ETHOS

Discourses on minorities (and vulnerable groups) access to education, inclusionary and exclusionary aspects

Ayse Bugra & Basak Akkan

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewers Eszter Kollar and Maddalena Vivona for their insightful comments to the earlier version of this report.

Want to learn more about what we are working on?

Visit us at:

Website: https://ethos-europe.eu

Facebook: www.facebook.com/ethosjustice/

Blog: www.ethosjustice.wordpress.com

Twitter: www.twitter.com/ethosjustice

Hashtag: #ETHOSjustice

Youtube: www.youtube.com/ethosjustice

European Landscapes of Justice (web) app: http://myjustice.eu/

About ETHOS

ETHOS - Towards a European THeory Of juStice and fairness, is a European Commission Horizon 2020 research project that seeks to provide building blocks for the development of an empirically informed European theory of justice and fairness. The project seeks to do so by:

a) refining and deepening the knowledge on the European foundations of justice - both historically based and contemporary envisaged;
b) enhancing awareness of mechanisms that impede the realisation of justice ideals as they are lived in contemporary Europe;
c) advancing the understanding of the process of drawing and re-drawing of the boundaries of justice (fault lines); and
d) providing guidance to politicians, policy makers, advocacies and other stakeholders on how to design and implement policies to reserve inequalities and prevent injustice.

ETHOS does not merely understand justice as an abstract moral ideal, that is universal and worth striving for. Rather, it is understood as a re-enacted and re-constructed "lived" experience. The experience is embedded in firm legal, political, moral, social, economic and cultural institutions that are geared to giving members of society what is their due.

In the ETHOS project, justice is studied as an interdependent relationship between the ideal of justice, and its real manifestation – as set in the highly complex institutions of modern European societies. The relationship between the normative and practical, the formal and informal, is acknowledged and critically assessed through a multi-disciplinary approach.

To enhance the formulation of an empirically-based theory of justice and fairness, ETHOS will explore the normative (ideal) underpinnings of justice and its practical realisation in four heuristically defined domains of justice - social justice, economic justice, political justice, and civil and symbolic justice. These domains are revealed in several spheres:

a) philosophical and political tradition,
b) legal framework,
c) daily (bureaucratic) practice,
d) current public debates, and
e) the accounts of the vulnerable populations in six European countries (the Netherlands, the UK, Hungary, Austria, Portugal and Turkey).

The question of drawing boundaries and redrawing the fault-lines of justice permeates the entire investigation.

Alongside Utrecht University in the Netherlands who coordinate the project, five further research institutions cooperate. They are based in Austria (European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy), Hungary (Central European University), Portugal (Centre for Social Studies), Turkey (Boğaziçi University), and the UK (University of Bristol). The research project lasts from January 2017 to December 2019

Executive Summary

In line with the general objective of the ETHOS project, this comparative report for WP 4.3 "**Discourses on minorities' (and vulnerable groups) access to education: Inclusionary and exclusionary aspects**" investigates the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion affecting minorities and vulnerable groups in the system of education as an area where the manifestation of the three dimensions of justice pertaining to redistribution, recognition and representation could be traced in different country cases. The case studies on six countries explore access to education, rules and regulations, and the content of school curriculum by focusing on the position of minorities and vulnerable groups which are selected to reveal the exclusionary elements in the system of education and to examine different discourses on the impact of education on the problems of co-existence in societies divided along the lines of class, ethnicity, religion or race and the ways of attaining a more inclusionary system.

The central question in the report is: To which extent can education be considered as a space of inclusion where the tension between equality and difference can be resolved in a way to contribute to the children's well-being and the development of their capabilities as substantive freedoms to achieve actual *functionings*, or "various things a person may value being or doing"? The methodology as in other WP4 research tasks include "qualitative content analysis with elements of discourse analysis" In the discourse analyses, content analysis involves systematic search for underlying meanings, patterns and processes and careful mapping of themes and arguments used to convey the exclusionary/inclusionary aspects of education. The investigations of different country cases share the common methodological approach which consists of the analysis of statistical data, official documents and reports by non-governmental organizations active in the field of education or concerned with minority issues in general, as well as a series of interviews with administrators, politicians, teachers and NGO representatives.

The studies on the six country cases show that different dimensions of injustice related to redistribution, recognition and redistribution, which are reflected in various forms of exclusion, define the position of the students from minorities and vulnerable groups in the system of education and thus constitute a barrier to the development of their capabilities. In the discourses, the problem is often discussed in relation to the "segregated" character of the education system and the inequalities of access to education often with reference to the spatial dimension of inequality where the quality of schools differ according to the characteristics of the neighbourhoods divided along the intersecting lines of class and ethnicity. The injustices related to recognition, which constitute an important factor defining the inequalities in education, are discussed by highlighting the problems of "difference blindness" and "misrecognition", as well as third problem which cannot be separated from the first two but nevertheless pertains more directly to "the attitudes toward the worth of different cultures".

Socio-economic inequalities and cultural differences which are not adequately addressed define the limitations of education in meeting the expectations about capability development. They also create doubts about the contribution of education to social cohesion. The combined effect of injustices related to redistribution and recognition make the minorities feel discriminated against, alienated or excluded, and consequently lead to an erosion of trust in society. Where their values are interpreted to be in conflict with the way society's values are defined, their claims for cultural recognition are seen as a threat to social cohesion.

Table of Content

1) Introduction

In line with the general objective of the ETHOS project, this comparative report for WP 4.3 "**Discourses on minorities' (and vulnerable groups) access to education: Inclusionary and exclusionary aspects"** investigates the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion affecting minorities and vulnerable groups in the system of education as an area where the manifestation of the three dimensions of justice pertaining to redistribution, recognition and representation could be traced in different country cases.

The case studies on six countries explore access to education, rules and regulations, and the content of school curriculum by focusing on the position of minorities and vulnerable groups which are selected to reveal the exclusionary elements in the system of education and to examine different discourses on the impact of education on the problems of co-existence in societies divided along the lines of class, ethnicity, religion or race and the ways of attaining a more inclusionary system through changes in policy or the attitudes of stakeholders.

The six country reports present a general panorama of the legal context and the institutional structure of the education system, the place of private and denominational schools in the system, and provide information on track differentiation and expenditures on education. Against this background, the reports explore the national political and advocacy discourses about the position and treatment of different minorities in the education system to assess the implications of the systemic dynamics of exclusion for the capabilities and functionings of minority groups. The reports draw attention to the intersecting social, cultural and economic inequalities associated with ethnicity and class which affect both the present and the future well-being of students. The investigations of different country cases share a common methodological approach which consists of the analysis of statistical data, official documents and reports by non-governmental organizations active in the field of education or concerned with minority issues in general, as well as a series of interviews with administrators, politicians, teachers and NGO representatives.

Depending on the relevance to the country case, some of the reports present a general discussion of the position/treatment of minorities in the education system while others focus on one or more specific minority group(s) in the education system. The Austrian report addresses the discursive framing of the problems depicted and the solutions proposed in the attempts at social integration of minorities, particularly with reference to language differences, aptitude in German and the teaching of minority languages. In the report on Netherlands, the access to education of minorities/immigrants is discussed by highlighting the "freedom of education" which appears as a valued principle or is problematised because of the tensions it might involve in relation to the objective of equal access to quality education in different discourses.

The Hungarian report investigates the particular case of the Roma minority in relation to access to and cultural recognition in the system of education. The Roma constitutes a particularly vulnerable minority faced with intersecting problems of redistribution and recognition which are also investigated in the reports on Portugal and Turkey. Along with the Roma minority, the Portuguese report also focuses on Afro-descendant communities while the Turkish report discusses the position of the Alevi minority whose claims for the recognition of distinct religious identity introduce important tensions in the debates on the education system in a society where religion is a central element of an increasingly intense polarization. The concern about "religious extremism" which informs the

attitudes toward Muslim minorities forms an important element of the background to the analysis of the political discourses on educational justice and the position of Muslims in the education system presented in the UK report.

