of how they make a balance between issues of social membership and the coexistence of cultures, or how they interpret the connection between social status and cultural specificity, and eventually between social exclusion and cultural devaluation. These differences are obvious even at the level of naming “the problem” and “the problematic” categories of people whose position in the society (statistically characterised in most of the cases by lower levels of achievements on any domains of life) is shaped by both their socioeconomic status and cultural attributes. However, the French terms like “people of foreign nationality”, “people born abroad”, “pupils born of immigrant parents”, “people with foreign attributes”, “children of immigrants” or children of immigrant background”, are covering similar policy challenges and problems as other categories of identifications, used in other European countries. We are making reference here to classifications such as: the German notions of “migrants/descendants from migrants”, “people with a migration history”, “people with a migrant background”, “foreigners”, “German-Turks”, “people with non-German background”, “religious groups”, “non-native Germans”, “refugee students”, “people with Muslim or with Arabic origin”, “Islamic groups”; or the British categories of “ethnic minority”, “pupils with a mother tongue other than English”, “pupils from nationally underachieving minority ethnic groups”, “minority ethnic groups”, “racially distinctive groups”, “Asian students”, “Afro-Caribbean students”, “Muslims”, “Black Caribbeans”; or the Nordic terms of “ethnic minority”, “immigrants”, “bilingual children”, “pupils with an immigrant background”; or even the Central and Eastern European notions of “ethnic Roma”, “Roma as national minority” or “Roma as ethnic minority”. This large palette of categories of identification is signalling the different traditions of different countries in terms of the politics of naming “people with different background”, but also their insecurities about the politically correct and the pragmatically efficient ways of defining the vulnerable categories to whom universal equal rights, equal opportunities and special treatment, anti-discrimination, and multicultural programs are addressed to.

Still – due to the mentioned balancing between the social and cultural approaches toward the case of these citizens, and eventually to the traditional ways of constructing national identities in the respective countries – their educational policies are preoccupied to a different extent with issues of equality rights, inclusive society and cultural entitlements. These principles, referring to the mentioned categories of people, are ultimately shaped by the patterns of understanding nationhood (civic, cultural or mixed) that dominate in one country or another, and are bearing the legacies of their past (whether informed by colonialism, state-socialism, or the recent inflow of huge masses of economic migrants). In the following three sub-sections we will exemplify the differences in these terms through the cases of the countries involved in our research project.

FUNDAMENTAL CIVIL RIGHTS EMBODIED IN ACCESS TO AND ADVANCEMENT IN EDUCATION

As already pointed out in the previous chapter, the rights of “people with immigrant background” in the Western European and Nordic countries, and those of the ethnic Roma in Central and Eastern Europe are conceived differently from country to country. In some of the nation-states it is the assuring of universal (citizenship) rights for individuals that historically predominates all area of policy-making either lacking any formal recognition of rights bound to ethnicity (France), or, contrarily, making the formal recognition of ethnic/racial differentiation a fundamental constituent of otherwise equal rights (the UK). In other nation-

states (like in the Nordic countries) all-embracing citizen rights have been gradually imbued with multiculturalist notions, either toward pronounced policies of assimilation (Denmark) or toward the institutionalisation of cultural diversity (Sweden). Yet in others (like in Germany), inclusion has been approached through a great number of practical steps concluding just recently into the formal extension of citizen rights together with the recognition of a linguistic/cultural rights agenda regarding the ethnic groups. In the “new democracies” new notions of citizenship have been informed partly by remembrances and experiences of forced collectivism under state-socialism and partly by the adoption of new equality and anti-discrimination legislation that formed a strong prerequisite for them to access the European Union. Depending on where, when and how the still prevailing inequalities of meaningful citizenship are recognised, different explanatory schemes and remedial policies are put into work. As to their translation to the sphere of education, in certain cases it is the social aspects of disadvantages that are emphasised (France); or else it is the responsibility of the individual and his/her immediate communities (Germany, and often also in the United Kingdom); while in other contexts it is the educational needs to transform the vulnerable groups into accepted citizens (Nordic countries); and yet in other countries – mostly in Central and Eastern Europe – it is the ethno-culturally perceived pre-modern traits of “otherness” (mostly meant for Roma) that are to be civilised and modernised and as such, are put into the foci of policies and practice. As in general policies of the respective welfare states, the predominant approach on the domain of education depends on how the relationship between the individual and the state is conceived: whether it is framed as a relationship mediated by a set of citizenship rights and obligations, or by a set of ethno-cultural features, and – linked to these distinctions – whether their foundations are laid down in a general civic or an ethnically divided understanding of nationhood and historicity (Kymlicka 2001; Banting 2005).

As yet the formal assurance of rights for the categories of “people with different background” as equal citizens has not been enough for visibly improving their access to school – as data regarding their school performances are clearly showing (Eurydice 2004; OECD 2007). The anti-immigrant and anti-Gypsy prejudices, the impact of the explicit or hidden ethnic differentiation on peoples’ social position and the weaknesses of law enforcement might explain why in all of the researched countries one may observe the increase of drop-out rates among these categories of people and the inability of the state to ensure or enforce their school attendance through compulsory education (OSI EUMAP 2007; European Commission 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008). The failures encountered on this domain seem to reproduce from the perspective of the majority the idea according to which “there is nothing to do with ‘them’, despite all the efforts ‘they’ do not want to integrate”; and on the side of many minority leaders may enforce the arguments for a stronger cultural identity politics claiming the recognition of traditions and autonomy.

COMBATING SOCIOECONOMIC DISADVANTAGES AND ATTAINING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IN EDUCATION

The principle of reducing socioeconomic differences hindering equal opportunities in schooling is mainly framed in the context of the welfare functions of education. In this endeavour, *welfare* is understood with two different, though related meanings: first, *broadly*, as comprising all sorts of programmes that are aimed at securing social rights and guaranteeing social protection for the citizens (Esping-Andersen 1990); and, second, *narrowly*, as the collection of measures aimed at promoting equal conditions and evened options in relation to children’s education. Though the welfare systems and both their broadly and narrowly meant provisions are “colour-blind” everywhere, this common trait is surpassed by great differences in universality and massive unevenness in the levels of financing as well as remarkable inequalities in actual access to various rights, goods and services. The characteristics of welfare in the broad sense substantially affect the opportunities of

disadvantaged groups and their membership in community: to put it bluntly, it makes a profound difference to grow up in a jobless family in Denmark and in Slovakia or Romania.

As schooling remains the most important sanctuary of the equality principle in democratic societies and since participation in education is considered to be a self-evident right for all children in Europe (Szalai et al. 2008), the observable dramatic differences in educational opportunities have a power to enforce some sort of welfare measures for equalising. In this sense, education is not only seen as the major institution of knowledge transmission but also as an important agent shaping daily living of masses of children and youth. In light of this recognition, some “educational welfare” measures exist everywhere. However, European countries seem to considerably differ in the types, coverage and duration of their provisions. Beside variations in the available finances, the differences reflect diverse philosophies and institutional traditions, but also express the varying degrees of public attention paid to the barriers in access of certain groups of children to their education rights.

The systemic disadvantages working to the detriment of minority ethnic groups are generally conceptualised as *products of intersecting socioeconomic factors*. The crucial force at play seems to be global and historic: the dramatic decline in demand for unskilled or semiskilled manual labour over the past two-three decades. Technological development, rationalisation, production transfer and outsourcing have afflicted immigration groups in Denmark, Sweden, Germany, France and UK (whose education had been fitting into the industrial demands of the post-war decades). A similar ‘fate’ of uselessness has been shared by Roma in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia (who had jobs until the “iron curtain” provided autarchic protection for the economies of the COMECON). The differential impact of recent economic developments on the majorities and the minorities is in close association with long-term historical factors shaping the patterns of employment and education in departing ways (Esping-Andersen 1996). Post-colonial migration processes concluded in mostly peripheral positions for masses of workers in France or the UK, while state-driven recruitment schemes to attract unskilled foreign workers for the one-time need of domestic economies shaped the skewed structure of migrant communities in Germany, Denmark, Sweden and to a lesser degree also in the Czech Republic. As to the case of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe, the pattern was somewhat different. Lasting economic marginalisation and exclusion of their “redundant” communities had been transformed to marginal industrial employment under socialism with quickly disappearing positions when adjustment to the world market made socialist industries themselves superfluous upon the systemic change (Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and also the Czech Republic).

The consequences of these long-term differences still prevail. As comparative data on education indicate, the disadvantages informed by foreign/ethnic background not only persist as certain unintended by-products of socioeconomic forces at large but are actively maintained and transmitted from one generation to the next through a number of private and institutional channels (OECD 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008). This is a striking fact despite the apparent achievements in nearing the respective group-positions by widespread programmes of targeting Roma illiteracy in Slovakia or Romania; through making efforts to converge the educational paths of majority and minority youth in Germany or in France; with the mediation of adult education schemes for “catching up” in schooling in Denmark or Sweden, etc. Nevertheless, the gaps still prevail, and make fortunate or less fortunate family background a decisive factor of departing opportunities in education and beyond.

As will be introduced in details later in this report, in addition to the enduring impact of socioeconomic background, *insufficient language skills* are also conceptualised as a systemic barrier for labour market and education integration: in Germany and Denmark language is understood as the key vehicle of social integration and investments in language competence are perceived as the main investment in the integration of immigrant groups. Language insufficiencies are also perceived as troubling for a part (a not negligible part) of Roma students in their educational advancement in Romania, Slovakia, and also Hungary. In

this latter group of countries, it is, however, certain *cultural expectations related to school performances* that are put into the focus of corrective measures. Health programmes, catering and the “teaching” of certain hygienic rules are seen as welfare provisions to combat poverty with an openly announced secondary aim of attaining “civilising” achievements at an early stage.

As education is acknowledged as a *route to labour market participation*, there are concentrated efforts everywhere to prepare students in a way that helps them to avoid later unemployment (and thus to prevent the rise of a proverbial vicious circle of unemployment within the family). Together with this trend, there seems to be growing (political) tendency to conceptualise education as a civic (and moral) *duty*: in the context of the well-known relationship between unemployment and low level of education minorities have been often spelled out by blaming their members for insufficient educational *efforts* and irresponsible attitudes⁶. Despite such tendencies, government-led institutional initiatives to improve access to education remain a common issue with increasingly emphasised importance – especially due to the powerful political discourse about knowledge economy that frames education as crucial *economic investment* and as *engines of sustainable growth* (European Commission 2007). This new discourse has been nourished by various European-level core documents on education (European Commission 2005, 2009) and seems to penetrate the political discourse and policy-making all across the member-states. In harmony with the EU recommendations, preschool education as a primary “investment” is supported by the governments in all countries, however, there are large differences in the actual political efforts in securing availability and access to kindergartens.

Education is certainly seen in all the countries as *an important arena in shaping social status*. However, in certain countries – as it will be introduced in more details in the subsequent discussions – the educational systems are able just mildly reroute the life paths “inscribed” by the students’ family background. As there is an actual threat for a substantial part of minority pupils to conclude compulsory education by becoming unemployed or living on welfare as their most likely social status, there are increasing investments aimed at helping disadvantaged pupils to avoid such “no status” destinies. As the country reports reveal, policy measures implemented in the countries under the study seem to have sufficient power to protect gifted and going-ahead pupils against the perpetuation of their parents’ underprivileged position. However, there are but few initiatives/programmes that are potent enough to “bestir” average and rather unexceptional students with disadvantaged background to struggle for attaining a higher level of education.

Educational policies seem to centre around corrective measures aimed at lessening the negative impact of socioeconomic differentiation on the students’ school achievements. In other words, corrective measures are focused on prevention against school truancy and dropping out, or simply on maintaining full elementary education as the prerequisite of later education and status advance. Measures that are aimed at assisting in equalising school performances are considerably varied among the countries under scrutiny. In some of them, the actual initiatives seem to be aimed at *patrolling on the bottom (drop-out) line* with little help in reducing all other types of inequalities in attendance, performance and career paths.

However, the respective schemes usually do not develop on their own. The existing welfare measures in education mirror the types of welfare state regimes in a rather complex way. Poor social protection and the lack of preventive schemes generate gaps in educational opportunities of children with disadvantageous background and these gaps have to be patched by special targeted programmes. It seems on the surface that there is an inverse correlation between the level of universalism of a given welfare state and the need for targeted (means-

⁶ In some countries the task of making sure that children get proper education is considered primarily a parental obligation (Germany, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary), while in others it has been conceived of as a collective endeavour with assigned duties of the community (UK, France).

tested) programmes for children: with better quality and higher degree of undifferentiated coverage in welfare the necessity to “invent” specified programmes declines. At the same time, universalism allows for group-sensitive care: the encompassing regimes (Nordic countries) have numerous equalising measures built in the daily working of their educational systems where they operate preventively and more or less invisibly.⁷ On the other hand, countries with basic security regimes that do not protect disadvantaged groups against multidimensional deprivation do not necessarily run complex inclusion programmes for students with disadvantageous background. If their case is addressed, it remains mainly within the framework of individual welfare assistance, but for the most part it is left to the families to struggle through the related hardships.

As indicated above, the welfare systems of the studied countries all are “colour-blind”. In addressing still existing ethnic disadvantages, certain proxy-categorisations are used. In their educational welfare schemes, most of the countries work with the category of “disadvantaged student”, and define the target group with indicators on family income, the parents’ educational attainment, participation in certain schemes designed for the poor, etc. Members of the target group are usually entitled for material support, free meals, free textbooks, after-school services, even certain grants and scholarships. Another group of countries approaches educational disadvantages and designs the adjoining corrective welfare measures by designating disadvantaged areas or communities. In this conceptualisation, great emphasis is given to urban developmental interventions and measures in education are seen as adjoining elements by providing special community programmes and rendering positive discriminating action (of differing scales) for the involved students.

Socioeconomic disadvantages as hindrances for educational advancement and sources of long-term inequalities in opportunities appear in a most complex form in the varied arrangements of separation along ethnic lines. Segregation is a phenomenon experienced in all our surveyed countries, and in many of them it is seen as the very source of all other ills in rendering fair distribution and maintaining workable inter-ethnic relations.

In line with the importance of the issue, across borders, there are ongoing debates regarding the causes and multifaceted disadvantageous consequences of segregation, accompanied also by an opposite line of argumentation that emphasises certain advantages of ethnic separation. Again, there are states and situations where ethnic (school) segregation is viewed as an outcome of social segregation, and there are cases when the impact of cultural elements on this phenomenon (among them racist prejudices on the part of the majority and self-protective mechanisms on the part of minorities) are in the focus of concern. Occasionally, practices of segregation are accepted due to their remedial promises, i.e. by the idea that they are preparing disadvantaged people to properly integrate into the mainstream life-styles (like in Germany or Romania). Sometimes segregation is understood as a by-product of the liberalisation of the parents’ (and students’) choice of schooling (like in the case of the British and Nordic school systems) or of the tracking mechanisms observable in all the countries under scrutiny. Altogether, scholars emphasise that – where it appears – school segregation does not simply follow residential segregation, but arises from a complex interplay of factors in differing local contexts including geographical location, material conditions, historically shaped social positions, racism, mutual lack of trust, the history of particular schools, the emphasis on parental choice or the actual arrangements of tracking within the school system.