In each report, we find an investigation of the conflicting or shared views on national values, dominant culture or social cohesion reflected in different discourses regarding the role of education in society. The reports examine how the objectives of education are defined and the barriers against the realization of these objectives are interpreted by different political and advocacy groups. They discuss the claims for access to education and the recognition of cultural difference in the school curriculum, and examine the openness of the education system to these claims. The reports also address the representative dimension of justice by drawing attention to the asymmetries in the channels of representation of different views on what an inclusive system of education should be and what the barriers to integration are in the existing system.

This report presents the findings of the country reports in six sections including the Introduction. After the Introduction, the second section, "The Analytical Frame" discusses the theoretical perspectives and concepts relevant to the inquiry by focusing on the capabilities approach and the social exclusion paradigm in relation to the redistributive, recognitive, and representative dimensions of justice. The third section, "The Panorama" gives an overview of the legal and institutional structure of the education system in six countries. The following three sections, "Access to Education"; "Diversity and Recognition of Difference", and "Social Cohesion, Equal Participation in Society and Capabilities" discuss how these three generally shared objectives in the section titles are interpreted in different discourses with different views concerning the obstacles to the advent of an inclusive of education system contributing to social cohesion. The tensions that emerge among the policies implemented or proposed for the realization of the objectives in question are also depicted through the analysis of political and advocacy discourses.

This comparative report draws on the following country studies:

Jing Hiah (2018) Country Report for Netherlands: National Discourses about Minority Social Rights with Respect to Access to Education

Cristina Roldao, Bruno Sena Martins and Maria Paula Meneses (2018) Country Report for Portugal: Political and Advocacy Discourse Analysis of Inclusionary and Exclusionary Aspects of Education

Wanda Tiefenbacher and Maddalena Vivona (2018) Country Report for Austria: Minorities and Access to Education in Austria

Agnes Kende (2018) Country Report for Hungary: Discourses on Roma Students' Access to Education: Inclusionary and Exclusionary Aspects

Pier-Luc Dupont (2018) Country Report for United Kingdom: Political Discourses on Educational Justice and Muslims in the UK

Başak Akkan and Duygun Ruben (2018) Country Report for Turkey: Discourses on minorities' (and vulnerable groups) access to education: Alevi and Roma Case

2) The analytical frame

2.1) Education as a matter of justice; equality, difference and capabilities

Education is an important policy area for eradicating persistent inequalities that define future life chances as well as the source of the inequalities in the society (Tikly and Barrett, 2011; Untherhalter 2003; Power, 2012). Reflecting on education as a matter of justice, several studies draw on Fraser's normative justice framework where redistributive, recognitive and representative dimensions are examined (Gewirtz, 2006; Huttunen 2007, Keddie 2012a, 2012b; Power 2012). As argued by Tikly and Barret (2011), the institutional injustices are embedded in the discourses which shape our understandings of education by indicating what is/is not or what can/can not be said. Therefore, the discourses on education are important to understand the political frame in which inequalities are constructed.

The distributive understanding of justice is important to explore the inequalities in education as access to good quality education is deeply affected by the socio-economic status of the family. Poverty and early school leaving are still considered to be one of the causes and consequences of educational inequalities that define the future prospects (Keddie, 2012b) and life chances of children with disadvantaged backgrounds. Distributive factors are important to address particularly in an era of marketization, where market forces are increasingly active in the education system with consequences for the gaps in the education outcomes among students from different socio-economic background (Power and Frandji, 2010). Education policies that are developed to tackle inequalities prioritize financial allocation of resources, government spending on education and access to free compulsory education for all (Power, 2012). As the country reports also demonstrate, the access to free compulsory education has been a priority in all contexts in tackling socio-economic inequalities.

Distributive injustice affects children's position in the education system, creates a barrier to access to quality education, and appears as an element of capability deprivation negatively shaping the future life chances of children coming from economically disadvantaged families. The normative theory of justice highlights (see Fraser 2003, 2008) that socio-economic disadvantages are significantly intertwined with cultural differences and calls for the assessment of different dimensions of injustice related to redistribution and recognition. Injustices faced by minority groups are often defined by the interface between the misrecognition of ethnic, religious or racial differences and redistributive inequalities. The exclusionary dynamics created by the inequalities of opportunity in access to quality education and the experiences of alienation caused by misrecognition which affect school performance limit the contribution education is expected to make to capability development for children from minority groups. Differences themselves are not matters of inequality, but the social arrangements in the school environment such as "the extent to which race, ethnic, or gender differences are salient with regard to the experience of education" (Walker and Unterhalter, 2007: 10) are inequality producing mechanisms. Injustices in the realm of education might stem from rules and practices with exclusionary character that are insensitive and culturally blind to the background of students. This could manifest itself in silencing of knowledge of the "other" in the curriculum, or creating an inferiority in relation to the dominant culture of the society and the prevailing middle class values in the education system (Keddie, 2012b; see also Lynch and Baker, 2005). The ways in which cultural, ethnic, linguistic, religious, racial and other diversities are addressed in a system of education define the

inclusiveness of the system. The blindness to cultural differences or stigmatization of such differences in the school environment constitute an important aspect of the exclusionary processes in education. In this respect, education system could foster either belonging or alienation among students from minority communities. According to education scholars, an inclusive education policy should aim at redistributive politics without losing sight of cultural differences as factors of exclusion/inclusion in the education system; low socio-economic class of minority groups, recent immigration, racial segregation, language, distribution of material resources across the schools, should be considered for the ideals, constraints and strategies of inclusive education institutions and policies (see Allen and Reich eds., 2013; Steiner-Khamsi, 2003).

The moral values and societal norms that the education system incorporates and promotes constitute an issue which is especially relevant in today's pluralistic societies where conflicting values coexist. Discursive space of education manifests the normative understanding of a shared future of the society and the ways and means of dealing with different value systems in the social context. Whose and what knowledge is privileged in an education system (Keddie, 2006:270) thus emerges as a critical question. In a particular societal context, could the education system accommodate the plurality of "good lives" associated with different, cultural religious belief systems? The extent to which inclusiveness characterizes the rules, practices and content of education in these areas appears as the main question to be pursued in contemplating the discursive frame of education where concerns of "equality and difference" are revealed in a given society.

Education has a crucial significance for the formation of common values and a shared language as the basis of societal dialogue around the notions of common good. The socio-economic inequalities and cultural differences that are not well accommodated in an education system are perpetuated by the non-representation of the minority cultures and vulnerable groups in the society. Either they are not represented well, that is to say their claims do not find a voice in the education system, or they are being perceived as members of a certain group and their claims are expected to voice those of the group with which they are identified. Keddie (2012b:275) refers to this matter as "unburdening minority groups of their constructed distinctiveness",[1] which might go together with stigma as it is seen in the discourse analysis on Roma and their "distinctive" position in the education system (see the reports on Hungary and Turkey). Respecting parental choice is a way to address the question of representation in the education system. This is a right granted by the human rights legal framework as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) states, "Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children" (Article 26). Parental choice as it is being discussed in the country reports does not only pertain to the choice of high quality education but also choice of education system that suits best to the cultural and religious sensitivities of the family. Referring to Nussbaum, Walker questions the over-emphasis on the choice paradigm as our choices could also be adapted preferences determined by the boundaries of society and policies (2006:167). In a different vein, the emphasis on parental choice could controversially help the privilege class to extend the educational opportunities for their children while lower socio-economic status and minority position define the

---

[1] Sen (2000). See also Fraser (2001:29) where she contemplates the institutionalized value patterns that deny some people the status of full partners in interaction-whether by burdening them with excessive ascribed "difference" or by failing to acknowledge their distinctiveness.

features and extent of choices that are available to others. Hence, even the principles for fair representation and equal opportunities do manifest tensions in contemporary societies.