Eventually the issue of school segregation and attempts at desegregation provoke the old ambivalences predominating in many European countries about coexisting cultures, or at least about the best way of sharing the same social space by different ethno-cultural groups

⁷ They are ‘invisible’ for at least two reasons. Firstly, they have been functioning for decades and this fact has gradually made them a natural, unnoticed part of everyday life. Secondly, they do not differentiate between groups whereby the system avoids creating visible borders along disputable issues of social justice.

and assuring the minima of understanding and communication among them. When turned to policy alternatives, these issues translate into dilemmas of the positive and negative impacts of separation along ethnic lines. On the one hand, it is considered that separation might serve the interests of minority ethnic youth by being educated and performing in their mother tongue (or, as it is said, in a safe environment composed of their “own people” that lacks prejudices directed against them). On the other hand, it is feared that separation (especially if lasting) might create a disadvantage in terms of learning to communicate with the ethnic “others” and to perform in the multi-ethnic context of the world behind the school (with implications on reproducing the ethnocentric conviction according to which the ethnic “other” is a danger for “us”, the majority). Altogether, these dilemmas show how a phenomenon – school segregation – experienced by the most disadvantaged ethno-cultural and social groups (like Roma or immigrants) challenges a whole system of principles regulating inter-ethnic relations in the context of any given nation-state. And it also proves that proposals defined from the perspective of the most oppressed might generate transformations within the broader policy arena by shifting attention from the passion of “one’s own culture” to the preoccupation with the assurance of intercultural communication within an inclusive society. But in terms of educational policies the stake of desegregation is far more complex than this shift. Because it is not only about the development of a set of ideas and policies that eliminate segregation as a potent source of disadvantages, but it also needs to respect the linguistic/cultural rights of groups without damaging the human rights of their individual members, furthermore, it has to establish the necessary social-political balance by simultaneously establishing the conditions of intercultural understanding and social coexistence in a multiethnic environment (Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008).

RECOGNITION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL RIGHTS IN THE CONTEXT OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Cultural rights as part of recognition politics and achievements continue to be among the most hotly debated issues on the table of European policies, being at the core of the educational ones. They include a large palette of entitlements, from the right to learn in one’s “own language” about one’s “own history”; through the need to eliminate racial distinctions and implications, but also to get away with fundamentalist cultural convictions while maintaining the respect towards traditions and differences; to the recognition of the importance of intercultural communication and mutual understanding. Again, from country to country, policy-makers and –analysts are having different understandings about these topics depending on the country’s old and new experiences and challenges on the domain of cultural encounters and exchanges (Fraser 1997; Kymlicka 1995, 2001). One of the most confusing aspects of the treatment of culture-related issues/rights in our sample of countries is the assimilation of the ethnicised minority culture (in the case of immigrants in Western Europe) with “religious fundamentalism” and the danger of “Muslim terrorism”, and (in the case of Roma from Central and Eastern Europe) with the “culture of poverty” (including criminality and violence), and in both cases with a patriarchal regime incompatible with or hostile to “Western modernity”.

The country-specific policies regarding the cultural aspects of (ethnic minority) education are mostly referring to the language of instruction and the minorities’ mother tongues taught in schools. At their turn languages are celebrated sometimes as bearers of positive values (like identity and diversity), but at other moments are blamed as being responsible for misunderstandings, social tensions and conflicts. From time to time, language is thought to be as a main instrument of integration or assimilation, but it might be also instrumentalised as a mean of resistance, separation or hostility. In countries with a long colonial history the maintenance of the immigrants’ “own languages” is frequently perceived as an incentive for them to return to their home country and as a departure from the principle

of equal treatment for all. In Central and Eastern Europe, the introduction of Romani among the recognised languages of national minorities was one of the ways by which ethnic Roma were recognised as equal partners of the majority, but – in the eyes of some – it also contained the risk of opening up another mechanism of Roma segregation and potential exclusion.

In reflection of the European Union's repeated recognition of cultural diversity as a value, multiculturalism is celebrated or at least formally sustained in all the member states. At the same time, their experiences in implementing multiculturalism show great variations from its official-only acknowledgement (like in Denmark) through its sceptical treatment (like in Germany) to its almost total rejection (like in France). Again, depending on their historical legacies, the structure of contemporary inter-ethnic relations and the broader framework of policy-making, multiculturalism carry different actual contents. Their diverse experience about multiculturalism as the manifestation of parallel worlds that cultivate the distinct cultural traditions with the potential of resulting in separation and culturally-driven conflicts determine the degree of efforts that the different countries make toward incorporating multiculturalism in schooling. At any rate, after years of devotion and enthusiastic experimentation, it is nowadays all-round scepticism and criticism that occupy the stage. This said, the continuous and dedicated work of experts, activists, pedagogues and policy-makers toward revising the concepts and practices of multiculturalism and adapting them to the changed spirit of times also has to be acknowledged. In conclusion, the ideal of intercultural education seems to have the potential of saving the positive meanings of cultural diversity by shifting the focus from one's cultural closure toward appraising mutual cultural exchange. But up till now this exists more or less only as a package of new (or renewed) promises and ideals, without real political and financial commitment towards its implementation (Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008).

III. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN SHAPING THE SITUATION OF MINORITY ETHNIC YOUTH

In the following, the report will review the impacts of the prevailing educational structures, established policy frameworks, and dominant school practices on the daily lives and opportunities of minority ethnic youth in the countries concerned. Impacts will be captured by the performance of schools hosting different social composition of students and the attainments of minority students in contrast to mainstream peers and relative to each other. Impacts will also be understood in the larger societal context according to inclusion and exclusion dominated patterns in the distribution of access to knowledge and subsequent life prospects among young people. The EDUMIGROM background reports on education will serve as the main source of updated information in addition to some internationally recognised comprehensive reviews and evaluations of educational performance and advancement (Eurydice Network 2004; OECD 2006, 2007, 2008; European Commission 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008).

MANAGEMENT, FINANCING, AND CONTROL IN EDUCATION

In the investigated nine countries, different models serve to organise and manage primary and secondary education. In correspondence with larger traditions of state administration and governance, federal (Germany), centralised (France), regionally organised (Sweden, Denmark, and also Romania) and differently but rather deeply decentralised structures (UK, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary) are responsible for managing, financing, and providing inspection over the delivery of educational services. Where local

authorities have major role in financing (often by shared revenues with the central state budget) and managing public schools, national curriculum, teacher training, and inspectorates are mastered by central authorities (Germany, Slovakia, Romania, Denmark, Sweden, UK). In contrast to fairly decentralised systems, an excessively decentralised one easily escapes from the regulations and directions of the central educational authorities, and this fact certainly has immediate consequences on educating ethnic minorities in society by inducing a high risk of increased territorial inequality (OECD 2006, 2007). Forms of school administration influence, but not fully determine, school district regulations, the scope of arbitrariness in institutional decisions, neutral (blind) or exclusionary administrative practices in resource allocation, teachers' selection, and most importantly, in placing children.

Throughout Europe there is public sector dominance in ownership and funding of schools even if a division of labour between the government, the regions (Länder) and the municipalities is established. The numbers of independent and private schools are growing among which the most typical ones are the religious/faith schools in old member states and a mix of secular/alternative and religious schools in the new member states. According to the EDUMIGROM background reports, independent schools usually do not educate minority students in any significant numbers or are not established specifically for them, with the exception of some newly created, experimental multicultural schools (UK, Denmark). Nevertheless, the number of independent schools created by and for specific minority/ethnic groups definitely has been on the rise in recent years in both the old and the new member states – a rather new phenomenon triggering hot and cold social responses from all political angles.

Supervision in most educational systems is ensured by national/federal authorities, although in more decentralised systems local school boards and local authorities also have quality control and evaluation responsibilities. Our background reports show that a fair level of decentralisation does not necessarily bring about the loosening of quality control and performance inequity monitoring on national or sub-national levels. Well functioning supervisory systems may send warning signals to national policy-makers and school managers on tangible inequality problems across and within schools. Yet, in a lack of major standardised supervision, even problem signalling is missing or passed on to researchers and civil society actors (e.g. in Hungary). In some countries, teacher placement is often centralised in spite of differences in school administration (e.g. Germany and France). Merit recognition, as a main placement principle, fosters procedures that conclude in the best teachers taking positions at the best schools and thus leaving the problematic schools to the weaker ones. Attempts at implanting affirmative action in hiring teachers with a view on the needs of minority ethnic students are often blocked by formal equality considerations (Germany) or fear from the accompanying stigmatising perceptions (Romania).

In some countries, school boards and local authorities also have major roles in setting the curriculum, shaping broader pedagogical standards and admission policy. The participation of parents in school boards or other school related bodies differs country to country. Except for France, some efforts and spaces are created to connect parents to school management and decision making. In principle, parents' involvement in inspecting school decisions and performance may make school administrations more sensitive to special needs of minority ethnic youth, yet in practice, this path of inclusion may only give possibilities for parents of middle and upper classes to voice their views. Participation in formalised bodies requires some kind of self-confidence and competence that minority ethnic parents often lack.

Three larger sets of educational practices seem to have the most significant influence on minority ethnic youth: patterns of placing and tracking students at different stages of compulsory education; conditions to introduce integration-driven methods in teaching; and capacities to mitigate disadvantages in the broader learning environment of the schools (external to school management and life). Concerning the impacts of educational services on the careers of ethnic minorities, again three main aspects should be sorted out: access to

quality education in terms of admission, attendance, and completion; school attainments; and mobility towards further education and in labour market participation. In this overview of the major trends that have informed recent policy-making in our nine countries, prevailing educational practices and their outcomes are discussed in a simplified system: causes and effects are not sorted out analytically, instead, profound tendencies and larger associations are pronounced.

DIRECTING AND TRACKING CHILDREN

In reflection to differences in capacities and abilities of children, schools create pathways to match demand and supply in the educational space. This matching endeavour takes into account the manifold diversities in societies in a passive or active way with various ideological underpinnings.

In spite of a generally accepted norm that elementary education should be accessible for all children regardless of their status in society, school entrance is not unproblematic for a number of minority ethnic groups in Europe. According to internationally available statistics, roughly 5 per cent of children on average even in the best performing countries are not in school (European Commission 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008). The most obvious groups vulnerable to disappearance from school are the children of refugees, internally displaced people, nomadic groups, and illegal migrants (Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). Our background reports portray different systems for regulating the access of undocumented and documented migrants and minorities to schooling. In Germany the policy differs by Länder, some allowing, others blocking a smooth path of undocumented migrants to education. In the UK elementary schooling is universally provided, whereas in Romania authorities could deny access to those who do not have birth certificate which is quite frequent among Roma.⁸

Placing and admitting children in primary schools is one of the most debated elements of the entire education system in all countries and has special relevance to the life of minority ethnic youth. *School districts* are the most commonly used device to regulate catchments areas based on travel distance, head counts, and resource allocation considerations. Originally, school districts were designated also to ensure a balanced mix of students of different social and ethnic background. Our background reports reveal that in these days administratively defined boundaries of enrolment are debated or in some cases fiercely attacked from two angles: they do not seem to give enough space for competition, while they are not very successful to cater for equity objectives either. Where ethnic minorities tend to be concentrated in certain urban localities or rural regions, the rigid district system turns schools ethnically compartmentalised by default. When more space for parental choice is allowed, differentiations of student achievements between schools invoke a “White flight” from certain schools or districts. In France and Germany it is acknowledged that school districts are reproducing the territorial inequalities between nearby communities: the academic resources of schools tend to mirror residential segregation. School districts can easily become the basis for institutional discrimination, yet, their adjustment rather than complete dissolution is thought to be the proper response.

In several countries the district principle is binding for the schools but is not limiting parental options. In this combination of regulation and choice (e.g. in the Czech Republic and Hungary), no children can be denied from the district concerned yet parents can choose schools outside the district. In some cases, applicants of socially disadvantaged families cannot be denied or should be given priority among those who compete. This is to mitigate processes through which better-off parents can take advantage of choice (travel, move, etc.) in contrast to the poorer families among whom the migrants and Roma are overrepresented,

⁸ This issue is discussed in detail in Szalai et al. 2008.

respectively. In principle, constant rearranging of school districts could follow and target social composition of communities but this may not be the political will of the majority population often controlling decision-making bodies in the local authorities.

Tracking of children across types of school and *stratifying* them in different programmes within school in principle matches interests and capabilities with different variants of education and contents of knowledge schools offer. The relevant literature allows little contestation in that the key dividing line in regard to social mobility appears to be between those tracks and programmes that lead to higher or post-secondary education or at least continuing education, and the ones that conclude students' learning career, respectively (Checchi and Brunello 2006; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). Accordingly, tracking and grouping determine a path not only in the schooling system but in adult career as well. Thus, the earlier the selection takes place and the more it follows pure performance indicators, the more it blocks social mobility. The timing of the first selection is normally between age of 10 and 17 in OECD countries. Within this range, it is rather early (age 11 or below) in Germany, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, whereas it is delayed (age 16 or above) in Denmark, Sweden and the UK (OECD 2007, p.38). The PISA International Student Assessment 2006 Survey demonstrates that institutional tracking is in close association with the impact that parents' socioeconomic background bears on students' performance. The key findings indicate that the earlier students are clustered and directed in different programmes, the more the school's mean socioeconomic profile affects the performance of students in an unmediated manner (ibid, p.7).

Stratifying and channelling children based on academic performance rather than tastes and preferences is a basic rule in France and Germany. In the UK, parents' and children's desire and choice are heard and weighed in the decisions. In the new member states, tracking is also driven by performance of children that arranges the disadvantaged Roma students in schools with limited mobility potentials and high drop-out rates. In most countries concerned inflexibility characterises the tracking systems. If any move occurs, with small exceptions it is *downwards*. Minority ethnic students' parents are less prepared to comprehend the workings of selection. The success of comprehensive schools in avoiding early tracking (as examples from Germany and UK show) dissolves pre-determined paths for students. Some other examples indicate that tracking could be delayed, without risking quality and efficiency of the entire system, to the transition from lower to upper secondary stages (Denmark and Sweden). The Swedish system, compared to other European models, seems to be rather integrating as it stresses civic and academic knowledge at the expense of vocation training even in schools of practical orientation.

In most countries, secondary education has become more competitive in recent years and thus access often depends on the financial possibilities of parents. In secondary schools, managing authorities and boards have a larger role in defining curricula, subject areas, requirements, etc according to certain peculiar needs than on the primary stage. It is noteworthy that from similar traditions of secondary education different patterns have grown out in countries of geographical and cultural proximity. The German classical grammar school informed both the Danish model that allows a significant degree of differentiation as well as the Swedish model that is guided by the principle of integration in its secondary education system. Vocational training is often not only the dead-end of schooling but it is saturated by discriminatory practices that minority ethnic students have to face. In some countries, with not the worst unemployment statistics among the advanced European economies, the problem of finding apprenticeship is grave (Denmark, France). Students have their own responsibility in obtaining proper placement which is a troublesome duty for minorities with improper social network and exposed to potential overt and covert discrimination by employers. In other words, in vocational training minority ethnic youths are often subject to mechanisms that not only multiply their disadvantages but make them feel redundant early in their career.

CHALLENGES OF DIVERSITY IN SCHOOL PRACTICES

Schools create spaces in which daily routines of teaching and learning reflect upon social distinctions and thus orient students and their parents with regard to acceptable and unacceptable forms of social classifications. Curriculum, student evaluation, pedagogical tools, groupings of children across classes all play into the mix of practices that reflect and form diversity in the school. Although the scope of this research is on compulsory education, it is well documented that diversity challenges in the elementary schools are entangled with the status and accessibility of preschool/nursery services. Childcare facilities prior to school age vary due to distinctive family, gender, and welfare policies in Europe. As a general experience, however, preschool facilities are often less accessible for ethnic minorities than for families of the majority. Payment requirements, physical distance, discriminatory enrolment, and mutual suspicion between management and parents are to be blamed for the situation.

In all countries of the EDUMGIROM project, a concentration of minority ethnic and immigrant populations could be observed in certain districts, types of schools and classes. Tangible presence of these groups often calls for preparatory and special classes for language and competence development. Special needs driven education triggers little concern if it is parallel or optional, and leads to integration into mainstream courses. But these classes frequently become permanent institutions fostering or endorsing separation. Moreover, in all countries special schools and classes serve the education of disabled children. According to various investigations, these classes show a high percentage of minorities: the cluster of physically and mentally disabled children is merged with that of pupils who are considered to have learning and behavioural problems – and due to pedagogical attributions, minority ethnic children turn out to be systematically overrepresented among the latter (Harry and Klingner 2005; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). Cultural competence, differentially distributed in society faulted by ethnic and other lines, thus becomes cemented in social categories of abilities/disabilities hiding the ethnic or often racial nature of the division.