In this respect, the capability approach provides important insights in dealing with such difficult questions pertaining to the place of education for a *just* society. Sen identifies education as "a relatively small number of centrally important beings and doings that are crucial to well-being" (Sen, 1992:44 in Walker, 2006: 163). Hence, discourses on the well-being of children in relation to their capability building experiences in the education system open the way to dealing with the question of equality and difference with a perspective that avoids "binary thinking" (Lister, 2003).

In Sen's *capability* approach, capability refers to the substantive freedom to achieve actual *functionings*, or various things a person may value doing or being (Sen, 1999:75). Here Sen draws attention to personal differences, diversities in the physical environment, variations in social climate, which determine the different opportunities to translate resources into desired functioning to achieve alternative lifestyles. He also insists on the relational aspect of capability deprivation, and argues that the social exclusion paradigm makes a useful contribution to capability approach by highlighting this aspect (Sen, 2009: 255-256). In Sen's approach, therefore, freedom acquires a different meaning than it has in the conceptualisations of justice that exclusively consider the resources available to people to pursue their valued ends, and it takes into account the differences in the ability to use these resources in a way to have different types of instrumental freedoms, which contribute to the general capability of a person to live more freely. This approach addresses political freedoms, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, and protective security which complement each other in ways that determine the strength of their joint significance for freedom as an end (Sen, 1999:36-40).

The consideration of capabilities rather than the resources draws attention to certain conditions that define individuals decision making and choices; hence such approach takes into consideration "human diversity; complex social relations; a sense of reciprocity between people; appreciation that people can reflect reasonably on what they value for themselves and others; and a concern to equalize, not opportunities or outcomes, but rather capabilities"(Walker and Unterhalter, 2007:3) that allow individuals to take decisions, make choices that matters to them for a "valuable life" (Walker and Unterhalter, 2007). Then what capabilities matter most in developing agency and autonomy for educational opportunities and life choices? (Walker, 2006:164).

According to Walker (2006:168), education is "underspecified" or "undertheorized" in the capability approach that she identifies relevance of education from different perspectives:

- "Education is of intrinsic importance in that being educated is a valuable achievement in itself, for its own sake.
- Education is in itself a basic capability which affects the development and expansion of other capabilities.
- Having the opportunity for education and the development of an education capability expands human freedoms.
- Not having education harms human development and having a full life.
- It fulfils an instrumental social role in that greater literacy and basic education fosters public debate and dialogue about social and political arrangements.

- It has an instrumental process role by expanding the people one comes into contact with broadening our horizons.
- Finally, it has an empowering and distributive role in facilitating the ability of the disadvantaged, marginalized and excluded to organize politically".

Hence, the capability approach perceives education as an "unqualified good for human development freedom" (Walker, 2006: 168). The normative ideal of education as the prerequisite to the development of basic capabilities needs to be distinguished from the non-ideal reality of education which could well be a space of "unfreedom" and capability deprivation that reproduces inequalities (Walker 2006; Unterhalter, 2003; Tilky and Barret, 2011) as the analysis in the country reports also demonstrate. Education, in its importance for the well-being of children, is to be constructed as place of freedom in the sense that it is expected to be transformative and an empowering experience that would affect our present and future choices (Walker and Unterhalter, 2007). This point is highlighted in the capability approach and it is argued that: "We need to be clear that respecting a plurality of conceptions of the good life (and hence of how education is arranged) is not the same as endorsing all versions of the good life, and this has clear educational implications" (Walker and Unterhalter 2007:15).

Walker's argument on the accommodation of plurality of versions of good life, which could also be implied as plurality of cultural preferences and differences in the education system, calls us to revisit the discussion made in the WP4.1; "Beyond affirmative remedies that seek to include people faced with culturally or economically defined injustices - which frequently overlap - in an existing order of social relations, we are led to consider transformative remedies that question and challenge the existing order in which the underlying causes of these injustices are situated.[2] As we thus cease to consider the existing structure of institutions and social relations as given, we also cease to regard identities as fixed and unchanging. This takes back to the difference between assimilation and convergence introduced by Phillips and enables us to think about convergence as a possible outcome of processes of democratic negotiation where the norms of just representation prevail"[3]

Education in this respect lies at the heart of such a vision of convergence where the individuals with their unburdened distinctiveness could purse the valuable lives that they define through their enhanced capabilities and freedom in the education system. This is a transformative process where the redistributive, recognitive and representative ideals in the education system contribute to the development of *a sense of belonging in society.* The freedom to pursue individual choices goes hand in hand with this sense of belonging as education, with its transformative character, could accommodate equality and diversity as complementary ideals in our complex societies.

---

[2] See Fraser, 2014 and Phillips,1999.

[3] See D4.1 p 8

2.2)   Methodology

This study is situated in a theoretical frame which draws on both the capability approach and the theories of justice examining the redistributive, recognitive and representational dimensions of injustice. In this framework, the study investigates different dimensions of injustice faced by the children from minority groups in the actually existing systems of education in their non-conformity with the normative ideal of education as a crucial area for capability development.

The methodology as in other WP4 research tasks include "qualitative content analysis with elements of discourse analysis". In the discourse analyses, content analysis involves systematic search for underlying meanings, patterns and processes and careful mapping of themes and arguments used to convey the exclusionary/inclusionary aspects of education. The investigations of different country cases share the common methodological approach which consists of the analysis of official documents and reports by non-governmental organizations active in the field of education or concerned with minority issues in general, as well as a series of interviews with administrators, politicians, teachers and NGO representatives.

Documents analysed in each country context are in the political or advocacy category such as: policy documents and strategy papers by the Ministry of Education, NGO Reports, other governmental reports, recommendation papers, laws, local regulation, etc. Political discourses on education during the electoral campaigns are also included in the analysis in by revisiting the material for 4.2. Along with the document analysis, interviews were conducted with the representatives of teacher unions, student unions, advocacy groups engaged in the area of education, representatives of minority groups, administrators from the Ministry of Education and other relevant ministries.

Along with the themes and arguments that are investigated through qualitative content analysis with elements of discourse analysis, the country cases study also present statistical and other factual information on segregation, unequal access to quality education and inequality of opportunity as factors leading to capability deprivation. The country case studies focus on minority groups and, by insisting on different dimensions of injustice that affect these groups, they consider the role of education in the development of individual capabilities in their relational aspect.

This study does not follow a methodology that pursues "comparison of country cases with a set of common criteria".   Alternatively, drawing on the discourse analysis provided in the country cases, the analysis here contemplates the inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of education with respect to position of minorities and vulnerable groups in different country contexts. This report tackles contested concepts such as diversity, difference blindness, values, cultural worth, trust, etc found in different approaches to the role of education in all societies. Therefore, instead of a rigid comparative study that works with common indicators, this study has a comparative perspective that sheds light on the problems redistribution, recognition and representation in the field of education through the investigation of common and divergent themes discussed in the country contexts.

3) Panorama of education in six countries

Education in six countries have commonalities as well as differences pertaining to the construction of education as constitutional right, years of compulsory education, registration (residence based) systems, different actors in the education system and types of schools.

Free education is a right protected by Law in all country contexts. The Fundamental Law of Hungary (Article 11) guarantees access to education where the State is responsible for public education. In Netherlands, the right to education and freedom to education are two separate categories. While right to education is guaranteed by the international law, freedom to education is considered as a fundamental right where the parents have a choice to select the education institution according to their beliefs and ideologies. The right to education flows from the international human rights conventions of which Netherlands has become a party, while the freedom to education is a Constitutional right (Article 23). In Austria, the Constitutional Law and School Organization Act set the goals of the education system. Free and non-discriminatory education is a constitutional right in Turkey. According to the Article 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, 'no one shall be deprived of the right to receive an education', primary education is compulsory for all citizens [regardless of gender] and is provided free of charge in state schools. Equal access to education regardless of gender and other identities is also set by the Basic Law of National Education as it is featured in the Law that receiving education is the right of every Turkish citizen, and institutions of education are open to everyone regardless of language, race, gender, disability and religion, and no privileges shall be provided to anyone, any family, any group or any class.

The years of compulsory education range from 9 to 13 years in the countries studied.

In Austria, it lasts for 9 years (6-15 ages). The first 4 years is in primary education, after which children are required to choose which type of secondary school better suits them. The secondary education also lasts for 4 years. There are two options. Children either enrol general secondary school (a vocational/professionalised school), "new middle school" ("Neue Mittelschule"), or attend the lower grades of a "higher" secondary school ("Gymnasium"). Free compulsory year of kindergarten has been introduced. (see the report). After the "new middle school" students can either move to upper secondary level or start working. The same holds true for children attending the gymnasium, although the passage to higher secondary school in this case is mostly a given.

In the Netherlands, compulsory education lasts for 13 years from age 5 to age 18. For children between 5-16 it is known as compulsory education (*leerplicht*), for children between 16-18 it is known as compulsory qualification (*kwalificatieplicht).* As of the age of 12, children are liable for their own school attendance. In Hungary, compulsory education is 13 years, from age 3 to 16. Pre-primary, primary, lower and upper secondary as well as post- secondary non-tertiary level (including the period of compulsory schooling). The primary (general) school comprises the primary level (Grade 1-4) and the lower secondary level (Grade 5-8). Since 2015, children have had to enrol in pre-primary education from age 3-6. Although pre-primary education has become compulsory for kids between 3-6 years of age since 2015, it is still open to exemptions. In Portugal, compulsory education lasts for 12 years from 6-18. Pre-school education for children 3- 5/6 ages is optional. Basic education lasts nine years. Secondary education has a three-year benchmark, and is organized according to different forms, with courses permeable to each other oriented both for the pursuit of higher education and for the labour market (this includes some sort of technical

training in specific schools). The compulsory education in the UK is 11 years from 5-16. Primary level is for ages 5-10 and secondary level is for ages 11-16. Since 2008 children under the age of 18 who have not obtained a General Certificate of Education at the advanced level in at least two subjects also have a duty to participate in education or training in UK. In Turkey, the compulsory school age is 12 years from 6-18 ages. It consists of three levels, namely the primary school, the lower secondary school (middle-school) and the upper secondary school (high-school), all of which lasts for four years.

The countries manifest diverse education institutions and differentiation tracks.

In Netherlands, an "institutionalized" dual school system composed of "neutral" public schools and denominational schools is evident (Netherlands report, page 3). As the Netherlands report underlines, this is a "constructed neutrality"; "neutral" education is constructed as the ideal of religious diversity/equality/non-discrimination. Furthermore, it involves a "positive" and not a "negative" freedom; thus, students may show their religious affiliation in school by wearing religious symbols such as a cross, hijab etc. Although there are private schools, these are few in numbers and do not have high reputation (Netherlands report) The denominational schools that has a religious character (as well as ideological features) have been conventionally Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish schools but recently also Muslim and Hindustani schools (Netherlands report). They are all funded by the State and follow the same national curriculum. However, the denominational schools have the liberty to provide religious education, teacher recruitment and student admission. Whereas public schools that has a secular and neutral character could not pursue a particular religion or belief system, do not have the freedom to hire teachers according to their beliefs and they must be accessible to all children. Yet as it is emphasized in the Netherlands report, the denominational schools (Roman-Catholic, Protestant Christian) which are perceived as high quality education institutions are also preferred by other belief groups or non-religious families. (p. 6) In the UK, the system is highly decentralized where there are state-funded schools (primary and secondary) and all-through schools that are run either by a local authority (community and foundation schools), under the joint governance of local authorities and other parties which are mostly religious organizations ("voluntary aided", "voluntary controlled") or run by private foundations (under a funding agreement with the state) called "academies" and "free schools". But there are also "independent schools" that do not receive any funds from the state and run by the tuitions of the students. Majority of the students are enrolled in one type of state funded schools. While the schools under the governance of local authorities follow the national curriculum, the schools fall under the category of academies, free schools and independent schools are not enforced to follow the national curriculum as long as they provide a curriculum composed of linguistic, mathematics, physical and aesthetic skill development. (p. 9)

In Austria, the majority of the students go to public schools (90%) run by the federal state. Private schools (mostly denominational) are attended by 8% of the student. Registration in public schools is residency-based according to a system of administrative districts. The majority of private schools are also funded by the State, yet they ask for a tuition and residentially they are situated in the districts where upper-class families reside. In Portugal, public schools constitute the majority of the schools at the compulsory education level, yet there are also private and independent schools. Schools with association contracts have a kind of public-private partnership, in which the state pays private schools to receive all the students; therefore, these schools, although private, cannot request tuition fees from the students.

In Hungary, public schools are run by the state and the municipalities, but also by the church, business entities, and other legal entities like foundations and associations. All public schools are accessible to all. Private entities could provide public education as well. They receive public funds, yet they charge tuition fees. The system has been highly de-centralized in the 90s. Under the current government the system is becoming more centralized. Former municipal schools are now being governed by the central state unless the Municipality area has a population above 3000 (p.7). Public school registration is residence based, yet families are free to choose a school outside of their district. Churches and religious denominations can establish schools, under an agreement with the state. A process of taking over secular schools by the church schools can be observed (p. 10).

The education system in Turkey has a centralized character where Ministry of Education governs the public schools. The private schools that are run under the mandate of Ministry of Education must follow the same curriculum as public schools. Registration to public primary schools has been done by a computerized system which places the students to the nearest schools to their residence addresses. For the upper secondary schools, the most successful 10% of the students passing a central examination called LGS, can get into the high quality high schools (accepts student only by the entrance exam), and the rest of the students are registered to high schools through a residence based system. At the level of primary schools, there exist public schools, private schools, schools for disabled children. In the lower secondary school level, apart from these, there exist religious schools (İmam-Hatip okulları), which provide a religion-based education. Vocational and technical training are also offered at the level of higher secondary schools. These public schools differ from each other as there are science high schools, social science high schools, Anatolian high schools (regular high schools), along with religious schools and vocational high schools. In all these levels, there are also minority schools that belong to non-Muslim; Armenians, Jews and Rums.

4) **Access to education**

The case studies on six countries indicate that the problem of access to education pertains less to school enrolment rates than the differences in academic performance, drop-out rates, and the position in track differentiation which show the disadvantaged position of students from vulnerable groups in the system of education. In this regard, the Austrian Report (p.18) mentions the findings of a PISA study conducted in 2015 which indicate that students with an immigration background show significant underperformance academically in comparison to other students. This appears as an important concern for education policy in Austria especially since in Austria students with an immigration background constitute around 30 percent of students- a higher figure than the EU average of 21, 5 percent. However, the problem is by no means specific to Austria. The PISA 2015 results[4] in fact indicate that the variation, especially in science performance of students, is strongly associated with socioeconomic status

---

[4] OECD (2016), *PISA 2015 Results (Volume I): Excellence and Equity in Education*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264266490-en.

(measured by the PISA index of ESCS) and the association is above the OECD average in the five EU-member countries investigated in the context of the ETHOS project.

The disadvantaged position of vulnerable groups in the education system seems to be significantly related to the segmented character of the education systems. The Hungarian report, for example, highlights that variation in science performance in PISA between schools is strongly associated with students' socio-economic status (p17). The report insists on the highly segregated character of the Hungarian system, with "homogeneity within the schools and heterogeneity between schools" and draws attention to differences of quality of education in different schools with particular attention to the position of the Roma minority in this system. In a parallel vein, the country report on Netherlands mentions that the socio-economic background of students play a role in determining the differences in school quality; the schools with low quality of education are often schools where the students mostly have families with a lower socioeconomic status, which often coincides with minority migrant status (pp 6-7). Yet, as the report highlights there are schools with students of low-educated parents or migrant background also perform well, which indicates that in Netherlands the school that students attend matters. (p 7).