In the new member states, the category of *children of special educational needs* (SEN) denotes a practice through which Roma students are shepherded to separate spaces, in numerous cases in blatantly discriminatory manner. Separated education offered to special needs children becomes one of the major forms of segregated education. Sheer statistics on SEN placing would be enough to prove the impact of institutional segregation, but sophisticated research also reveals main practices to be faulted (Kende and Neményi 2006). Testing students for SEN status often lacks competence and fairness, or in case of elementary sincerity and good intention, is saturated with the perceptions of skills and competencies of the dominant culture of mainstream society. Roma parents often willingly accept the SEN clusters for safe environment for their kids, but it is reported that in Hungary they have started to contest the decision of selection bodies entering the road of recognition struggle.

Special schools receive extra funding creating incentives to perpetuate the recruitment of SEN pupils (Hungary, Slovakia, Romania). In Hungary, as a result of recent decisions, SEN students cannot be clustered in special schools, yet their integration through internal, within-school methods to regular classes so far has proven ill-fitted, thus many of them drop out or lag behind. Moreover, in November 2007 the European Court of Human Rights ruled that segregating Roma students into special schools is a form of unlawful discrimination referring to a widespread practice in Central and Eastern Europe in confining Roma students, regardless of their intellectual abilities, into “special” schools for children with learning disabilities.⁹

⁹ The case known as D.H. and Others v. the Czech Republic was originated by the European Roma Rights Center (ERRC) after unsuccessful filing of complaints in the Czech courts in 1999 on behalf of eighteen

In schools of mixed social composition, language is considered as key to all competences (e.g. in the Czech Republic all immigrants are classified as SENs). In general, the knowledge of the country's dominant language is viewed as a tool for adaptation and assimilation (this concern is especially strong in Denmark). Regardless of the duration and status of ethnic minorities and one-time migrants in a country, genuine bilingual education is rare (Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). In some places, language specific classes are organised on the assumption of migrants' return to their home countries (Germany). Minority language schooling is allowed or even supported for several national minorities in Central and Eastern Europe, yet ethnic Roma do not enjoy similar entitlements. In lack of own resources, they are not able to establish or maintain this sort of schools (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary). Poor quality of bilingual education turns to be detrimental to school performance: bilingual students perform badly in lower secondary schools, producing the greatest gap in science (Denmark), yet this outcome of course should not be attributed to one single cause. Other characteristics of the social status and position of the relevant ethnic group should also be sought among the highly influential factors revealing themselves more visibly in secondary education attainments than in primary one.

It is not new to acknowledge that in several European schooling systems traditional classroom pedagogy and the evaluation of students prefer codified knowledge to creative skills and multiple competencies. Codified knowledge is built and stored by cultural screens of the majority society. Thus, White bias could be observed in exam questions (UK). In addition to key curriculum aspects, designating holidays, dress codes, and food regimes also embarrass minority ethnic students. As a consequence, mutual distrust often emerges between schools and minority ethnic students and parents. Distrust confirms teachers' weaker or stronger stereotypes of undisciplined and low-performing minority ethnic students. Antagonism becomes high in particular between teachers coming mostly from the majority population and young minority male students who are considered not only undisciplined and disinterested but misogynists/sexist (UK, Denmark). The concentration of minority ethnic boys in certain types of schools and classes, on the lower end of the school status hierarchy, is the result and an indicator of "White flight" (France, UK). In Germany Muslim boys are viewed as the most problematic at schools, developing adversarial behaviour, language, and culture. Elsewhere, the Caribbean males appear to cement racial categories and become a minority within the minority (UK). Student evaluation may have detrimental effects on minorities not only through adversarial relations but through a mirror practice as well. Well-intended lower expectations towards minority ethnic youth often become a self-fulfilling prophesy. It is believed that due to the troubled relationship between minority ethnic parents and teachers and school managers, absenteeism is more frequent among these groups. In fact, while absenteeism shows great variance among minorities in the UK, it is high in schools where the majority is Roma in the new member states (Romania, Hungary).

In view of diversity challenges, schools introduce special courses to target cultural competence and normalisation (civilisation), that is to make all students think and feel democratically in "Western" or "civilised" manner (Denmark, Germany). Migration is often presented as a problem rather than a potential resource (Germany). When group differences along ethnicity, culture, religion, etc. are thought to be acknowledged in school practices, identity politics driven multiculturalism reinforces boundaries instead of nexus. A widespread outcome of this limited multicultural spirit is that White people are put in the centre of representation and carnival-like difference is placed around (UK). In multicultural debates in Germany, a static approach of culture is faulted with its universalistic approach to promote either Western supremacy or a perplexed notion of diversity lacking efforts to introduce the concepts of conflict and hybrid. Even the best intention triggers pedagogical dilemmas in

children from the city of Ostrava represented (For details of the case and the Court's judgement, see: The European Court of Human Rights 2007).

sorting out sameness and difference entangling ethnic and other, differently clustered, groups of society.

In most countries concerned efforts to comply with anti-discrimination regulations in education are prevalent but teachers are largely unprepared to deal with antagonism in particular from anti-school male students. Everywhere it is on the agenda to introduce language courses in teachers' training and better involve teachers with migrant or minority ethnic background. This latter measure faces obstacles due to the requirement of neutral job position (Germany). Moreover, those minority teachers who are involved are reduced to migrant specific tasks. A major drawback of many integration programmes is that they are voluntary and no additional financial and organisational tools are provided by the state, federal, or local authorities.

The EDUMIGROM background reports reveal that the introduction of more innovative and inclusion-driven changes is preconditioned by conceptual shifts in understanding multiculturalism, subsequent pedagogical renovations, and altered resource allocation. Recent experiments for multicultural education include not only knowledge on other cultures but on oppression and racism in the curricula (UK). Intercultural education contests how cultural heterogeneity is accepted within the liberal Western tradition (Nagata 2004; UNESCO 2006; Bleszynska 2008; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). A genuine multicultural thinking has been transplanted in education in Sweden since 1995. This implies non-compulsory first language education with mandatory service delivery by schools, late tracking, and trespass allowed across tracks. Bilingual education was institutionalised as a right in Denmark in 2007. Since then debates have been addressing the proper targeting of bilingual teaching (language for life or for school) and evaluating the achievements of experimental schools for inclusive education (e.g. the so-called "Copenhagen Model"). Pro-active anti-discrimination and equality policy is initiated by providing special government funds and programmes for fighting social exclusion (explicitly named) in the UK. As part of it, individually targeted financial support based on needs assessment is combined with language education. Further, mechanisms to better inform and enable students on moving in the tracking systems are put in place and some flexibility is also introduced, but the results are not yet known.

Within the framework of the internationally agreed and nationally implemented Decade of Roma Inclusion programme, the new member states are prodded to keep the debate on education duties of the state serious. Roma school inspectors and mediators responsible for enrolment, special support, and language education are in place in Romania. The first accounts of the special programme in support for integrated schools with sizeable Roma population show modest but promising signs in Hungary. Yet, perverse incentives through resource allocation and in lack of proper inspection tools remain in the system. The integration experiment is often on the shoulders of non-governmental organisations with fragile positions in funding. High hopes are placed in the potentials of the distribution of European structural funds in giving boost to Roma integration in all CEE countries. It warrants to critical examination that big PHARE projects in the recent past did not seem to bring about major impacts or delivered only fragmented ones. It is also argued that financial support for minority ethnic youth in secondary education is a proven technique for lowering the stigma of non-qualifying for certain tracks as an ethnic group (Romania, Hungary). In sum, experiments for integration driven educational models are in progress, yet in most cases evidence for their larger scale impacts is still to be seen.

As a main rule, mainstream schools do not allow religious education in most old member states. In response, new faith schools often lacking state monitoring have been established to meet the educational needs of certain minority ethnic groups (e.g. the madrassas in the UK). Clashes of Western human rights concerns with cultural autonomy perspectives are believed to lead to separation of communities. Backyard Mosques and Private Koran classes generate prime suspicion by mainstream society as well. Private

schools for minority ethnic middle class in a less adversarial manner also convey the message of solving multiethnic education through separation (German Turks). In Romania the discontent of minority leaders with school services inspired them to lobby and organise special schools that would respect their identity and culture, and do away with majority biases. Thinking on Roma integration in this country is complicated by models and spill-over effects of differently structured interethnic relations of the majority population and an acknowledged historical minority (Hungarians). The idea of separate education is embedded in the referential relationships of ethnic groups in society obtaining saliently different status. The model of minority education for Roma is framed after the national minority that seems to achieve recognition through maintaining its own language and culture, among other things, through education (the big brother effect). Thus, targeted actions and hidden racism may both contribute to the high number of segregated schools. Statistics prove that in separate minority education systems parents and pupils face less tension but often perform at lower expectations.

ATTAINMENT DIFFERENTIALS IN THE BROADER LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

There is a vast literature in social sciences and policy studies on how the school system – even if it consciously strives for enhancing equity or at least reducing distinctions considered unfair – tends to reproduce existing social inequalities.¹⁰ Even heavily controlled and tightly structured education systems have internal mechanisms for differentiation (e.g. extra classes to offer better service to higher social classes in the French system). Wealthier and high status families can simply take more advantage of the education services than people on the lower end of the social hierarchy. In other words, social and ethnically blind services may disfavour groups of disadvantage, including ethnic minorities. Moreover, the well-offs find ways to distract the system to their needs even if choice is limited (Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008).

The EDUMIGROM background reports as well as other inquiries endorse that overall educational attainment of minority ethnic youth looks much less favourable than the average. To zoom on details, however, reveals internal variations. Statistics show that second and third generations of one-time migrants are making significant academic progress in the old member states (UK, Sweden), although some minority ethnic groups stand as negative exceptions (e.g. Caribbeans and Pakistanis in the UK, Somalis in Denmark). In other countries, descendants of labour migrants from the 1970s are doing worse than children of recent migrants (Germany). In essence, ethnicity appears to be a motor of high achievement and motivation to learn, by the same token also as an explanation for school failure and source of oppositional identity (UK). The inspiration of immigrant parents can be higher than that of ordinary citizens. Some minority ethnic groups may do better than mainstream in getting to higher education, whereas others do worse (France). European and other White groups are usually doing better but some exceptions occur (e.g. Portuguese students and those of Central and Eastern European descent in Germany). In states of high social diversity, it is far from being evident how the school performances of the most “visible” migrant groups, such as Asians, Africans, Caribbeans, and Turks vary. In old member states, a particular hierarchy of the ethnic groups transpires when regarding all major performance indicators: in an all-round comparison, Roma are gaining the least from the educational system.

When looking at the role that ethnicity and nationality play in relation to other social distinctions, the interpretation of school performance data becomes ever more complex. In all countries of the EDUMIGROM project, education research confirms over and over that performance differences between ethnic groups are *intertwined with class distinctions*. The

¹⁰ For an extensive discussion of the recent literature on the ethnic/racial dimension of these persistent inequalities in education, see: Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008.

poorest ethnic groups have the lowest achievements underlying that social class is the stronger factor affecting attainment in education (UK). Within the same social class, minorities often do better, while some ethnic groups clearly compound class disadvantage (in the UK the Indians and the Chinese). In some countries it is found that direct family influence on children's motivation has decreased yet the indirect one of socioeconomic position has increased (France). Elsewhere it is believed that the cultural capital and educational level of the parents add to the class divisions (the Czech Republic). In countries where *intersecting social classifications* and inequalities are discussed, the interplay of gender, ethnicity and socioeconomic background is also revealed in attainment inequalities. For example, boys in general are conspicuously underperforming compared to girls. White boys of lower classes come out as worst performing as the single most important group for policy attention (UK). Yet, social class can reverse the gender gap: higher status boys are overdoing lower status girls. In Romania, ethnicity and gender intersect in the higher drop-out rates of Roma girls compared to boys. This differentiation is complicated by an urban-rural divide: in rural communities distinctively low quality school services are offered to pupils among whom Roma are overrepresented in several regions.

The notion of dropping out implies that some children, and more often their parents, choose to stay away temporarily or systematically from schooling during the compulsory education period. By the same token, it is well known in education research that being at school, in a lack of quality education, does not create a sense of learning, dignity, and ambition. In many cases, schools themselves produce circumstances that push out disadvantaged or low-achieving students. School quality and school climate are most often discussed as the most tangible conditions behind attendance and drop-out (Hövels, Rademacker, and Westhoff 1999; Huskin 2007; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008). In the new member states, different inquiries highlight that early discouragement of Roma children at school lowers their self-esteem that results, in turn, in self-exclusion, truancy and dropping out (OSI EUMAP 2007). In Hungary, a smaller scale testing shows that the repetition rate for Roma is fivefold that of the majority students. In Slovakia, research indicates that Roma are 30 times more likely to drop out and 14 times more likely to repeat grades than students from the same age groups within the majority population. In Romania the drop-out rate over the 8th year of schooling is much higher among the Roma than in the mainstream (Crighton, Budiene, and Dedze 2005). In all countries of the EDUMIGROM research project, drop-out is much more likely in schools that belong to lower status and are segregated with a high overrepresentation of ethnic minorities than in better-quality educational units that are either ethnically evened or are dominated by the majority. As the statistics indicate, minority students are more likely to become drop-outs in secondary schools than their mainstream peers (Eurydice Network 2004).

The 2006 PISA survey provides useful data and explanations for some key domains of school performance differentials. As pointed out above, it is clearly shown that institutional tracking is closely related to the impact of socioeconomic background of parents on student performance. In addition, it is also demonstrated that in schools that sort out students in all subjects by ability, the overall student performance is lower than average. The survey offers an account for performance variations between schools in some countries of the EDUMIGROM project. In Germany, the Czech Republic, and Hungary the performance variation between schools is much higher than the OECD average. Students' socioeconomic difference explains a significant part of between-school differences in countries such as the Czech Republic, Germany, and Slovakia. From our country sample, it is Hungary and France where student background explicates the largest portion of student performance variations (OECD 2007, p.34). Moreover, the widest gap in performances between two students from different socioeconomic backgrounds can be predicted in France, the Czech Republic, UK, and Germany, in countries that otherwise belong to the relatively well performing cluster.

MAJOR GENERAL TRENDS

In all countries concerned, a general democratisation in education took place in the post-war period inducing vast upward mobility and guaranteeing a certain level of schooling accessible for basically everyone. Notwithstanding, this democratisation process has progressed hand in hand with the emergence of new and subtle differentiations in the benefits that families and youngsters can get from schooling. Differentiations are partly due to growing space for choice that seems to have positive and negative *spiral* effects. According to the PISA 2006 survey results, those schools that face at least some competition generate better student performances than the ones that are exempted from competition. At the same time, more choice tends to create involuntary separation and segregation for certain groups that can have relatively low chances to take part in the competition due to structural conditions (OECD 2007, p.7). Those who are capable players in the competition can take better advantage of the increasing performance of schools, whereas others converge to those segments of the system in which resentment culture and low expectations determine the position and outcome of the service users.

Everywhere in our country sample one can observe that the hierarchy of the more and the less desirable schools has become crystallised and the tracking and placing of children across these schools also display regularised patterns. Although the ethnically divided societies show major differences in their potentials of integration and antagonisms, in general it is fair to argue that ethnic minorities, or at least substantial segments of them, are becoming the low performing users of the schools system. They also tend to have access to the lower levels of the school system leaving limited potentials for life-long learning. In sharper cases, “White flight” is in progress or has been completed creating or reinforcing patterns of educational segregation. Parental and student reactions often converge in avoidance and resentment strategies. As a typical result, involuntary ethnic segregation intensifies the tensions between teachers and pupils reinforcing the ethnic/racial antagonism (Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008).

Debates on inequities in education address the share of education system in producing discrimination compared to other walks of life (France). It is argued by strong voices that school segregation is a product of external forces such as increasing division in wealth, housing, and on the labour market (UK)¹¹. Ethnic lines are deployed in different ways to explain differential access to good quality education. One can observe an overemphasis of school problems (violence, lack of respect) in ethnic terms whereas denial of ethnic discrimination as an ordinary fact of daily life (France). In another context, the invisibility of ethnicity in the education policy agenda transpires whereas its omnipresence in public debates on order, security, police, employment, etc. is conspicuous. The debates on the avenues of Roma integration in all new member states embody the dilemma of targeting racial segregation or solving broader issues of class relations, poverty, and social exclusion. It is also pronounced that targeted support programmes may trigger embarrassment about affirmative action among the members of the beneficiary social groups (Romania).