At the same time, questions are raised about the resources needed to improve the quality of education in the system as a whole. In the reports on Portugal, Hungary and the UK, the trends toward marketization and privatization are explicitly discussed in their effects on public schools. In the Austrian report, some of the interviewees mention the difficulty of adequately responding to the special needs and potentials of students given the shortage of resources and their impact on the quality of teaching. The presence of significant differences in the quality of national education coincides with segregation along the lines of social class and ethnicity. In such segregated systems, differences of language, ethnicity and religion, combined with economic disadvantages which often accompany these differences, lead to a situation where students from minority groups face different forms of exclusion. Although the overlapping injustices of redistribution and recognition could be discerned in most country contexts, economic and cultural aspects of the exclusionary dynamics do not manifest themselves in the same way for all minority groups. In the case of Muslims in the UK, for example, the problem of access to education is discussed with special emphasis on questions of values and culture. In contrast to this, the Roma minority suffers from equally strong injustices of redistribution and recognition as discussed in the country reports on Hungary, Turkey and Portugal which highlight the particularly disadvantaged position in the system of education.

As all the interviewees in the Hungarian study confirm, Roma children are the most vulnerable group regarding access to quality education and most of them are faced with the threat of exclusion both from and within the education system (p.32). These children often go to general primary schools that are not able to equip students with the basic competencies necessary for further studies and they find themselves in low quality vocational high schools with high drop-out rates.

The reports on the cases of Turkey and Portugal also present the Roma minority as a group in a particularly vulnerable position in the school system; they attend poorly equipped schools, have high drop-out rates and low academic performance.

The country report on Turkey emphasizes the spatial character of Roma children's access to poorly equipped schools in Roma neighbourhoods. The report also illustrates that "Roma families cannot afford the expenses of

schools like school uniforms, trips, materials, etc.; they mostly go to the school without having breakfast that creates concentration problems; they have difficulties in completing their school homework due to the lack of access to internet and lack of a quite studying area as they live in crowded households. Many Roma children also drop out of school as they start working at a young age in order to contribute to their family budget and some are involved in seasonal agricultural work with their families in another city"(p.15).

The country report on Portugal mentions the findings of a national study where 85 percent of the Roma families interviewed indicate that their children have dropped out of school before completing compulsory education.[5] The report also gives statistics that highlight the significance of the experience of grade repetition among Roma students: 37 percent in the Low Primary, and around 60 percent in the Upper Primary and Low Secondary. [6] (p. 12). The vocational pathways in education of Roma- as well as Afro-descendant- students in Portugal further indicate that these students are much more likely than other to find themselves in vocational/technical courses where they are hardly prepared to later compete in the national exams that give access to higher education.

Although the Roma minority constitutes a particularly striking case regarding the problems of access to quality education, these problems also affect other vulnerable groups in similar or different ways. In the country reports on Portugal and Turkey, the differences and similarities between the dynamics of exclusion faced by different groups are explicitly discussed, with reference to the Roma and Afro-descendant minorities in the case of Portugal and to the Roma and Alevi minorities in the Turkish case.[7]

The country report on Austria highlights the stigmatizing terms that are salient in public discussions on quality schools such as the "left-over schools" (*Restschulen*) or "the "hot spot schools" (*Brennpunktschulen*). This type of stigmatization goes together with the segregation in the national education system, which in fact appears as a problem highlighted in the discourses analysed in all country reports which draw attention to the spatial determinants of access to quality education. The country report on Austria, states that "the wealth and demographics of the neighbourhood is a good indicator of the schools within it... neighbourhoods in Austria are rarely heterogeneous but rather dominated by various (income) classes. Less wealthy districts tend to host public or vocational schools, often called the "left-over schools" *(Restschulen)* where children with less favourable socio-economic background and/or a range of problems are clustered". This report also mentions that the *Brennpunktschule* are marked by problems of German language aptitude of their students and these are schools in which nine out of ten students have a migratory background (p. 29).

Segregated schools in segregated neighbourhoods with inadequate resources and low quality of education reflect the spatial dimension of the problem of access to education. In this regard, the country report on Portugal quotes the Secretary of State for Education as saying "*One of the major problems is that there are still pockets of*

---

[5] National Study on the Roma Communities (Mendes et al., 2014)

[6] DGEEC (2018)

[7] As it will be discussed later in this comparative report, in the Turkish case the dynamics of exclusion is examined with reference also to "the threat of minoritization" faced by secular members of the population.

segregation within the system, including within the public school. Some segregation is a reflection of our urban public. The neighbourhoods are segregated, the schools are in the neighbourhoods, therefore, they are segregated also" (p. 15).

The report on Portugal evokes the political initiative launched in the 1990s to demolish the self-built neighbourhoods, whose objective was defined, in political terms, as the "eradication of shanty towns in metropolitan centres", with a narrative on "better living conditions". The report argues that the project resulted in the re-housing of thousands of families in neighbourhoods which were built away from urban centres for this purpose and have a very strong black, Roma and working class composition. The inhabitants are served by schools within or in the vicinity of neighbourhoods, which are characterized by extensive dropouts, low academic achievement and the increasingly vocational character of the curriculum (p.15).

In the report on Hungary, the spatial dimension of the school segregation problem is discussed in relation to two factors. First, the reality of housing or settlement segregation translates into the clustering of students who live in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in low quality schools in these areas. While registration is not residency-based in Hungary since 1985, children from poorer families mostly stay at district public schools where the resources are inadequate and the quality of teaching is low. On the other hand, better off families could search for better options and benefit from the legal possibility of free choice of school for their children. Hence, the phenomenon of "white flight" which constitutes the second factor that leads to school segregation. In Hungary, the schools where the Roma constitute a large portion of the student body are low quality schools; the relationship between quality and student composition is reinforced by the non-Roma families' tendency to seek other options in case the number of Roma students attending the school increases.

It is quite understandable that families try to seek better quality schools and also wish to have their children to have an education which conforms to their values. Residency based registration rules might therefore be seen as inimical to parents' freedom to choose the school they consider "right" for their children. Respect for freedom of choice of schools appears as a central norm in the education systems of Hungary and Netherlands, and in both cases this is discussed in relation to its implications for the inequalities with exclusionary outcomes. Such inequalities are exacerbated when the schools' rules for admission might not be impartial. In this regard, the denominational schools in Netherlands and the publicly supported Church schools in Hungary, which provide a high quality education, attract criticism for contributing to the segregation in education.

However, the cases of Portugal and Turkey, where residency based registration rules exist, these do not seem to be particularly conducive to equal access to education. The report on Portugal mentions difficulties of implementing the residency rules in school to prevent the emergence of ethnic and racial segregation, which the NGOs representing minority groups underline when expressing their doubts about the official attempts at stricter implementation of these rules given the ability of middle-class families to forge their addresses or to send their children to private schools in order to make sure that they are educated in mostly white, prestigious schools. (p. 17) Hence, the "white flight" phenomenon in the flexible registration system in Hungary finds itself reproduced within the context of different rules that exist in Portugal.

In Turkey, the residency based registration rules re-enforce the spatial dimension of inequality while also limiting the freedom of parents to choose schools according to quality considerations or the conformity of the curriculum and the pedagogical approach to the values they wish their children acquire in school. What is important to note is that the inequalities of class determine the extent to which the parents can overcome the restriction of residency and have the freedom to choose. In Turkey, where not only the costs of private education are exorbitant, but preparing for very competitive examinations for entering good private or public schools are very expensive, only the parents with means can have this freedom. In a different vein, in the case of Austria, where the residency based registration rules have become more flexible since 2017, it is observed that it is mainly the well-educated parents that can assess the school quality and make informed choices about their children's education. The tension between freedom and equal access to education thus appears in complex ways, and discourses on the systems of education address this tension from different angles.

Different discourses on the legitimate scope of parents' choices regarding the education of their children and the leniency of admission criteria of denominational schools show that generally shared objective of an inclusive education contributing to social cohesion is actually interpreted in highly different ways. "Freedom", which is valued as an important factor contributing to the inclusiveness of the education system especially in Netherlands, is also questioned with reference to its compatibility with the development of the capabilities and functionings of students from all segments of the society in many country contexts including the Dutch one. The negative implications of the freedom of choice (of parents and schools) on the well-being of children from disadvantaged groups both in the present and in the future are discussed by drawing attention to capability deprivation associated with the economic and cultural barriers to equal participation in society. In Hungary, for example, the Conservative- Christian government has introduced a series of exemptions in the rules against practices that involve discriminatory student admission and justified the decision on the basis of "religious and philosophical freedom" and the "right of recognized minorities to operate their own schools". The critiques of this perspective on freedom insist on the way the exemptions contribute to a segregated system fostering and enhancing the problems of participation in society of children of disadvantaged families.

There is, however, another level at which freedom of choice is questioned. At this level, the emphasis shifts from the well-being of children to social cohesion as an important objective of education. As extensively discussed in the UK country report, the debates around the "balkanization of society" through the "proliferation faith-based schools" problematize the segregation in the realm of education in its implications for social cohesion. While the term social cohesion could well be interpreted in a way to incorporate the eradication of inequality, where the question is the Muslims' right to education, these debates turn more around prevention of conflict with "the threat of Islamic extremism", which is at times interpreted by Muslims stakeholders as driven by "Islamophobia" at the background. Security concerns which mark the context of the debate are reflected in the complaints about "lax government oversight" and demands for more serious government intervention against the trends toward segregation associated with faith-based schools. In fact, "the problem of Islam" also appears as an element of the Dutch context where the bias against Islamic schools reveals the boundaries of freedom of choice in some discourses on education (p. 20).

The discourses on the tensions that might appear between freedom of choice and the objectives of education defined in terms of equal access and social cohesion differ in their framing of different dimensions of justice. Yet, it

is possible to see that different arguments put forward to affirm, to contest or to redefine the existing rules and regulations affecting the parents' choices and the school admission practices all incorporate a certain perception of the relationship between justice and equality. The report on Netherlands presents an insightful discussion of the discourses on the barriers to equal access to education by distinguishing between discourses that insist on "equal opportunities", "inequality in opportunities and social class" and "an unjust system" (pp.14-18). These discourses reveal different perceptions of equality in the approaches to overlapping problems of redistribution and recognition as they are reflected in rules and regulations, practices and the curriculum. In the equality of opportunity discourse, the barriers to access are discussed in relation to the disadvantages of children that need to be addressed in an inclusive system while the inequalities of class and culture that prevail in the society are left out of the discussion. "Transparent", "fair" and "user friendly" procedures are mentioned and the procedural characteristics of a just system are highlighted. The second discourse addresses the inequality of opportunities mainly by insisting on social class positions and the economic dimension of the problem or by connecting the cultural disadvantages associated with ethnicity to class positions. While this discourse does not overlook recognition (and misrecognition) of cultural difference as a dimension of justice, this dimension becomes central to the third discourse where it is discussed with reference to the extent to which cultural diversity is present (or rather absent) in the school curriculum. Justice is discussed with claims for the recognition of the intercultural character of the society, the promotion of intercultural knowledge among students, and the introduction of home-language teaching for students from minority groups. These different perceptions of the relationship between justice and equality are situated in a context where the question of equal access to quality education is discussed by highlighting the problem of social segregation. Discourses on segregation vary according to the ways in which group differences are addressed. The concern with segregation is expressed in different discourses where "diversity" and "recognition of difference" appear as dominant themes. The following section will explore how these themes articulate with different perspectives on justice in its different dimensions.

5) Diversity and recognition of difference

5.1) Managing diversity

Discourses on diversity and the policies designed to deal with social segregation vary according to the perceptions of the reality of class-related, ethnic, religious or racial differences. In some of these discourses, diversity appears as a problem that needs to be addressed and dealt with. The country report on the UK discusses this perspective on diversity by drawing attention to its relationship with a particular assessment of the recent changes in society. Here, cultural diversity appears as a new phenomenon, a reality of "modern" British society which is "increasingly" "multi-faith", "multicultural", "diverse", "pluralist", or "mixed-belief" (p. 14). As the country report observes, this formulation reflects the idea of a more homogenous society which existed in the past and was disrupted by large-scale international migration. "The irreversible plural nature of modern Britain" is a challenge that must be faced with an adequate response in order to avoid "the conflict that can and does take place among those of different cultures and beliefs" (p.14). This brings to the fore security concerns which mark the dominant approach to the problem of segregation already mentioned in the previous section on equal access to education. The debate around "the balkanization" of schools thus reflects the approach to diversity as a problem to be managed and calls for a system of education which helps the children to learn to "navigate" the rough sea of cultural diversity (p.15).

Although it does not appear as strongly as it does in the UK report, in other country reports too, we find similar accounts of approaches to diversity with a recently more important concern and as a problem to be managed. In Netherlands, for example, civic education was introduced in 2006 and currently there is a legislative proposal to make civic education mandatory in all schools, including denominational schools. These steps are taken also with the objective of providing students with an education on citizenship and democratic rule of law, with the intention of contributing to social integration in a society of diverse cultures with different value systems (p.12). In the current global context, Islamic extremism appears a widely shared concern in many European countries with the potential to introduce or enhance the role of Muslim religious identity in shaping patterns of discrimination. For example, in the case of Austria, where the question of diversity is mainly discussed in relation to native language differences and the imperfect mastery of German as a key element shaping the problems of equal access to education, the country report mentions that the children from families with a migration background face many problems at school and quotes one of the interviewees as saying *"Last year it was so that the main discrimination ground was Islamophobia. Muslim students were faced by it."* (p. 46).

On the other hand, the report on Portugal states that "none of the interviews emphasized religious diversity as an aspect to be taken into account in the policies for school inclusion of ethno-racial minorities, an issue that has been highlighted in other country contexts" (p. 21). But as in other country contexts, the "management of diversity" appears as a concern reflected in "the creation of some institutions and projects, and even some alterations in the legislation" in 1990 (p.20). In the Portuguese context, this development reflects the elements of continuity and change in the conceptions of the "benign" and "non-racial" nature of Portuguese colonialism and the accompanying idea of diversity as an unproblematic character of a multicultural society. While these conceptions are challenged by some of the interviewees of the study on Portugal, they still play a role shaping the problems of the policies that aim to tackle cultural diversity as it will be discussed in the section 5.2 of this report on the recognition of difference.

In the case of the current Hungarian government's approach to the problems of equal access to education encountered by the Roma minority, the term segregation does not have entirely negative connotations. As discussed in the country report, the inclusion of Roma in the Hungarian public education system is emphasized a major goal in the National Social Inclusion Strategy 2011-2020. However, it is also observed that "the education related regulations in the last eight years have facilitated the realization of school segregation" (p. 36). The report draws attention to the official government discourse where and anti-segregation language can be used along with a term such as "affectionate segregation" as part of an approach involving "positive action" to enable catching up and closing gaps (p.28). The changes in regulations and the application of the legal prohibition on segregation could easily be argued to have an exclusionary impact on the Roma minority. However, the policy of integration through "affectionate segregation" could be welcomed by the "white" majority happy to provide a good education for their children by separating them from the Roma children. In fact, policies facilitating segregation articulate with the "white flight" phenomenon as a factor contributing to the threat of exclusion faced by the Roma minority. Under these circumstances, politics of segregation is likely to be more successful than politics of integration. As one of the interviewees in the Hungarian study, a lawyer of a rights protection and public interest litigation organisation put it: *"As long as integration does not have positive yield for the majority, it is very difficult to argue for it effectively"* (p. 33).

This is an important point which brings to the fore questions pertaining to the politics of policy making, and shows how the objective of inclusiveness can be pushed back by appealing to the interests and values of the majority interpreted in particular ways. However, the objective of inclusiveness could be compromised in ways which affect the minorities as well as a considerable portion of the society which then finds itself face with the threat of minoritization. In the intensely polarized society of Turkey, where the current government presents Islam as the defining characteristic and the binding element of society, both the proliferation of religious schools and the increasing salience of the teaching of religion in the regular school curriculum are strongly contested not only by the Alevi minority but also those families who wish to have children receiving a secular education.