There is growing evidence on rising residential segregation (UK), interwoven social and ethnic segregation, urban unrest coinciding with most tangible minority segregation (UK), and the experience of parallel lives (Germany). Efforts are acknowledged to tackle urban segregation and involve middle mainstream society, but one may question why there is nothing or much less to talk about specific tasks in schooling, such as introducing intercultural curricula and changing classroom culture (reduction of class size, extra teachers, whole-day schedule, etc.). One may argue that relating school attainment differences in the

¹¹ As will be discussed later in details, in the UK, recent research on segregation has brought up also important sources of anti-segregation trends that owe their success to a rather broad public belief in cohesive strategies and to certain deliberately designed complex local policies of inclusion, respectively.

broader learning environment of schools may enrich the policy understanding of educational inequalities. By the same token, to push all major structural causes of inequalities out of the walls of the school distracts the debate from acknowledging the significance of intra-school life, classroom practices and moving children along the compulsory education pathways.

IV. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION: A CROSS-COUNTRY OVERVIEW

This chapter attempts to pull together the strings of the previous discussions by mapping across countries the problem definitions, the main goals, and the actual forms of implementation of educational policies for minority inclusion. The presentation is informed by considering that the choice policy-makers can make among the sets of competing goals and means is informed by a two-way process. On the one hand, the scope of the applicable programmes and interventions is highly determined by the given educational structure and the interplay of the surrounding social, political, and economic forces that embody interests and dedications often at odds. On the other hand, the earlier introduced principles as products of longer historical development and larger socio-political arrangements exert their continuous “pull-effect”. Amid these twofold determinations of the “givens” and the “potentials”, it is the challenge of the most pressing needs and conflicts and the will of the political actors to resolve them that give rise to new experiments, innovations, and novel practices to change the process of education toward more equality and improved inclusion. When outlining the details of recent developments country by country, data and descriptions are cited – as indicated earlier in this report – from the EDUMIGROM background reports on education that the country teams of the project prepared in fall 2008.

PROBLEM DEFINITION

When the general principles of the welfare state are translated to guiding principles of the policies in education, this multi-step translation process concludes into the designation of specific problems that given policies and measures should tackle through addressing short- and longer-term goals that are to be achieved by applying a given set of interventions and measures. As pointed out earlier, policies addressing the education of minority ethnic youth conceptualise their problems (and the corresponding goals and measures) in three major sets of relations:

- the relation between education and rights;
- the relation between education and social status;
- the relation between education and culture.

The texture of policies is eventually shaped by the ways how different countries understand the connections among these three large sets of relations and how they perceive their weight and interplay in shaping people’s opportunities within and beyond education. As will be shown below, the conceptualisations show remarkable differences that reflect the varied traditions of thinking about the listed three domains of relations, but are highly influenced also by the given manifestations of new needs and tensions in the real-world functioning of education with regard to rights, status and culture.

While the *right to education* is considered one of the basic universal rights in all our countries, the actual contents of this right remarkably vary among them. Firstly, they approach compulsory education in diverse ways: some countries define the age limits, others determine the form of schooling, yet others understand the concept as a right to knowledge.

Hence, the problems for policy-making vary: the focus might be to provide service and institutional control for those under a certain age; or to broaden access to quality schooling within a given general form of education; or to render alternative services of knowledge transmission with a heavy weight on equalising performance and outcome. Beyond these differences, problem definition of school education in terms of rights is shaped by the country-specific “translation” of universal human rights, of affirmative action measures and of their connections. Furthermore, at this chapter (regardless whether it is a universal or it is a special right addressing a given group) further differences occur in the professional focus where solving of the problem is hoped for: the loose legal binding of the regulations regarding minorities may claim further laws, public policy interventions, and enforcement; while an outcome-oriented conceptualisation of (equal) rights tends to conclude in policies and measures within the professional areas of teaching, counselling and child-related welfare for families.

The multifaceted relationship between *education and social status* calls for even greater diversity in problem definition and related policies than the understanding of rights. There are two major axes of the differences: firstly, whether they focus on entrance in or departure from the school-system; and secondly, whether they identify their addressees in individuals, closely defined target groups, or the institutional structure as such. As to the first axis, focus on entrance usually translates into the identification of *unequal access* to various forms and contents of schooling. As we have seen above, it is shown and argued that early differences in schooling have immediate impact on quality and performance that largely determine later opportunities for further education and on the labour market. When it is access that is in the focus of problem definition, the related policies usually centre on early childhood development, the extension of pre-schooling, measures of welfare for families with children, and education-specific schemes of support to combat institutional disadvantages. At the other end of the same axis, another set of arguments focuses on *differential opportunities at leaving education*. As the previous chapter outlined it, the problems that are identified centre partly around the issues of tracking within the school-system, and partly consider inequalities in gaining adequate knowledge students can capitalise on when entering the labour market. In relation to the problem definition, related policies aim at improving the content and quality of education in especially the tracks attended by minority ethnic youth, and/or attempt to open bridges for transgressing the otherwise remarkably segmented and closed tracks, and/or try to establish closer links with industry through extending the concerns of educational policy for the schemes of vocational training and apprenticeship. As to the addressees, there is a tendency toward applying schemes (scholarships, grants) to help individuals in combating “personalised” disadvantages of access that are further refined by certain group-specific measures in case minority ethnic groups and/or descendants of migrants are openly acknowledged as collectively hit by educational disadvantages. At the same time, focusing on the inequalities in opportunities upon departure tends to call for structural modifications: as briefly pointed out above, recent reforms to change the rigidity of tracking in most of our countries as well as attempts at launching new institutional forms for integrated schooling of Roma in some Central European countries point toward this direction.

Finally, the relationship between *education and culture* implies a number of old and new dilemmas concerning the institutional representation of cultures, the preservation of traditions and languages in a multiethnic context, the formation of a fair and balanced intercultural dialogue, and last but not least, the legal and institutional mechanisms of cultural protection and the banning discriminatory practices that are to safeguard respect and trust as major constituencies of the working of democracy. As translated into problems that corresponding policies should tackle, the listed issues centre on the fundamental dilemmas of assimilation toward cultural homogeneity versus deliberately sustained and cultivated cultural diversity. Policy-makers and -analysts are aware of the involved dilemmas in their implications on all the three major areas of education, i.e. as they manifest themselves in the

preschool, school and after-school performances of minority ethnic children and youth. On the one hand, if the role of education is seen to equip students in an equal way with the building blocks, skills and qualifications of the dominant culture shared by the nation as a whole, then bilingual education, multicultural curriculum, the proper training and employment of teachers with minority ethnic background might be concentrated on the preschool years and the early phases of compulsory schooling as “affirmative” tools to assist to overcome the initial disadvantages of minority ethnic children. While this problem definition might help to maintain the unitary goals of general education, it might conclude in the subordination of minority cultures and might imply unintended degrading “messages” for the members of the community. On the other hand, if education is seen as a terrain of developing and sustaining cultural diversity with a concordant colourful spreading of community schools under the intellectual and administrative rule of representatives of the ethnic community, then there will be a tendency to build up full-fledged schooling and training structures for all the distinct groups. While such structures may prove potent in valuing the given cultures and developing them in a vivid manner, their distinct development might conclude in unhealthy separation (and the ultimate freezing of intercultural dialogue), while it also might jeopardise the all-societal goal of assuring equal quality in education for all students, be they involved in any of the institutional forms.

GOALS

Despite the above-indicated great variation in defining the focal problems of minority ethnic youth education, the actual general goals set forth for policy-making and reflected in key government documents show a rather high degree of uniformity on our EDUMIGROM-map. These general goals fall under three major domains:

- assuring the right to education in the daily practice of schooling;
- increasing the social inclusion of disadvantaged groups;
- creating and maintaining an appropriate climate of cultural diversity.

As objectives defined under the umbrella of these principal goals, one finds a very colourful arsenal across the countries. The concrete aims (with a relatively short time-span attached to them) range from organisational attempts through framing novel pedagogical solutions to introducing deep-going revisions in the scope and content of the curricula. In some countries, priority is given to the increase of participation of minority ethnic children in preschool and secondary education, respectively (in order to successfully complete the compulsory grades at both ends); in others, inclusion and better school performance of minority ethnic students is hoped to be rendered through extending instruction in one’s mother tongue while making more efficient the acquisition of the state language, yet in others a new balance of mutual understanding and respect is seen to be achieved by redefining the core components of knowledge through giving a balanced representation to the history and culture of the nation state and those of the major minority ethnic groups of the country. Among the medium- and longer-term goals one can identify more complex strategies to enhance the opportunities of minority ethnic students by desegregating the school system through sharply modifying the schools’ mandatory catchments areas and/or through putting an end to the tracking of minority children into special schools or separate classes within the regular schools. Even more far-sighted policies set the aim of expanding the notion of “the right to education” by creating and sustaining programmes that assist children with special educational (and material) needs or by ones that allow early leavers to return to school and complete compulsory education at a later stage of their life.

The choices among the short-, medium- and longer-term goals are but informed by a number of factors. As pointed out above, in the countries under scrutiny, priority is given to one set of policy goals or another in accordance with the legacies of the historically

developed understandings of nationhood and citizenship that largely determine the institutional structures and the scope of manoeuvring within them. At the same time, the very same scope of manoeuvring is either tightened or broadened by the civil and political organisations that often frame their priorities in competing policy recommendations with an indirect though lasting influence on the actual policy-makers. In addition to this ongoing dialogue between the state actors and civil society, it is the government's openness to the policy recommendations of the European Union on minority rights, equal opportunities, anti-racism and anti-discrimination that may set forth new paths for change, together with the transnational or at least regional strategies that are developed as joint initiatives on the broad issues of social inclusion and inter-ethnic equality (as e.g. the Decade for Roma Inclusion in countries of Central and Eastern Europe).

At the same time, the way how the different social actors at different levels understand the necessity, the advantages – but also the risks and disadvantages – of identifying the target groups of their policies of inclusion according to ethnicity (or for that matter, foreign background) also determines the goals to be set and the means and procedures attached to them. That is why one may observe remarkable differences in the nature and functioning of minority educational policies across countries according to the varied ways of ethnic identification. Where ethnicity is part of one's recognised personal traits, policies of inclusion define their target groups accordingly; where ethnic identification is the task of a representative minority organisation on behalf of an entire residential community, it is usually the community as a whole that is addressed by developmental interventions; finally, where ethnicity is only tacitly "implied", the goals of policies of inclusion are set around the central notion of combatting social disadvantages (with blurred border-lines between the poor and certain ethnic minorities).

MEANS

As can be expected, the measures to approach the above introduced colourful set of short-, medium-, and long-term goals show perhaps even greater variations than the respective goals themselves. To give an overview of the means and forms of intervention, it seems most purposeful to structure them around the three broad perspectives of problem definition. Thus, below we are discussing the measures of minority educational policies as linked to the set of goals defined under the following headings:

- measures aimed at assuring the access of minority ethnic children to education;
- measures aiming at lessening the impact of socioeconomic differentiation on the access to education of disadvantaged groups;
- measures assuring respect for cultural/linguistic differences, and the promotion of multicultural education and intercultural understanding.

Measures aimed at assuring the access of minority ethnic children to education

The measures belonging under this heading relate mostly to the sphere of legislation. Derived from the strict banning on discrimination in the constitutions of our countries, educational laws put forth the equal right of children to education, further, they combine this right with the compulsion on schooling. The actual implementation of these unconditional and universal rights is then assisted by a large set of welfare measures and affirmative actions. However, the "philosophies" of these latter measures show remarkable variations against the conceptualisation of minority ethnic rights in the given countries. The overview below indicates that countries where "ethnicity" is not an acknowledged dimension of the legal and institutional regulations, it is mainly a set of welfare measures addressing socioeconomic disadvantages that are aimed to indirectly assist ethnic/racial equality. On the

other end of the scale, recognition of ethnicity involves measures that target well-defined minority ethnic groups and are designed to achieve ethnic/racial equality in education through covering the specific cultural needs of the groups in question.

In concordance with the principle of non-differentiation of citizens according to ethnic origin, in *France* there exist no specific laws and regulations regarding minority ethnic groups, so they are not openly designated as targets of educational policies either. Issues concerning the education of ethnic minorities are therefore addressed indirectly through measures aimed at “disadvantaged” youth in an effort to remediate the obvious disparities between the school performances and careers of students from different socioeconomic categories. However, the struggle against racial and ethnic discrimination has increasingly become a governmental priority over the past ten years, and several state-sponsored or state-led institutions have been set up to combat discrimination in the workplace, in housing, and in leisure activities – though not directly in education. At the same time, the growing number of surveys and reports testifying remarkable inequalities by citizenship and/or “foreign background” feed the ever more pronounced claims of a number of civil organisations for openly facing “ethnicity” as a serious dividing line in French society and design ethno-specific policies for combating inequalities and coded discrimination. The alternative policy programmes of these bodies and organisations emphasise the need for measures to ascertain equal rights in access to education (especially, in the tracks where minority youth is currently severely underrepresented) as a high priority on their agenda.

Following from the slow recognition of the historically new multiethnic character of German society that has not yet imbued all areas of policy-making, up until now, *Germany* has not introduced measures that are targeted toward defined minority ethnic groups in assisting their equal access to various forms of education and/or that provide effective protection against direct or indirect discrimination in education. Furthermore, the current suggestions for school reforms and development aim at improving individual students’ achievements and increase the autonomy of individual schools. The general debate on school reforms is characterised by the idea of the flexible individual and the aim to create human capital. In the spirit of this predominant trend, the focus of policy measures in the case of immigrants is also put on the individual responsibility of students and their parents, on local networking and the involvement of migrant organisations. Similar to the French case, assistance is given mainly through various welfare measures that address poverty but leave unattached ethnic discrimination as a deeply ingrained constituent of it. Due to these characteristics, educational statistics show remarkable inequalities between “citizens” and “foreigners”, and call attention to the detrimental consequences of spontaneous ethnic segregation. Thus, the rather powerful civil organisations of the largest ethnic group (the Turks) claim extra investment, specialised teacher training and targeted developmental efforts in school areas heavily inhibited by the German-Turkish population.

The Race Relations Act of 1976 in the *United Kingdom* made it unlawful to discriminate against someone on racial grounds, so in this country educational policies are linked to a general, proactive race equality policy. In this context, schools and teachers have responsibilities for promoting race equality and monitoring admission and progress of students by reference to ethnic group. Promoting and monitoring race equality on all grades and in all forms of the educational system is a key part of the policies and practices of all schools and other educational institutions, not only those with Black and minority ethnic students – as far as the general policy aim is to make such good practices fit effectively into the routine work of the school. It is worth noting that race equality indicators are continuously checked by the local educational authorities whose right and duty is to intervene and claim the introduction of targeted measures in schools that are falling behind. This “dialogue”-based management and control concludes in relatively quick and responsive interventions and is beneficial also for spreading good school practices within and beyond the local boundaries. Although the factors behind are certainly complex, but the indicated

institutional sensitivity has definitely played an important role in the earlier mentioned betterment of indicators of attendance and performance of dominant groups of minority ethnic students.

The social liberal policies rendering equal access to all forms of educations through universal measures and rather uniform forms of instruction have been remarkably challenged by recent experience both in Denmark and Sweden. While the prevailing structures still prove beneficial for large groups of the majority, expanding experience in mixed schools and, especially the widening gaps between the majority and descendants of foreign parents in the secondary levels of schooling have called attention to the multifaceted cultural and linguistic barriers of the latter groups that the uniform ways of instruction are unable to tackle. In the light of rising social inequalities in and beyond education, both governments established initiatives to improve the position of vulnerable children through organising bilingual classes, introducing multicultural curricula, and training and employing teaching staff from the same backgrounds where students come from. At the same time, the new regulatory mechanisms pertaining to ethnic minorities are not aimed at keeping ethnic groups apart or at acknowledging their differences, but rather at making sure that students with an immigrant background acquire the skills and qualifications to keep pace with their peers and ultimately become well-adapting citizens of the respective nation-states. Beside the mentioned measures in schooling, both countries rely on a complex welfare and adult educational programme designed for assisting the transition of newcomers. This broadly perceived design targeted at families with “foreign background” is a peculiar feature of the Nordic welfare states that has been deliberately aimed at attaining quick adaptation to universal norms and regulations through group-specific forms of intervention. It is hoped that these citizen-educating schemes prove benevolent also for children in the respective families through intensifying the parents’ interest and involvement in efficient schooling. Partnership between parents and schools (and their respective organisations) is seen as a key to stop dangerous ethnic separation and to effectively hinder further deepening of the prevailing inequalities in education.

Across countries of *Central and Eastern Europe* Roma became recognised as a national minority¹² subject to specific minority rights only after the collapse of socialism. But – due to the historical legacies of their position in these societies – they are still hardly perceived as nationalised categories. The perception of Roma as not “proper” nationals is generally explained by the fact that their “national toolkit” is less developed, and they do not have an equivalent for the “mother land” that all the classical national minorities of the region possess, or – differently put – they are stateless minorities scattered across all the European countries. If not assimilated, the Roma minority is mostly racialised and classified according to differences attributed to their “blood” or utterly different (considered as pre-modern) “culture”. Such a widespread view of the majorities has left its imprints also on a set of institutional measures in education. Although the enforcement of the laws on compulsory education during the past decades has concluded in nearly all-inclusive enrolment in primary education, the expansion of coverage went hand in hand with the spreading of special schools. As it was discussed in the previous chapter, according to their charter, these schools intend to provide services to meet special educational needs (SEN). However, in practice special schooling means degradation (by defining Roma as mentally capable below the standards of ordinary primary schools and/or as those needing “corrections” in behaviour and customs) and brings about lasting involuntary separation. But even if formally included in mainstream schooling, Roma students are still heavily overrepresented among the over-aged and the drop-outs – hence, equal access to education largely remains a goal on paper. In the past few years, policy-makers have made strong attempts at changing the formerly tacitly

¹² In Hungary, Roma are not considered a “national” but an “ethnic” minority. However, laws on minority rights, political and cultural representation, schooling, etc. define identical entitlements for Hungary’s 12 recognised “national” minorities and its sole “ethnic” community.

acknowledged old scenario. During the accession process these states were closely monitored by different European and other international human rights bodies, and making improvements with regard to “the Roma issue” became in their case a criterion for the successful pre-accession negotiations. Moreover, these were the times when they signed the Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities, when they translated into their national legislation the European directives regarding equal opportunities, anti-discrimination and minority rights, and when they were required to establish different governmental and parliamentary bodies responsible for these concerns. Not independent from these developments, the issue of education came to the forefront of policy-making. Special schools and classes as embodiments of harsh institutional discrimination came under heavy criticism and certain efforts have been made all over the place toward integrating their students into classes of regular education (Hungary has started to gradually close down the entire scheme). Additionally, certain modest steps have been taken also toward improving the access of Roma students to secondary and tertiary education. As parts of the governmental programmes launched under the Decade of Roma Inclusion, a number of new grant schemes have been launched to provide financial assistance in schooling. However, extreme poverty of the majority of Roma families still remains a major impediment of achieving meaningful advancement in minority access to education.

Measures aiming at lessening the impact of socioeconomic differentiation on the access to education of disadvantaged groups

Equal opportunities initiatives

Although the right to education to be assured unconditionally and universally to all children is laid down in the constitutions and put as a corner-stone of the educational laws in all the countries under scrutiny here, policy-makers are well aware of the fact that unequal socioeconomic conditions make children’s chance to *de facto* capitalise on these universal human rights very uneven. In recognition, governments have developed a large set of measures for lessening the impact of socioeconomic differentiation on the access to education and for providing guarantees of equal opportunities for all, regardless of ethnicity, gender, age, religion, or sexual orientation. But despite the good intentions, the responsibility of school achievements is altogether put on the shoulders of the individuals and their immediate communities. Either under the strong political pressure of the neo-liberal ideology that urges competition and praises merits, or due to the severe financial conditions that countervail the state’s budgetary constraints by cutting spending on the “soft” areas of culture, education, and equal opportunities programmes, or imbued by the tacitly shared public convictions that take cross-border mobility as a threat, it is in the first place minority ethnic children and their families who either fall through the holes of the individualised schemes or, if reached, might face the stigmatising connotations that assistance for equal opportunities has gained in recent years. At best, these forms of assistance might be punctual correctional or temporary levelling measures. As such, they cannot change the broad socioeconomic situation of the affected groups, because that lies behind the reach of educational policy on its own (making necessary a concerted effort in education, employment, welfare, and housing). At the same time, as affirmative action measures – that in themselves might not bring about dramatic change in the performances of children belonging to the targeted disadvantaged groups – may well have the unintended side effects of inducing a cruel competition between the more or less “deserving”, and also of turning different groups of the poor against each other along the lines of inclusion and exclusion.

While the spreading of individualised assistance schemes is a general tendency in the surveyed countries, in some of them, the schemes in question prevail in conjunction with

larger-scale measures of developmental programmes that conceptualise and approach equal opportunities from a different angle. Recognising the fact that regional differences might be a source of severe inequalities that educational policies and pedagogical measures are unable to overcome, certain developmental areas have been designated for extra governmental support. True, this way assistance might be less targeted in the strict sense of the term than by applying detailed individualised characteristics for deciding about entitlement. At the same time, support to entire communities might strengthen cohesion and assist mobility, while it reduces the above-indicated risks of stigmatisation and unintended exclusion.

Two important examples of such attempts can be reported: one is the case of France, the other is the UK.

As mentioned earlier, while ethnic differences are not acknowledged in government policies in *France*, lessening of the impact of economic and social inequalities in schooling long has been a strong drive in designing interventions in education. In line with this, on the domain of equal opportunities, or in order to decrease the effects of social inequalities on schooling, government schemes have been launched since 1982 to help children in deprived districts called educational priority zones (*Zones d'éducation prioritaire*) that, above regular budgeting, have received an additional ten percent state funding for reducing class sizes, financing more teachers and fund bonus payments to teachers working in the area. Besides, rather important modifications have been introduced to improve the opportunities of disadvantaged (minority ethnic) children in access to good-quality secondary education by putting increased emphasis on mediocre results of several years of earlier performance and this way lessening the weight of one-time entrance exams.

When New Labour came to power in 1997, the party pledged to commit to social justice and education as means to create a just society. However, as the country report on education in the *United Kingdom* shows, educational policies with commitment to social justice were largely driven by economic policies, and since education has become increasingly marketised, parents are forced to compete with one another for school places – a process that does not ensure integration, justice and equity. Anyway, one of the first policies to attempt to pursue the goal of social justice was the 2000 Race Relations Amendment Act. In the next section about the cultural aspects of educational policies we are going to refer again to this Act; here we stress that among the strategies generated as one of its consequences was the setting up of a Social Exclusion Unit that was established with the task, among others, to enquire into the high figures for the exclusion of Black pupils. Further on, the “Excellence in Cities” program (2004) identified action zones with the intention of combating urban disadvantage in areas densely populated by minority ethnic groups and attempted to bring together local schools, communities and businesses in offering financial and professional support to gifted and disruptive children. Another important intervention has been the “*Sure Start*” program for children under four and their parents in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods in the UK, many of which are areas with high proportions of minority ethnic groups. Financial support for high quality provisions for child care support and significant local control has been very beneficial in some areas, improving collective self-esteem and children’s future chances at school. A department called the Ethnic Minority Achievement Unit was also set up to provide money for schools with a significant number of minority ethnic pupils. In the same line, the “Aiming High” scheme (a national strategy for young people and their development), the “14-19 Programme” (a scheme that offers young people more opportunities in their educational pathway), or the school censuses completed three times a year in order to reveal special needs are all integral parts of the rather wide scale of equal opportunities measures in the UK.

The above described tendency of moving away from universal regulations and schemes toward more targeted individualised ones can be well exemplified by the Nordic case. Equal opportunities for all are formally established through strict legal regulations and the already mentioned high degree of institutional uniformity in the Danish public school

system. Amid these conditions, increasing inequalities transmitted through generations have gained intense public attention and invoked extensive research about the socioeconomic and demographic factors that are at play in the background. In acknowledgement of the unanimous results, the government established a broad equal opportunities initiative (*lige muligheder*) in 2007 with the purpose of strengthening the position of vulnerable children and young people's resources so that this way their scope of choice can be extended and decisions about their future career can be made under lessened constraints. The initiative is to be implemented over a four year period, with four different focus areas: early efforts, school and further education, networks, and parent responsibility. The high drop-out rate of immigrants has been addressed by a number of other initiatives as well, aimed at professionalising advisory facilities, introducing special training programmes for future counsellors, and enlarging the scope of communication between the communities and the professionals through the establishment of the "Information Centre on Educational and Vocational Counselling" in 2006. Despite all these measures and initiatives, the report on the Nordic countries observes that the central political initiatives aiming at improving ethnic minorities' educational level have mainly been of a linguistic nature and have left unaffected the social heritage of children that researchers have proven having primary importance for their later school success.

In *Germany*, the focus of policy measures is put on the individual responsibility of migrant students and their parents, on local networking and the involvement of migrant organisations. The National Integration Plan includes a chapter on "Integration on the ground" (*Integration vor Ort*) that recommends for mainstream members of the public to volunteer as "readers" or "reading mentors" in assistance of those with "foreign background". Although the civil networking potential of the scheme is rather promising, the lack of allocated funding and the necessary organisational means brings about serious limitations. Another initiative set up aims at providing support in the first years of childhood. The "Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters" programme has been running in 24 locations in Germany since 1991: it brings together families with children in preschool age in a neighbourhood and for 30 weeks the parents are supported in teaching their children the basic learning skills. The projects "*Stadtteilmütter*" (neighbourhood mothers) or "*Rucksack*" (backpack) are based on the idea that migrants themselves may act as mediators to migrant parents who cannot offer an educated, literate environment to their children. The country report on education in Germany reveals that despite the potential of these particular initiatives, policy measures on the local and individual level may not sufficiently solve the exclusionary structures of the school system, and the discriminatory customs and rites within the schools. The report also shows that even if a great number of foundations support integration programmes at schools or give grants especially to individual migrant students, they are rather weak in providing protection for those affected by direct and indirect discrimination in education, and are certainly unable to meaningfully compensate for the shortcomings that follow from the lack of efficient governmental measures fostering equal opportunities in education.

Although equal opportunities initiatives aiming at lessening the impact of social differentiation on the school access of Roma were drafted in recent years in a rather great number in all the four Central and Eastern European countries surveyed here, these initiatives usually remain on paper or, if put into motion, die out within a short while. It is partly the lack of adequate resources and the weak organisational arrangements that hinder efficient implementation. But the most serious obstacle hardly can be tackled by the traditional measures of policy-making: it is the hostile attitude of the non-Roma majority toward these programmes. Vocal groups of the public consider spending on Roma a "waste", even harmfully supporting idleness and irresponsibility; further, assistance to reduce unequal opportunities is seen endangering quality schooling thereby jeopardising competitiveness on the international stage. Amid these conditions, many of the programmes, schemes and

measures become contested on constitutional or legal fora – concluding in effective closing down or serious postponement in implementation. A brief summary of the respective findings of the educational background reports testifies the case.

The country report on Romania describes a series of equal opportunities measures targeted at the Roma community both as a disadvantaged social group, and as a national minority. These measures include the preschool preparatory “summer kindergarten” (*grădinițe estivale*) programmes; the “Second chance” programme (*A Doua Șansă*) that enables the attendance of compulsory education at a later stage in life; a quota system of the special spots for ethnic Roma youngsters at secondary and tertiary educational level; funds for the material assistance of children from poor families; and the school mediator programme (*mediator școlar*). These measures are backed up by the Equal Opportunities Law, the Law for Combating Discrimination and the Governmental Strategy for Improving Roma’s Condition adopted in 2001, and organisationally are sustained by ministerial bodies such as the National Agency for Roma, or the specialised departments at the Ministry of Education serving the policies for minorities and the policies regarding the access to education of disadvantaged groups. While the necessary structures at the top apparently exist, effective implementation of the listed programmes is severely hindered by the missing building blocks on the lower levels, further embarrassed by the above-indicated hostility and counteracting interests of large groups of the majority society.

As far as Slovakia is concerned, scholars point out the controversial character of the “Act on Equal Treatment in Certain Areas and Protection against Discrimination” that was passed by the Slovak parliament in May 2004, but was contested in 2005 by the Constitutional Court. The latter decided that the “specific positive actions” are not in compliance with the Slovak Constitution and they were thus invalidated. However, no integration programmes or projects were banned as a consequence of the Court decision, and all policy instruments (like the zero grades and the teacher assistant programmes) that could be plausibly perceived as “temporary levelling measures” remained in place. Moreover, some schemes have been even broadened in the meantime: pre-school attendance in the last year of the scheme has been made free for low-income families; grants and scholarships targeted at Roma students have been expanded both in scope and finances, etc. The whole constitutional dispute, however, pointed to the irreconcilable views on the notion of equality within the Slovak political representation. Altogether, one may say that the “Conception of Integrated Education of Roma Children and Youth, Including Secondary Schools and University Education Development” adopted in 2004 remained valid but has been compartmentalised and partly even emptied out prior to become effective.

In the Czech Republic, the government had adopted a new policy conception towards Roma entitled “Policy of the Czech government towards the Romani community supporting their integration into society” in April 1999, but that was adopted only in 2001. The document is mostly about general principles and aims, and less about concrete measures of intervention on the domain of equal opportunities. The “Anti-discrimination Act” still has not been put in force so no wonder that what it affirms about various equal treatment norms and the prohibition of various forms of discrimination could not yet be transferred into effective equal opportunities initiatives.

In Hungary, promoting equal opportunities for disadvantaged students has been a much emphasised goal in the recently drafted public education programmes, though much of the good intentions have yet remained on paper. The most important fields where actual progress has been achieved are in extending access of poor families to pre-primary education, reducing learning deficiencies by organising after school arrangements and educational assistance, launching scholarship programmes and welfare support (free meals, free textbooks, financial aid) to combat poverty as the main source of failures in schooling. It is worth noting that the great majority of these initiatives are framed for socially disadvantaged children, without making distinctions by ethnicity. The only exception is the after school

programme ('*Tanoda*') that is organised typically by local Roma self-governments or sometimes by local Roma NGOs mostly, but not exclusively for Roma children. While these schemes have produced promising outcomes in improving school performance and advancement, they have shown limited results in reaching out to the most disadvantaged settlements and schools where poor Roma children are concentrated. As research has demonstrated, it is residential and institutional segregation that works as the strongest factor of reproducing the major inequalities between students by ethnicity, hence efforts without tackling the very heart of the problem remain severely restricted. As briefly mentioned earlier, in acknowledgement of these associations, in 2003, the government initiated a complex programme (the educational integration scheme) to provide financial incentives to local governments to take measures for desegregation and to assist schools in developing inclusive teaching methods for improving the school performance and advancement of disadvantaged students. However, by its very definition, this scheme applies only to settlements where several schools work that can be desegregated. Due to this built-in limitation, the most severely disadvantaged groups of students – Roma living in clusters of villages in the most remote parts of the country – still remain outside the scope of practically all equal opportunities endeavours.

Measures to combat school segregation

Among the measures aiming at lessening the impact of socioeconomic differentiation, each country under scrutiny has developed specific programmes to combat school segregation along overt or covert lines of ethnic separation. Eventually, at least in theory, these are initiatives addressing the relation between the social and cultural elements of disadvantages and inequalities that shape/limit the access to quality school education of minorities.