In Turkey, the education policies that enforce the proliferation of religious schools and the introduction of the elective courses on religion in the curriculum are endorsed in the official discourses as "the state's response to the demands of the public" (p.30). The state officials claim that there is a demand from the public for such religion courses to be instructed, that they are merely responding to such demands, and nobody is forced to take these classes. In a public speech, President Erdogan proclaims: *"Our people have demands for elective courses such as Quran and Life of Prophet Muhammad. Nobody is forced to take these classes. People who want it take it, those who don't want don't take it. Nobody will force the child of a KESK[8] member to take these classes"* (p.31). However, as our interviewee who is a representative of Alevi NGO put it*:*

> *"The children involuntary take the elective religion courses. For instance, while a student chooses mathematics as an elective, the school says that there is no teacher and offers the elective religion course"* (p.30).

Both Hungary and Turkey are currently ruled by populist governments with a majoritarian outlook where the recent proliferation of religious schools is closely linked to government policy. Yet there are also differences between the two cases. The emphasis placed on school quality and academic performance appears as an exclusionary factor in Hungary. In Turkey, on the other hand, quality concerns are dominated by a policy orientation with an Islamist character and the objective of re-shaping the system of education in conformity with the basic tenets of "our" value universe. In these two cases, as in the other country contexts, recognition of difference as a justice claim constitutes a central question which is approached from different angles and in often conflicting discourses, and it informs policy choices which have different implications for the inclusiveness of education.

5.2) Recognizing difference

Recognition is an important dimension of justice which has to do with the terms of participation in society. When Adam Smith wrote about "appearing in public without shame", he was referring to poverty as a factor leading to social exclusion. However, equal participation in society, as captured by Pettit's "eyeball test" as a device for measuring social justice which refers to "a person's ability to look another in the eye without fear of intimidation or rebuke" (Pettit 2014:99), involves more than the absence of economic disadvantage. Social injustices with exclusionary outcomes have often overlapping economic and cultural dimensions and their impact on individuals

---

[8] A leftist trade union for state employees

are often related to group identity. While the inability to participate in society constitutes a serious harm which all rational people would try to avoid, the need for belonging is shaped by people 's distinct cultural experiences and values acquired in relations within groups that might be different from the majority in their ethnic, religious, racial identities or languages.

The discourses on injustices related to recognition discussed in the six country reports draw attention to three problems: The first problem is that of *difference blindness*, which constitutes a barrier to the acknowledgement of the claims and grievances and to the introduction of policies that could effectively deal with them. This problem can also manifest itself with a tendency to insist on one of the often overlapping redistributive and recognitive dimensions of injustice, overlooking the other. Economic and structural sources of exclusion, for example, could be highlighted in a way to dominate the concern for cultural factors. The second problem emerges where difference is recognized in a way that takes the form of *misrecognition* or informs policies which lead to further segregation rather than more inclusiveness.

The third problem cannot be separated from these two problems of non-recognition or misrecognition, but it pertains more directly to the perceptions and attitudes toward the *worth of different cultures*. Here, the exclusionary dynamics operate through the feelings of alienation of the students from minority groups whose history, culture or language do not find a place in the curriculum or appear in a negative light. All three problems lead to failures to effectively address the underlying social inequalities that affect vulnerable groups.

5. 2. 1. Difference blindness and misrecognition

"Colour blindness" as an obstacle to the struggle against ethno-racial discrimination receives particular emphasis in the country report on Portugal. The absence of statistical data on ethno-racial belonging is mentioned as an indication of the tendency to overlook the reality of race and ethnicity as an important aspect of the injustices faced by vulnerable groups. This tendency is reflected in the discourses of the interviewees in official positions where class or poverty is mentioned as the main factor behind the inequalities in the access to education. The following view from the High Commissariat for Migration constitutes a typical example:

> *"In Portugal, the great factor of exclusion of any person is their economic capacity. (...) In this way, the commitment of all partners must be to fight poverty in a consolidated and concrete way, and to assume it as a priority in our actions. This fight against poverty is done by promoting the empowerment of young people, taking into account that the degree of schooling can be an aid in social mobility or in the training of those who, due to the most varied circumstances, are at the lowest levels of economic survival".*

This diagnosis is critically evaluated by other interviewees who insist on the recognitive dimension of injustice related to racism. For example, the leader of the Association of Afro descendants is quoted as saying:

> *"There is a very strong social culture of devaluing racism, that racism is not a fundamental aspect to the discussion, that social class is more important for discussion than racism (...) Not having racism as a frame of analysis is to say that racism is an interpersonal relation and that there is not institutional racism, the way institutions perpetuate racism"* (p. 12).

In different country contexts, difference blindness often accompanies the discursive framing of equality in terms of equal opportunities where the acknowledgement of different needs of individual students appears as an important condition for inclusive education. As one of the interviewees quoted in the Austrian report puts it:

"It is always important that the education system is just, not equal, because after all, every student is their own individual with different needs, there cannot be a mass finishing through an education system that is always the same and does not further talents" (p. 34).

This call for the recognition of different needs of individual students could be questioned in its implication for the recognition of group differences which often determine the widely documented disadvantaged position of minorities in the system of education. Where these disadvantages are dissociated from the underlying social and cultural inequalities, the recognition of disadvantage might easily articulate with discriminatory tendencies. In the report on Hungary, this problem is presented with reference to "the double discourse" which denotes the use of "disadvantaged children" and "Roma children" as synonyms. As an aspect of the "colour-blind racism" in the Hungarian education system where the ethnic registration of Roma children is prohibited, the terms "disadvantaged" or multiple disadvantage" are used when what is meant is actually the Roma students. The report states that "Since the Roma is not just a social category but also a recognized minority with specific rights deserving recognition as an ethnic minority group, using the "disadvantaged" category in their case makes the Roma children as an ethnic minority disappear from the system" (p. 24).

In the Portuguese context where the salience of colour blindness is highlighted, too, Roma children have a visibility associated with their disadvantages. The country mentions, for example, that the widespread notion that Roma women, as soon as they enter adolescence, are prevented by their communities has been used to create classes attended by only Roma girls, thus contributing to the stigmatization and segregation (p. 13).

The recognition of Roma in association with their disadvantages is a tendency which can be observed in different country contexts where it reflects and re-enforces the prejudices underlying the discrimination faced by the community. Different policy measures introduced to address the observed disadvantages, often contribute more to segregation than inclusiveness of the education system. This is also the case in Turkey where the Roma, that is not considered as a minority in legal terms, cannot escape misrecognition. As one of the interviewees in the report on Turkey observes:

"Teachers often label Roma children as children having difficulties in learning and there are cases that Roma children are sent to CRCs (schools for students with special needs). A remedy designed to address special needs leads to further disadvantages for groups like Roma. If the CRCs might diagnose these children as mentally disabled, this would have serious consequences for their future life course. The families of children do not oppose this practice, as the state provides a certain amount of monthly aid to the families whose children are sent to the CRCs. However, after some NGOs have informed the parents with the possible consequences of diagnosis by CRCs, they started to be more careful about this issue" (p.20).

As the interviewee also reveals that *"the practice of the sending of Roma children to CRCs, and therefore being tagged as "disabled" has the potential of having long-lasting effects on the life chances of these children, including*

being exempt from military service, which highly valued by the Roma society, and hindering them to obtain a drivers licence, which may result in serious disadvantages in the labour market" (p.20).

The problems of stigmatization and discrimination of minorities recognized by their disadvantages manifest themselves also in the Austrian context where the deficiency in German language aptitude appears as a central issue in the debates on inclusive education. This "deficiency orientation" is problematized in following terms by an interviewee in the country report on Austria:

"To focus on German and it solely focusses on learning German, is really also a problem, because firstly it neglects the language reality and the real life living conditions of pupils – it is very often a multilingual reality. In this respect it is necessary to find means of promoting the acquisition of German as official educational language also in climate of multilingualism. This would be a very important aspect and not only to see the language competence here with regard to deficiencies. This orientation towards deficiencies is also an obstacle of the current situation. But to see the potentials of pupils; to see which resources they are able to offer, even if that is not transferred in the official educational language German" (p.42).