All over the *Central and Eastern European* region, segregationist practices were sustained for long in a rather undisturbed manner by the general conviction (shared also by policy-makers and local decision-makers) that school segregation as a given state of affairs was connected to the socioeconomic distance between the majority and the Roma minority, or came about as a result of factors (like residential segregation) that could not be changed by educational measures. However, discriminatory implications of the phenomenon were not raised, or if mentioned by professionals and experts, their arguments remained unheard in public debates. Eventually the mounting evidence of scholarly work and the growing pressure of international and national human rights organizations made the governments of the region recognise that segregation involves not only the grouping of ethnic Roma children into their "own" schools, but it also means that they are tracked into units characterised by a lower level of educational quality (among others, in the above mentioned special schools). But even if new state regulations (born during the last decade) define school segregation as a form of discrimination and they ban all forms of ethnic/racial separation accordingly, desegregation practices still do not work properly. Among others, this is due to the extremely decentralised administrative structure of the school systems that, as noted above, allows local decision-makers to neglect the central regulations, further, follows from the painful lack of strong legislative tools and proper sanctions and remedies for compliance with desegregation. But besides, the remarkable resistance of separatist practices is owed to the ways how teachers and parents (and children), Roma and non-Roma, think about the questionable needs and limited possibilities of mixing, or even consider it a source of risks and dangers to share the same school or classroom. And last but not least, attitudes on these terrains are also marked by the disagreements among Roma rights activists, and/or between them and activists of other minority groups, in particular between the human rights approach of those supporting inclusion and the minority rights perspective of those in favour of disjoined minority education. Amidst these controversies, the concrete measures put into work are rather

scattered, experimental and recent (with partly contested results and unexpected side-effects), but nevertheless should be mentioned. They include the training of teachers on inclusive education and on new pedagogical methods needed to work with integrated classes; the elimination of Roma-only classes (among them also those that were created earlier as part of some “reparatory” strategies); the redrawing of the boundaries of the school-districts (in *Hungary*) or even eliminating altogether the school district system (like in *Romania*); financial incentives offered for schools that carry out integrative programmes and for teachers for their extra work with “children with special educational needs”; integration of children from the special schools into the regular or mainstream ones (including new bussing services run by the local governments and/or NGOs); government support to assist schemes designated to meet “special educational needs” (in *Romania*), or the so-called pilot and eventually unsuccessful “transitional classes” (in *Slovakia*), or programmes inventively called in *Hungary* “Out of the Last Row”.¹³

As pointed out earlier, segregation is not only characterising the condition of Roma in Central and Eastern Europe, but to varying degrees, the phenomenon is part of the everyday and policy realities of the immigrants and their descendants in most of the Western countries as well.

Ethnic segregation has become an issue of intense political debate and has invoked a large number of in-depth studies in *France* over the past few years, as it has been considered as one of the possible causes behind the riots periodically erupting in the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods at the peripheries of large urban centres. The public generally sees ethnic segregation first and foremost as a direct by-product of strong social segregation, while the play of ethnic/cultural factors as independent constituents is usually not taken into account. As discussed above, it is recognised that, in the most extreme cases, segregation does have marginally negative effects on students’ performance at the end of lower-secondary school, but it is not thought as being an important explanatory factor of academic performance in general. Furthermore, it is stated that separation by social class (with or without ethnic implications) may have also “positive” effects on students’ school careers since it tends to go hand in hand with lower teacher expectations and less severe evaluation of performances. At any rate, anti-segregation measures do not represent a high priority on the government’s agenda. Just to the opposite, the preference of the current administration is to liberalise the school market making it possible for parents to apply to the preferred schools, while leaving the ultimate regulatory role to the individual units that would then openly compete for the best pupils. However, most specialists of the educational system warn against the negative effects of such a reform that most likely increases already existing inequalities among students of different socioeconomic status and create a sharply polarised and segmented educational market. While the issue of ethnic segregation has remained relatively marginal in most public discussions about the ways how best reforming the *carte scolaire*, experiences about voluntary and involuntary ethnic segregation occasionally come up in the arguments among both those who are for and against further liberalisation.

In *Germany*, ethnic and social urban segregation is a major issue in the public discourse about integration and education. The debates date back to the largely deficient urban integration policies since the arrival of the first waves of guest-workers in 1955. In comparison to their more fortunate counterparts, schools in segregated neighbourhoods bear the additional task of having to teach skills and subjects that children of wealthier families

¹³ In a negative sense, but the already referred case of the Czech Republic should be mentioned here as one that had a contribution to raising awareness about the discriminatory nature of channelling Roma children into remedial education facilities. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the legal cause based on the European Roma Rights Center research on ethnic segregation was closed in Strasbourg at the European Court for Human Rights in November 2007 when the Grand Chamber found the Czech authorities guilty of discrimination against Roma children and of violating the European Convention on Human Rights.

often learn automatically through their home environment or in extra private lessons. As already mentioned, some new initiatives in these neighbourhoods have been set up as “integration centres” connecting students, parents, teachers as well as migrant organisations, the local economy and other relevant agents to develop specific profiles in order to attract (German) middle class parents and therefore stop or even reverse segregation. Certainly, “positive action” strategies in favour of students and their families in socially underprivileged neighbourhoods (such as initiatives on reducing the size of classes, improving the student/teacher ratios, arranging for co-teaching by two teachers in one class, organising whole-day schools, as well as implanting concepts and methods of intercultural pedagogy) have brought about positive changes in classroom culture and conflict management, and have contributed to the improvement of school performances of disadvantaged students. But in the light of restricted funding of urban policy programmes, the longer-term feasibility of these strategies is doubtful, and marketisation in education – along with an increased competition between schools – may also contribute to the intensification of segregation and the repeated falling behind of impoverished “migrant” neighbourhoods.

Research on the changes in school composition has brought up controversial results concerning recent trends in the *UK*. Some findings indicate that segregation in schools has increased in certain parts of England, while other studies suggest that, apart from certain communities in Northern England and for certain minority ethnic groups, ethnic segregation has been on the decline. At any rate, interwoven social and ethnic segregation is evident in communities that have a large South Asian or Black population, such as London. But one can be sure that the more recent focus of the New Labour government on parental choice in educational placement does wrong to equalisation and will contribute to the repeated rise of social and ethnic segregation. Nevertheless, the role of parental choice is not regarded as the only or even the major reason for why segregation exists, since large groups of middle-class parents actually see it feasible to combine quality teaching with pronounced social cohesion. As to the reasons behind segregation, the majority of the studies in question discuss the direct and indirect effects of the increasing divisions of income and wealth, the incentives for separation in local housing policies, the new patterns of immigration, the high levels of poverty among most minority ethnic groups, and the prevailing practices of institutional racism. As pointed out earlier, tracking in the British system also tends to lead to segregation by concluding in placing ethnic students in lower sets that have a reputation for behavioural problems. Another issue contextualising segregation as a central concern in public discourse has been New Labour’s focus on encouraging the role of Faith Schools in education. Many commentators notice that these schools can lead to unhealthy fault-lines in local communities by refusing multicultural agendas and rejecting the teaching of universal human rights as distinct from particular group values. However, this latter debate is not merely about educational segregation: it puts the case into the broader context of citizenship and cultural diversity, thereby drawing attention to new dimensions of ethnic/racial separation that educational policies on their own are but unable to tackle. All in all, the prevailing policies focus more on individual educational opportunities than on the devastating effects of segregation. As seen in the previous sub-section, the differential potentials that various residential areas open up for their inhabitants are also framed in the context of opportunities, while segregation as such is considered mainly as a by-product of the interplay of local demographic, economic, and social processes that should be mastered by means of urban development. Due to these peculiarities, desegregation is largely absent from the educational policies in the *UK*, and the missing elements in the chain toward reducing socioeconomic inequalities are made up mostly by programmes in housing and welfare.

Measures assuring respect for cultural/linguistic differences, and the promotion of multicultural education and intercultural understanding

The last major area of educational policies for ethnic minorities comprises the varied set of initiatives that address the cultural aspects of social coexistence between majorities and minorities. In the countries under scrutiny these are more or less linked to the recognition of the cultural specificities and needs of ethnic/immigrant groups, but also to the awareness about the necessity of intercultural communication and understanding. The latter is mostly conceived to be achievable through the means of what is called “multicultural education”.

The term “multicultural education” is rarely used within the *French* educational system. At the beginning of the 1980s a few rather timid attempts to encourage intercultural education through the recognition of the cultural and ethnic diversity of the French population and the contribution of immigrants to French society were formulated in official directives of the Ministry of Education. However, these precepts were seldom translated into actual changes in teaching approaches or curriculum content. Little has been done to encourage teachers to innovate in this area – as the centralisation of the system, the guidance of instruction under a uniform national curriculum and the system of standardised examination at the end of secondary schooling tend to reinforce conservative teaching practices. Only in the area of language teaching are there specific, yet very limited, provisions for culture-related teaching to children of immigrants. Recent arrivals who do not speak French or whose level of schooling in the home country proves insufficient to place them directly into regular classes benefit from special “welcoming and integration classes”. Official directives of the Ministry of Education stress the necessity for rapid yet progressive immersion of such students in the regular streams with adequate support during transition. As far as cultural traditions are concerned, the French educational system provides extra menus for children who do not eat pork for religious reasons, while the wearing of visible religious insignias, particularly head covers, is severely restricted by the law as making harm to the principles of secularism, one of the fundamental guiding values of the French state. Regarding the representation of the “Other” in school curriculum, one should note that over the past few years, two rather controversial laws have been voted by parliament, one that openly acknowledges the slave trade as “a crime against humanity”, and another one that stipulates the recognition and praising of the positive role of the French presence overseas.

In *Germany*, there is a strong focus on German language acquisition as the tool of successful integration of migrants and their descendants. Integration measures have therefore been focused on language acquisition (for example, through advanced training in language teaching methodology, by setting up a system of preparatory classes for children with poor language skills, and via initiating programmes of learning German as a second language). Meanwhile, actual arrangements of bi- or multilingual teaching and multicultural education are subordinated and often entirely dependent on the commitment of individual schools or teachers. The issue of accommodating culture-specific needs is quite contentious and often intertwined with the ideologically hardened debate about the compatibility of ‘Western values’ and ‘Islam’. The official acceptance of Muslims and Islam as a social reality in Germany, the wish to prevent Islamic fundamentalism and the spreading of “parallel lives”, and the strives for controlling the contents of Islamic lessons, practices and teacher training have paved the way for intense seeking of solutions for implementing religious instruction in German schools. The approach in the core curricula and the school textbooks is dominated by a division between native Germans and migrants/descendants from migrants; in this dichotomy, Islam often appears either in historical description as an enemy or as a current threat in the form of Islamism. Moreover, migration is often depicted as being a problem that affects migrants and the “host” society alike – though the challenges are different in nature

and magnitude. In this “ordering” of difficulties, the “culture shock” that migrants have to face is often undervalued in its damaging consequences on individual and group identity in comparison to the sacrifices that the majority society has to face in tackling increased unemployment and the arising threats to social and cultural cohesion. In this context, the issue of Muslim dress codes has become a highly sensitive and politically tense topic, although Muslim and Jewish students are allowed to stay at home on their high religious holidays (Christian holidays are official holidays). In the German educational system, intercultural or diversity pedagogy is regarded as being supplementary qualifications and only a few Länder include intercultural learning and teaching.

As pointed out earlier, at the start of entering office in 1997, the New Labour administration set out to tackle the challenges presented by an increasingly multi-ethnic society of the *United Kingdom* by focusing on education as a way of inculcating anti-racist attitudes among a new generation of children. The new educational policies were driven by the strong assumption that the problems engendered by multiculturalism were the central concern and that schools were the place where these could best be addressed. However, after the suicidal bombings in London in 2005, views attacking the progressive liberals for supporting diversity were escalated, and the government moved away from recognising institutional racism toward blaming racism as a personal failing of individual people. Amidst the quickly developing nationwide discourse of ‘Islamophobia’, the new rhetoric of the administration claimed that terrorism and immigration were the public’s main concerns that required tightened control of cross-border flows and investments in national security. Muslims began to be particularly targeted as potentially dangerous, though this discourse mapped on to existing patterns of racism with many other minority ethnic groups suspected of anti-Western attitudes and ways of living. One case related to education that was debated keenly in the public arena concerned the hijab and it was set within the wider context of the tensions between liberal and multicultural political visions. The New Labour government responded to these tensions by commissioning a review related to diversity and citizenship that came up with a number of ideas for reconciling intercultural dialogue and respect. Among their recommendations were incentives for promoting community cohesion among different groups in the area of education through school twinning, extended school activities to include parents from different communities, ‘buddy’ schemes to help second language speakers, citizenship education, revisions of the religious education curriculum, and the involvement of local employers and voluntary groups in the 14-19 curriculum. As of today, most of these recommendations still wait for being put into practice, though ‘twinning’ and ‘buddying’ as local civil initiatives have spontaneously spread over certain parts of the country.

In *Denmark*, there are three kinds of regulations on minority ethnic culture in compulsory schooling, with special attention on linguistic aspects: the right to learn Danish as second language, language stimulation of preschool children, and mother-tongue teaching in certain languages. Programmes that provide teaching in Danish as a second language are organised for bilingual children in preschool classes and in form levels 1-9. The requirement of Danish second language teaching was laid down in ‘The Education Act of Compulsory Schooling’ in 1993, focusing on bilingual children who were given linguistic support according to their special needs to overcome linguistic and cognitive disadvantages by the time of entering primary education. As briefly discussed above, apart from framing cultural differences in terms of language, there is no multicultural curriculum in the Danish educational institutions, whereas the curriculum for *Swedish* preschools stresses the right of multilingual children to develop all of their languages and also to practice their specific cultures. While the preschool in Denmark, as already noted, is obligated to teach minority ethnic children Danish so that they quickly learn to use the language on equal terms with majority Danish children, the preschool in Sweden provides opportunities for children to learn both their mother tongues and Swedish as second language. Municipalities have an

obligation to live up to the curriculum requirements, for example, by providing special support in first language instruction for children with languages other than Swedish. Minority ethnic students may also study 'Swedish as Second Language' as a subject. The founding government report introducing multicultural education in the mid-1990s underlined the fact that Swedish society was to be characterised as multicultural and outlined a set of schemes how this fundamental novel trait should be translated in the schooling system. Despite all these efforts, research has shown that neither of the two Nordic routes has provided the expected results so far: both the 'assimilation-oriented' Danish schools and the 'multiculturalist' Swedish schools fail to ingrain genuine multiculturalism beyond education while both systems reproduce inequalities in performance and advancement along the fault-lines of ethnic divides.

Post-socialist educational policies in *Central and Eastern Europe* have been oscillating between two conceptual strands by putting an emphasis either on the ethno-cultural or on the socio-political aspects of the case of Roma. At their turn, Roma themselves (more precisely the leaders of diverse Roma groups) have perceived and presented their claims in cultural *versus* social terms, and have been ready to enter into harsh debates among themselves along the "authentic" way of representing the Roma issue. However, by today, one may observe in the countries under scrutiny a multiplicity of Roma educational policies that address their target population both as a socially disadvantaged group and as a national/ethnic minority with the right to be educated in its own language, and to maintain and develop its own culture. Yet, the meanings and dilemmas of these approaches are still not fully clarified. If the social dimension of "the Roma problem" is stressed, this conceptualisation may assimilate the entirety of the Roma community with people living in poverty. At the same time, the ethno-cultural approach may hide those socioeconomic mechanisms that exclude people perceived as Roma from access to quality services, thus it may unintentionally contribute to the ghettoisation of the minority group and also may enforce the belief into the "cultural essence" that prescribes destinies and opportunities. Despite all the arising confusions, the educational policies in the surveyed countries seem to be rather indulgent with the legal and institutional arrangements related to the Roma culture (however, they are more anxious towards the cultural demands of other minorities, like the ethnic Hungarians in Romania or Slovakia whose claims regarding cultural autonomy are more frightening for their resonance with the appeal for political independence). Nevertheless, the actual content of the widespread tolerance is rather questionable. It might be explained by the public attitude that considers teaching of Roma language, history, and traditions an innocent cultural stuff that does not touch upon (even benevolently conceals) the actual reality of severe racial discrimination and social exclusion. Thus, official support is generously provided. In some cases (like *Slovakia*) teaching in minority languages is regulated by a special law, in other cases (like *Romania*) it is a matter of some governmental ordinances, but obviously always is subjected to specific criteria. At any rate, the new rights remain rather empty under the lasting deformations that the long history of cultural and political oppression has produced in the social structures of these countries' Roma communities. The cultural elite is too thin and too much divided while the institutions that are recognised by the state as appropriate for offering educational programmes and degrees are simply insufficient for putting into practice the rights referring to minority languages and the development of own cultural institutions.

V. POLICIES OF INCLUSION: THE SCOPE FOR INITIATING CHANGE

In this report we attempted to give a comparative account on educational policies in the nine participating countries of the EDUMIGROM project by introducing their attempts at advancing inclusion of minority ethnic youth in schooling. Three major domains of intervention were identified: designs for enhancing the content of citizens' rights by improving access to quality education; redistributive measures to mitigate social disadvantages and promote equal opportunities; and treatments driven by multicultural concerns to observe group-specific rights and respect and sustain cultural diversity. As could be seen, these three domains comprise important segments of policy-making in all our countries, though the underlying philosophies and the applied formulations show great variations. Accordingly, there are variations also in the emphases given to competing goals and the ways of implementation to approach them: in some countries issues of access to quality education dominate the scene (France, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe), in others it is the issue of equal opportunities that is in the forefront of designs and interventions (Germany, the UK, Denmark), yet in others cultural rights and multicultural considerations seem to occupy recent debates and actions for change (Sweden, partly the UK).

Despite all these diversities, there are a few general lessons that can be drawn upon our comparative endeavour.

The findings of the country studies backing this report cautiously but unanimously argue that good quality education for minorities can compensate for disadvantages that second generation migrants or Roma in Europe often face. Moreover, it is legitimate to assert, in line with authoritative reports of relevant international organisations, that there is no association between the size of the immigrant student body in the countries studied and the range of the performance differences between students of the majority and those with minority ethnic background. In accordance with large-scale investigations in the OECD-countries, this finding of our study undermines the still fairly widely shared assumption that high level of immigration makes educational integration almost impossible (OECD 2006; OECD 2007, p. 107). We do not have enough evidence, however, to make the same claim in regard to the size of the Roma community and the achievements in integration in the case of the new member states.

Details drawn from our background reports confirm that the political and the policy debates in Europe on the significance of education in social inclusion reflect on widely experienced key aspects of social, economic, political, and cultural tensions and dilemmas. New currents of policy thoughts reckon that non-integration and discrimination generate not only bad educational results but incur tangible material costs for society, although the intensity and sophistication of these debates vary across the countries we investigate. Our background reports also reveal that in the last 5-10 years, pedagogical concepts and complex classroom practices of multicultural education have gained more visibility and larger reform packages were introduced, waiting for the first round of critical evaluations. However, tangible evidence prove that due to new conflicts of interest around schooling (the pressures that intensified expectations toward market-conform competition exert on schools, the multifaceted impacts that increased inequalities of income and wealth induce, and also the remarkable changes in attitudes toward minorities that inevitably filter down into daily classroom practices), ethnic minorities often do not receive good quality education, and the most recent trends are sometimes warning about fresh currents of deterioration. As a main rule, in developed OECD countries second generation migrant students perform significantly better than first generation ones, whereas in Germany and Denmark from our sample countries, second generation students perform worse than first generation students (OECD

2007, p. 105). Signals of shifts to more adversarial relations between minority ethnic students and their peers in the majority, and more importantly between groups of minority young people and the school and other institutions of society, are on the rise. Adversarial relations tend to enhance prejudice, anger, and general distrust between minority and majority groups of society that easily deflect or break the patterns of promising models of school based social inclusion. As examples of the most developed countries in the EDUMIGROM project show, where general education results are improving and meaningful advancement of different social groups is experienced, more subtle mechanisms of often covert ethnic distinction and discriminating institutional selection make the life of ethnic minorities more vulnerable and confined to lower quality and status tracks in schooling and on the labour market (France, UK, Sweden).

As the detailed account in Chapter IV indicates, within these general trends, some policies in given country contexts seem to be more successful than others in attaining improvement in educational access and attainments of minority ethnic students, yet other policies in other contexts prove more efficient in supporting their entrance to the labour market than is the case elsewhere. In light of these differences, it is justifiable to ask: how far do differences in results follow from the variations in the applied policies, and how far do they reflect more general social, political, and cultural associations within and beyond education? Or put it differently, what is the scope of manoeuvring of area-specific policies in education to attain improvement in social inclusion, and what are the broader conditions of success and failure in this decisive sphere of the modern welfare states?

Here we attempt to formulate a few responses to this important question.

LIMITS IN ASSESSING SUCCESS AND FAILURE

As it was discussed from a number of angles throughout this report, educational policies aiming at the inclusion of minority ethnic youth are not independent terrains defining and following their own principles and goals, but are deeply ingrained into the broader socio-political context attached to the roles and functions of education as a major actor of knowledge distribution, the key provider of future labour force, and one of the primary agents of moulding cultural norms and intercultural relations. At the same time, the range of policy interventions is determined by the historically shaped school structures and the customary ways of running, managing, and controlling schools. Beyond these immediate determinants, the given policies are informed and formed by the general working of the welfare states, and within this, the arrangements that regulate the relationship between the state on the one side, and communities, families, and individuals on the other. Amid these multifaceted determinations it seems to be an almost impossible engagement to establish a common scale that would measure success and failures in some eternal manner, and would thus position certain policies and practices as more efficient than others independent from their actual embedding. This would be all the more problematic, because given interventions and measures have different outcomes in different social, cultural, and policy contexts. As we saw earlier, language education on minorities' mother tongues can act by nearing the cognitive performances of children from disadvantaged background to those of the majority, thereby efficiently reducing the potentials of later institutional segregation justified by performance differentials. However, the very same measures can produce an opposite outcome by bringing cultural/linguistic separation earlier down in age and segment the child population in the preschool years. Similarly, depending on the socio-political circumstances, well-intentioned affirmative actions might have controversial effects. On the one hand, they might point toward the designed equal opportunities goals by providing grants and learning schemes as well as ascertaining quotas of admittance for designated disadvantaged minority ethnic groups, provided the widespread acceptance of solidaristic attitudes and trust in the values of equality and diversity on the part of the majority. On the other hand, in lack of mutual trust

and inter-ethnic solidarity, affirmative actions targeted toward certain minority/immigrant groups might induce competition with other poor groups of society, and might intensify prejudices and overt or covert discrimination on the part of the majority. These and similar examples should draw the attention to the main lesson of our comparative enterprise: after all, it is the interplay of class and ethnic relations, the ways how culturally diverse communities co-exist and exchange with each other, the degree of mutual tolerance, and the quality of solidarity on the part of the ruling majority toward disadvantaged minority ethnic communities that give the composite fabric of policies – be they designed with the best intents and in the best possible intellectual manner.

As details of the preceding chapters indicate, in the countries under scrutiny – even if their basic principles and main aims merge towards assuring redistributive justice and cultural recognition – there are diverging understandings of “the problem” in inter-ethnic relations that needs to be solved by the policy of inclusion. Therefore, states develop and use different concrete measures targeted toward groups that they define differently. If ideal types existed in real life, and one was to give examples, then we could offer the case of France *versus* the United Kingdom in terms of the socially *versus* ethno-culturally informed policies for poverty alleviation in education, or point to interventions aimed at reducing the detrimental consequences of selection through overarching regional developmental schemes in the West, while approaching the same task mainly through a set of means for individual support in Central and Eastern Europe. But reality as usual, and in this case, too is more complex and coloured than the ideal types would suggest.

The picture is further structured by the way how the target groups of the given policies are defined. Again, it is difficult to establish the “best” approach. Instead, deep-rooted differences in understanding the notion of citizenship have to be acknowledged. Along this line, when different countries make use of varied sets of minority educational policies, their decision is not about recognising the role of social and cultural factors in shaping people’s situation, but is about understanding how should people be enabled to act as citizens (Kymlicka 1995). Should they be addressed as members of ethno-cultural groups (and for that reason, should ethno-cultural groups become the target of policies)? Or should they be treated as individuals who occupy a certain socio-economic position inheriting the capitals of all kinds of their immediate families into which they happened to be born? Furthermore, should they be addressed as people learning about the world through their mother tongue and the traditions that their communities follow? Or should they be subjected to social interventions as individuals who need to gain professional skills and the official language of the country in order to be able to perform on the labour market and to sustain themselves economically? Responses to these questions surface themselves in remarkably differing educational policies, but the freedom of the policy-makers is rather limited. It is the historically shaped and institutionalised meanings of citizenship that become translated. In societies with a relatively high degree of integration (where ethnic differences appear in inequalities but do not conclude in social exclusion on ethnic grounds), it is *equal citizenship* that is put into the focus of improving inclusion that, in turn, implies interventions mainly in the socioeconomic domain, the school’s tasks being designated accordingly (Korpi 1983; Parekh 2006). In other societies where social exclusion has gained a strong ethnic taint, it is more the policies targeted toward given ethnic groups that are thought to create the bridge toward inclusion. In these latter group of societies, citizenship tends to have *different* meanings along the line of ethnicity and the special rights to ethnic minorities – as well in education as beyond – imply an important goal of “catching up” (Kymlicka 1995; Szalai 2006). It is not hard to detect that the double-edged policies on language teaching, special schools, etc. might even intensify social segmentation and exclusion. Therefore, here we can establish some ranking: all-inclusive policies considering ethnic belonging a matter of individual choice and decision may better serve inclusion than policies based on ethnic segmentation. To put it more accurately: acknowledgement of ethnicity on the ground of all-

inclusive notions of citizenship does good to inclusion, but recognition of ethno-cultural divisions in legitimising differential measures might turn harmful and might point toward exclusion if considered as an either/or base of rights with distinct implications on first- and second-order citizenship (Muller 2003).

At least at the level of the rhetoric considered as properly European (in accordance with the recommendations of the European institutions for the EU member states), no one country would refrain from recognising the need to guarantee to its citizens basic universal human rights and to assure equal opportunities for all. But again, there are differences among countries regarding the characteristics of addressing their citizens with or without distinctions, as well as there are great variations among them in the degree of tolerating special treatment measures while accepting the principle of equal opportunities; or the extent of recognising ethnic discrimination as a specific problem despite the colour-blind working of institutions. Consequently, in the context of some states, the ethno-cultural features of individuals (gained as a result of socialisation), and/or the disadvantages cumulated by groups due to the fact that they are classified (culturally defined and socially distinguished) in ethnic terms are more strongly recognised than in others. But stronger or weaker recognition of ethnic distinctions in itself does not guarantee the successful mitigation of the identified inequalities, neither does it reduce the prevailing inter-ethnic conflicts and tensions. In any event, efficient outcomes require some transformation: the attainment of a certain correspondence between ethnically informed social and cultural differences and those socioeconomic inequalities that are to be powerfully tackled by the established redistributive means of the existing political economies (Fraser 1997).

Looked upon from this perspective, a most striking finding of our comparative endeavour is the substantial variation in the ways how different countries perceive certain problems that turn out to be similar (or even identical) in nature, and how different their approaches are in designing policies along the above outlined diverse conceptualisations of citizenship and inequalities, respectively. Three such sets of common problems with departing understandings could be identified in our study. The first one is segregation along ethnic lines that manifests itself in mostly involuntary separation of minority ethnic students in education; the second one is the strong interplay between ethnicity and disadvantaged socioeconomic positions that induces inferior results in performance and advancement in schooling; the third is intersectionality between cultural and social distinctions in society at large that brings tensions of intercultural coexistence within the walls of the schools and claims certain forms of multiculturalism in education.

Though segregation along ethnic lines is a general phenomenon affecting the school systems in all our countries, it seems that as such, it does not come into the focus of educational policies with equal weight. In countries where residential segregation is approached as a product of the forces of the market inducing inequalities to be tackled in an urban developmental context, mitigation of school segregation does not appear as a manifestation of ethnic discrimination to be addressed as an area-specific task by educational policies. Instead, schools are supported as primary agents amidst a wide range of social services, and their support is rather closely linked to initiatives in housing and employment (UK, France, Denmark). In Central and Eastern Europe segregation has been identified in recent years as the primary ill behind inter-ethnic inequalities and as a strong manifestation of institutional discrimination in education. Accordingly, group-specific special measures assisting the integration of Roma students into mainstream schooling are applied – but they are designed in “solitude”, much apart from other fields of the economy and welfare.

It is hard to measure which route is more efficient. The first does not actually change enrolment differences, but invests into educational services and thus improves the quality of education – for the profit of all students involved. The second reduces institutional discrimination and raises enrolment figures in mixed or integrated forms of education, but does not affect quality standards or even induces some deterioration in them (by larger class

size, lowered student/teacher ratios, etc.). Or put differently, in the first case, ethnic/racial inequalities are tackled in their community embedding, and schooling appears as one aspect of them. In the second case other dimensions of inequality (socio-economic and cultural ones) are brought within the walls of the schools, and their diminution appears as a special task for education. The first approach thus implies comprehensive welfare measures, the second makes education itself a crucial actor in welfare. At any rate, success of each route depends on its linkages: policies for inclusion in education cannot do away without well-defined welfare functions and the other way around, welfare policies aimed at reducing socioeconomic inequalities among students and their families fail to do so without tackling the issue of ethnic/racial inclusion.

As it was pointed out earlier, it is a general experience that minority ethnic groups occupy rather disadvantaged positions within the social hierarchy, and so do their children within the school communities. Thus, poverty as an issue with direct implications on attendance, performance, and advancement comes up in all countries as an aspect of educational policies aiming at improving the inclusion of minority ethnic youth. However, the conceptualisation depends on the prevailing approaches to poverty, i.e. on the ways how the welfare states define and tackle the matter. In countries where poverty is seen as a structural phenomenon bound to the working of the economy, its conceptualisation in educational policies focuses on raising students' educational potential by providing knowledge that makes them qualified to avoid unemployment. In this context, curricular and extracurricular schemes are attached to teaching vocations in the most effective ways, while financial support to individual students in need is considered a task outside the walls of the school and is seen a competence of welfare services proper (UK, Denmark, Sweden). In other countries, poverty is conceptualised in overt or, more frequently, in covert cultural terms: it is the families' destitute conditions that are seen to render immediate hindrances for educational advancement (Germany, countries of Central and Eastern Europe). Following the logic of this conceptualisation, the school appears as an agent for welfare provisions that are thought to assist family poverty and the students' school performance with one and the same momentum. Relatively little scope is left for collective actions: it is the individual school vis-à-vis its own students as individuals in need that is entitled and also responsible for making the selections and designating those who "deserve" support (Hungary, Romania, Slovakia).

Again, it is difficult to tell which of the two approaches is more efficient. The first route leads to certain structural modifications in tracking and the content of teaching, thereby indirectly enhancing the opportunities of disadvantaged minorities – however, all these are gradual and time-consuming. The second route does not touch upon structural matters (thereby tacitly accepts the reproduction of the given disadvantages), but provides immediate assistance to a certain circle of students and their families. Schools are but usually poor welfare agents: as the statistics show, despite enlargement in vocational training, minority ethnic students (and especially the poorest among them) tend to end up in segments that provide the least in protection against immediate unemployment or that hardly offer promising entrance to the labour market (Eurydice 2004; European Commission – Eurostat 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008). At the same time, poverty alleviation through supports for students restricts the application of anti-poverty measures in scope, time, and outreach, although brings about rather significant ease for those who become covered. As such, their direct impact thus might be straightforward in combating poverty on the individual level, though little is done to avoid poverty as a structural problem within and beyond education.

As our overview shows in details, the acknowledgement of the impact of cultural factors on performances in the diverse domains of life (including school education) might take different forms. It might be about the recognition of the fact that the cultural stereotypes about the ethnic other are underlying the processes of ethnic discrimination, and thus ethnicise the socioeconomic and political processes of exclusion. The case of United

Kingdom shows us that policies aiming at reducing racial discrimination bring about a positive impact on the decrease of social inequalities in education. Further on, culture-sensitive policies might be about admitting that the lack of skills in the state's language leads to the diminution of school successes and eventually to the failure of graduating even compulsory education. Or they might target action by recognising that culturally prescribed eating or dressing codes, the fear of being labelled negatively for these reasons at the school and, above all, the hindrances in coping with the language of instruction may prevent children belonging to ethnic minorities to attend school altogether or leave it at an early age. Usually, at the best, these cultural concerns are backing up programmes for the assistance of the latter issue by placing minority ethnic children into short-term preparatory language classes (Germany), or by allowing to learn the state's language as a second tongue (the Nordic countries), and/or by facilitating the cultivation of minority languages, traditions, and history through a separate curriculum designed for group-specific needs (Romania). Paradoxically, in some countries and during certain periods of times, these concerns have been used as supportive or recuperative arguments for the school segregation of ethnic minority pupils (to a greater or lesser degree, this has been the case up until recently in Germany and all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe), while they actually led to the reproduction of the gaps and social distance between minority ethnic and majority youths. For this reason, it is very hard to assess positively the impact of traditional multiculturalism on the formation of an inclusive society, even if its intention for respecting cultural diversity should be definitely admitted (UNESCO 2006).

If the price for maintaining one's own cultural world is an increase in social inequalities and distance accompanied by separation and the lack of intercultural dialogue and understanding, one cannot affirm that multiculturalism practiced in this sense is a successful minority educational policy serving inclusion. Its achievements remain questionable despite the fact that for many (especially for groups not perceiving their situation in terms of distributive injustice) minority educational policy *per se* is the policy assuring cultural autonomy and recognition. However, it has to be considered that self-confidence and a sense of dignity cultivated by a politics of recognition has demonstrably positive impact on even improving one's socioeconomic position in society (Kymlicka 1995; Fraser 1997). And one also has to observe that the more recent (but yet less developed) policy of interculturalism might be promising to transcend the problems of traditional multiculturalism that tends to essentialise and separate cultures, without being able to eliminate their hierarchisation (Nagata 2004). At least theoretically, interculturalism might be a successful policy of inclusion by both avoiding segregation and making people to accept and learn about each other's cultural features in shared social spaces without transforming one of the cultures into a mandatory norm for all (Kymlicka 2001; Banting 2005; European Parliament & Council of the European Union 2006).

TOWARDS A CRITICAL POLICY DEBATE

Our comparative enterprise leaves little scope for drawing pragmatic conclusions, let alone arriving at suggestions on the cross-country applicability of what is called in the literature "good practices" (Khawajkie 2008). As the above examples illustrate, good practices are highly conditional in two aspects. On the one hand, their strength to meaningfully inform everyday relations in schooling depends on the concerted working of a number of factors from the available institutional space for implementation through the tacit or open support of the affected communities to larger-scale processes in economy, society, and politics. On the other hand, given good practices lifted from their conditions and set into utterly different circumstances might produce adverse impacts: as we have seen, inclusionary measures on recognising cultural and language rights in one place may lead to separation and institutional discrimination in another; certain school welfare arrangements to complement

universal schemes of redistribution in alleviating poverty can turn to a source of stigmatisation and institutional ghettoisation when used as exclusive tools of targeting in structures of residual and selective social policies. These lessons should warn us to refrain from experimenting with the construction of a “cookbook” that would list some useful advices for policy-makers and school practitioners by specifying concrete designs that they should implant. Instead, we aim at assessing the potentials and limitations of educational policies in initiating social change and try to define the scope of action accordingly.

As it was repeatedly underlined in the above discussions, the conditions for successful policies of inclusion – be they designed to enrich and equalise the content of citizens’ rights, provide equal opportunities, or assist intercultural cohabitation and understanding – largely depend on factors beyond the reach of education. After all, it is the working of the prevailing social structures with their distribution of status and power that render larger or smaller space for representing the redistribution and recognition needs of minority ethnic groups within the given institutional structures of the welfare states. In this sense, one can say that the potentials for change that educational policies can aim at are the derivatives of the general societal policies of the nation-states that are shaped, in turn, by long-term social processes, the dominant traditions, and the fundamental values that the given welfare states are originating from.

At the same time, the outstanding role that the school plays in modern societies gives educational policies of inclusion some pioneering role. Firstly, it is not by incidence that, in recent times in many of the European countries, some burning socio-cultural dilemmas have come to the forefront of public debate through contestations in school practices: one can recall here either the widespread debate about wearing the veil (hijab) that originated from inter-ethnic tensions at schools but landed in general discourses about multicultural rights, or can refer to renewed debates about the validity of the IQ tests in orienting school selection that have been broadened in scope to put far-reaching issues of cultural and social inequalities on the public agenda. In this sense, schools as spaces of inter-ethnic encounter are also the spaces to renew and reorient public attention, mould the language of policy discourse, and work out alternative responses to challenges reaching much beyond the very activities of teaching and learning.

Secondly, policies of inclusion in education might experiment with certain solutions that would be too risky and too expensive to apply without prior “testing” – in this sense, schools come as fertilisation agents of change. A good example is the case of affirmative actions that have been introduced, as said above, to improve access to quality education and enhance equal opportunities. Gradually the idea has imbued fields directly regulated by the market: it turned out that similar policies in employment might be applied not only for reducing economic inequalities but also to raise qualifications that pay off in increased productivity. In this way, education as a carrier of new thoughts and approaches is capable of inducing meaningful structural modifications beyond its professional territory.

Thirdly, schools as key institutions of socialisation play an outstanding role in setting social relations that depart from the prescribed models carried by the broader environment. True, new classroom practices based on new patterns of interpersonal relations that embody trust, solidarity, and mutual understanding as primary values cannot be brought to life from one day to the next: the spreading of such practices requires deliberately planned teacher training, new methods of instruction, well-designed incentives that reward performances other than the customary indices of efficient teaching, and a supportive school atmosphere. These conditions can, however, be created by policies of inclusion even if they do not aim at short-term reforms to modify the entire institutional structure, and do not question the validity of the synchronous values of merit and market efficiency. In this sense, educational policies can be the forerunners of larger-scale policy designs that attempt at preserving and nourishing the basic values of equity, equality and recognition amid the pressures and challenges that the global economic competition puts on the economies and societies of the nation-states.

The outlined pioneering roles cannot be played out without due investments into the continuous renewal of educational policies to make them sensitive enough to react upon newly emerging needs and challenges. Such sensitivity is all the more necessitated because, as we saw, the conditions of meaningful inclusion of all children in society are extremely complex. Hence, the efficient designs have to simultaneously take into account issues ranging from the daily understandings of citizenship rights through the selective procedures in schooling to access to employment and decent living. While policies rarely comprehend their mission in such broad terms, at least some coordination across the various domains is certainly needed – a task requiring a good deal of sensitivity and foresight in itself. To keep these abilities alive, the responsibility does not rest only on educational policy makers, managers, experts, and the school personnel. Social scientists and policy analysts also have their irrefutable tasks to give continuous control and feedback, detect yet poorly recognised malfunctions, reveal the changing manifestations of inequities and misrecognitions, and bring forth powerful explanations for their working. The past two decades have brought about an impressive development in producing internationally comparable statistical measures for assessing school performance, advancement, and labour market opportunities in light of the functioning of the varied school systems of the European continent. The findings on the strength of socioeconomic associations and the impact of migration in shaping schooling have generated widespread debates within the domestic contexts, and also on the supra-national level. However, these debates have yet rarely concluded in profoundly new policies for inclusion: the shaping of national educational reforms seems to follow different paths.

In the meantime, as we saw, the situation of minority ethnic youths in education has at best shown modest signs of improvement. This calls for a need to place their case high up on the agenda. As our research reinforces, education systems in old member states of the European Union have a great deal to do for treating more effectively the increasing socioeconomic and cultural diversity in their student populations and providing similar opportunities for minority ethnic youth for using learning for better life conditions to that for the mainstream society. In the new member states, our findings clearly demonstrate that the schools should face their contribution to the growing exclusion of Roma people in society, and instead, they should actively facilitate social inclusion by helping minority students acquire the necessary skills, motivation, and confidence. In some places, these novice member states also have to start preparing and responding to labour migration from outside of the European Union generating partly similar challenges to those in the old member states. The background reports of our research portray both moderately promising and disconcerting experiences of how successfully these duties are treated by states, governments, and schooling systems in the countries concerned. In the next phases of the EDUMIGROM project, fieldwork in multiethnic communities and their schools intends to reveal, how the quality of inter-ethnic cohabitation influences and shapes local institutions within the given broad policy contexts of the respective countries, how the above outlined policy dilemmas and often clashing expectations toward education manifest themselves in school-level practices for integration vs. selection, how they shape daily life within the classrooms, and how they leave their imprint on longer-term life trajectories of students, parents, and other interested partners in schooling. The lessons to be drawn from the cross-country comparison of all our materials will hopefully provide a meaningful contribution to keep the dialogue on the potentials of policies of inclusion alive as a matter that calls for broad participation in the public discourse on the desirable directions of change well beyond the professional circle of experts, teachers, managers, and educational policy-makers.

REFERENCES

- Armagnague, Maïtena, Barbara Fouquet, Joelle Perroton, and Claire Schiff. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: France,' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Banting, Keith G. 2005. 'The Multicultural Welfare State: International Experience and North American Narrative.' *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol.39, No 2, pp. 98-115.
- Bleszynska, Krystyna M. 2008. 'Constructing Intercultural Education.' *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 537-545.
- Brind, Tom, Caroline Harper, and Karen Moore. 2008. *Education for Migrant, Minority, and Marginalised Children in Europe*. New York: OSI ESP.
- Checchi, Daniele and Giorgio Brunello. 2006. *Does School Tracking Affect Equality of Opportunity? New International Evidence*. UNIMI – Research Papers in Economics, Business, and Statistics, No. 1044. Milano: Università degli Studi di Milano.
- Crighton, Johanna, Virginija Budiene, and Indra Dedze. 2005. *School Drop-out and its Consequences: The Disadvantaged, the Diseffected, the Disappeared*, Budapest: OSI.
- Drál', Peter, David Kostlán, and Zuzana Kusá. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Slovakia.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1996. 'After the Golden Age? Welfare State Dilemmas in a Global Economy.' In: Gosta Esping-Andersen (ed.): *Welfare States in Transition: National Adaptations in Global Economies*. London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: Sage, pp. 1-32.
- Eurydice Network. 2004. 'Evaluation of Schools Providing Compulsory Education in Europe.' Brussels: Eurydice European Unit, DG Education and Culture.
- European Commission. 2008. 'Green Paper on Migration & Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Education Systems.' *Communication COM (2008)0423*.
- European Commission – Eurostat. 2008. *The Social Situation in the European Union 2007: Social Cohesion through Equal Opportunities*. Brussels: European Commission – Eurostat.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. 2006. 'Decision No. 1983/2006/EC: Concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008).' *Official Journal of the European Union*, Vol. 49, L 412, 30 December, pp. 44-51.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. 'From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a "Postsocialist" Age?' In: Nancy Fraser: *Justice Interruption: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York & London: Routledge, pp. 11-40.

- Fry, Gary, Shona Hunter, Ian Law, Audrey Osler, Sarah Swann, Rodanthi Tzanelli, and Fiona Williams. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: United Kingdom.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Goodin, Robert E. 1988. 'Equality'. In: Robert E. Goodin: *Reasons for Welfare. The Political Theory of the Welfare State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 51-70.
- Gullestad, Marianne. 1991. 'The Scandinavian Version of Egalitarian Individualism.' *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, Vol. 21, pp. 3-19.
- Harbula, Hajnalka, Nándor Magyar, Enikő Magyar-Vincze, and Letiția Mark. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Romania.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Harry, Berth and Janette K. Klingner. 2005. *Why Are So Many Minority Students in Special Education?: Understanding Race & Disability in Schools*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Hövels, Ben, Hermann Rademacker, and Guy Westhoff (eds.). 1999. *Early School-leaving, Qualifications and Youth Unemployment*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publisher.
- Huskins, John. 2007. *Priority steps to Inclusion*. Bristol: JH Edition.
- Huttova, Jana, Christina McDonald, and Caroline Harper. 2008. *Making the Mark?: An Overview of Current Challenges in the Education for Migrant, Minority, and Marginalised Children in Europe*. New York: OSI ESP.
- Kallehave, Tina and Bolette Moldenhawer. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic Relations: Nordic (Denmark and Sweden).' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Katzorová, Denisa, Radim Marada, Kateřina Sidiropulu Janků, and Arnošt Svoboda. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Czech Republic.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Kende, Anna and Mária Neményi. 2006. 'Selection in Education: The Case of Roma Children in Hungary.' *Equal Opportunities International*. Vol. 25, No 7, pp. 506 – 522.
- Khawajkie, Elizabeth (ed.). 2008. *First Collection of Good Practices in Quality Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, Will (2001): *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Korpi, Walter. 1983. *The Democratic Class Struggle*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kusá, Zuzana. 2008. 'Diskurz a premeny sociálneho štátu.' [Discourse and changes of welfare state]. *Sociológia*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 5-34.

- Kusá, Zuzana, Peter Drál, and David Kostlán. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic relations: Slovakia.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Laubeová, Laura and Markéta Laubeová. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic relations: Czech Republic.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Law, Ian, Shona Hunter, Audrey Osler, Sarah Swann, Rodanthi Tzanelli, and Fiona Williams. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic relations: United Kingdom.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Leibfried, Stephan and Paul Pierson. 1992. 'Prospects for Social Europe.' *Politics and Society*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 333-66.
- Magyari, Nándor L., Letiția Mark, Hajnalka Harbula, and Enikő Magyari-Vincze. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic relations: Romania.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Marshall, Thomas H. 1964. 'Citizenship and Social Class', in *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development: Essays by T.H. Marshall*, Chapter IV, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 65-122.
- Miera, Frauke. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Germany.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Moldenhawer, Bolette and Tina Kallehave. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Nordic (Denmark and Sweden).' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Molnár, Emilia and Csaba Dupcsik. 2008. 'Country Report on Education: Hungary.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Muller, Carol. 2003. "'Recognition Struggles" and Process Theories of Social Movements.' In: Barbara Hobson (ed.): *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements: Contested Identities, Agency and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 274-292.
- Nagata, Adair L. 2004. 'Promoting Self-Reflexivity in Intercultural Education.' *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, No.8, pp. 139-167.
- 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: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD.
- Offe, Claus. 2004. *Social Protection in a Supranational Context. European Integration and the Fates of the „European Social Model”*. Berlin: Humboldt University, mimeo

- Ohliger, Rainer. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic relations: Germany.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- OSI EUMAP. 2007. 'Overview'. In: *Equal Access to Quality Education for Roma. Vol. 2.* (eds.: Penelope Farrar, Katy Negrin et al.). Budapest: OSI, pp. 17-72.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. 2006. *Rethinking Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Phillips, Anne. 2007. *Multiculturalism without Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schiff, Claire, Maïtena Armagnague, Barbara Fouquet, and Joelle Perroton. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic Relations: France.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Sen, Amartya. 1992. *Inequality Reexamined*. New York-Oxford: Russel Sage Foundation-Clarendon Press, pp. 102-117.
- Sen, Amartya. 2006. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. New York: WW Norton and Company.
- Szalai, Júlia. 2006. 'Poverty and the Traps of Postcommunist Welfare Reforms in Hungary: The New Challenges of EU-Accession.' *Revija za Socijalnu Politiku*, Vol. 13, (2006), No. 3, pp.309-333.
- Szalai, Júlia et al. 2008. 'Ethnic Differences in Compulsory Education.' *EDUMIGROM Policy Brief*, No.1. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- The European Court of Human Rights. 2007. *Grand Chamber Judgement in the Case of D.H. and Others v. The Czech Republic*. Strasbourg, 13 November. <http://www.errc.org/db/02/D1/m000002D1.pdf>.
- UNESCO (2006): *Guidelines on Intercultural Education*. Paris: UNESCO
- Vajda, Róza and Csaba Dupcsik. 2008. 'Country Report on Ethnic relations: Hungary.' *EDUMIGROM Background Papers*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Vobruba, Georg. 2003. 'The Enlargement Crisis of the European Union: Limits of the Dialectics of Integration and Expansion.' *Journal of European Social Policy*, No. 1, pp. 35-62.
- Williams, Fiona. 1989. *Social Policy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Comparative Report on Education

Bolette Moldenhawer, Frauke Miera, Jenny Kallstenius, Vera Messing, Claire Schiff • 2009

Comparative Report on Educational Policies for Inclusion

Julia Szalai, Marcus Carson, Zuzana Kusa, Eniko Magyari-Vincze, Viola Zentai • 2009

Comparative Report on Ethnic Relations

Ian Law, Michal Nekorjak, Ondrej Daniel, Roza Vajda • 2009