The measures taken to deal with German language deficiency, which include the separation of "irregular" students lacking language skills from the "regular" ones, are criticized by several other interviewees who point at the implications of this classification on the irregular students' future prospects in education. As one of the interviewees puts it:

"*If the child is from a low-income family, then they are definitely also disadvantaged and that's also, an important factor, also the ascription of lacking German skills. Once you are a student, if [you are put into] a remedial German class, then there are also disadvantages that result when looking at the, at the further educational trajectory"* (p. 39).

The report observes that "the decision is not always based on mere language knowledge but is subject to other dynamics that disadvantage some groups more than others" (p.40).

In line with this observation another interviewee also questions the basis for classifying students as regular or irregular by pointing at the possible impact of discrimination on the decision to put a student in the "irregular" category:

"Often it was the case that they even only grew up speaking German, yes. One parent had a migratory background and because of that the child either had a darker skin, or a different appearance, or had a non-typical Austrian last name. And these children were classified as "irregular" despite their excellent German" (p. 40).

Whether such cases are exceptional or not, the observation of the interviewee draws attention to the possibility that in the presence of a "deficiency oriented" approach, discriminatory tendencies can play a role in reducing difference to a real or assumed disadvantage and affect policy outcomes in unintended ways.

5.2.2. The question of values and "cultural worth"

The recognition of group difference appears in conflicting discourses on the respect for cultural and religious sensitivities and the possible tension between the values of the society and those of minority groups. The views on the accommodation of religious values and societal values that are discussed in the reports on the UK and the Netherlands bring to the fore the ideas of "Britishness" and "Dutchness". In the discourses analysed by the UK country report, we find observations which pertain to the "*overemphasised Muslimness at the expenses of Britishness and the whole child"* (p 25) or "*what it means to be British Muslim in contemporary society*" (p25). The UK Report refers to the policy document Green Paper (2018) emphasising the importance of acquiring of British values in education: "*Children and young people should be taught about fundamental British values and should have the opportunity within school, further education, and beyond the school gates to mix and form lasting relationships with others from different ethnic, religious or socio-economic groups so they are well equipped for adult life*" *(*p.44). In the same context, according to Policy Exchange: "*Children should be educated about the history, traditions and values of Britain, taught a positive British identity. Respect for Britain's democratic institutions should be fostered"*(p.25)

As it is being elaborated in the Netherlands report, civic education is meant to enable the religious and cultural minorities to acquire the knowledge of the values of a larger society. The Netherlands report refers to a recent legislative proposal underway that aims to enforce civic education in all schools where civic education is also defined as Dutchness:

> *"Dutch traditions, values and freedoms must be anchored in education. We expect all teachers to endorse Dutch values and freedoms. Every teacher needs to know how to communicate these values to their students. In this way, students become better acquainted with Dutch fundamental rights, values and traditions and learn how we treat each other in the Netherlands" (p.12).*

In the Turkish context on the other hand, the cultural construction of Turkishness has consequences for the groups like Alevi who do not fall under such definition as it is being reflected in the Alevi Democratic Opening Report:

> *"The state recognizes its citizens, once they are Muslim, under common and general principles of Islam. In this respect, by defining both Alevis and Sunnis as "reasonable" citizen under a common identity roof, provides security and safety for all belief groups against social unrest and conflicts. Besides, the state with a sensitivity that goes back its foundation years, has constructed the Turkish identity on several dimensions and legitimized it. Ethnic, religion and cultural dimensions that come together and forms this identity as a last resort has a threefold reference aspects: Turkishness, Muslimness and Modernness" (*p.15).

The discourses on the embracement of larger values of the society also recalls the contested nature of cultural worth of different religions, ethnicities, belief systems. The UK reports points to the hierarchies in value discourses where Islamic values are situated at a lower level due to the perception of their "oppressive" nature as it is being revealed by the interviewee who is a Muslim activist:

"Religion is hierarchised in the UK. I feel like the way that we look at organised religion is very much - it correlates or it's very similar to the understanding of superiority and white supremacy. So I would say there are certain religions like, well, Christianity that are seen very differently and are perceived very differently to Islam. I would say something about Hinduism and Sikhism as well in the sense that Hinduism, Sikhism - at the moment Hindus are seen as the community to model the rest of minority communities on. They're seen as being 'integrated'. They've made it. While the Muslim community, it's not seen that way. We're going back to this kind of idea of the clash of civilisations and the barbaric, very oppressive religious doctrine Islam has, and then the more liberal or progressive, like maybe acceptance of sexualities - people are picking and choosing. And that difference is being negatively constructed in a way that is in favour of certain religions and not others" (p.51).

The tendency to identify ethnic difference with disadvantage, which is particularly strong in the case of Roma, is closely related to perceptions on values. In this regard, the reports on Hungary and Turkey draw attention to discourses where the Roma community is depicted as one that does not value education and cannot comply with the middle-class education values. As quoted in the report on Hungary:

"The quantity of the curriculum for this very low socialized group is so incomprehensible and because the curriculum is also lexical knowledge based that schools cannot be a pleasant experience for them" (p.32).

In parallel to the discourses on minority values and their compatibility with the values of the society entrenched in the education system, another set of questions emerge on the extent to which minority cultures are included in the school curriculum. The absence of the history and culture of minorities is problematized by the interviewees in different country reports as a reflection of difference blindness or misrecognition. In this regard, the report on Austria mentions the views of CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities: "*The shared concern of national minority representatives that their distinct cultures, traditions, and history in Austria over centuries are not adequately reflected in relevant educational materials, nor in the curriculum*"[9] (p. 17).

Non-recognition and misrecognition of Alevi in the curriculum is an issue that is being raised in the Turkish country report. As the report puts it: "The existence of Alevi are only mentioned in the course on religion (RCEC), and the information given about the Alevi in this course is insufficient, partial and represents the Sunni point of view on Alevi" (p.24).

In the cases of the UK, Netherlands, and Portugal, the silence of the curriculum to the colonial past emerges as an issue that determines the belonging of the minorities to the country.

The Netherlands report critically argues that "the diversity in the stories" are not being reflected in the curriculum that reflects the principle of neutrality in the education system. Such curriculum lacks "attention for the migration history of the Netherlands including the Dutch colonial past and the role of the Netherlands in the slave trade"

---

[9] CoE Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, 'Fourth Opinion on Austria', ACFC/OP/IV(2016)007 adopted on 14 October 2016, p. 7.

*(*p.16). Another striking story that is being presented in the Netherlands report is the *Sinterklaas,* regarded as a harmless children's festival by especially those people from the majority groups in society, is seen by others to be inherently tied to the history of slavery and the figure of Black Pete is perceived as a caricature of black people. In the report, it is argued that "the absence of quality education on the history of slavery and the colonial past has resulted in the misrecognitions of minorities in Dutch society" (p.16).

The Portuguese report also draws attention to the inferior depiction or non-representation of minorities in the history curriculum: "A significant part of the Portuguese population is not represented in history books or, if they are, they are represented as inferior, not fully-citizens, and their history is not part of the 'national history'. This is the case of afro-descendants and Roma communities". The Portuguese report, exploring this issue as a European problem, critically argues that Europe is presented as a positive construction without any references to colonial past: "Europe is presented in history textbooks as the primordial place of modernity and civilization, representing the continent as a well delimited place-holder of culture and where concepts such as democracy, nation-state, Christianity, industrialisation, urbanisation, and citizenship were born. These manuals instil, from very early on in the educational project, a Eurocentric representation of national/European/world history, which helps to construct and reinforce a binary structure of difference in which the "Europeans" (translated as "whites") are at the centre and the "others" are present as part of the peripheries, to be assimilated by higher cultures. This binarization of the relations throughout the various historical periods naturalizes processes such as slavery, racism and colonialism" (p.18).

In the UK report, the discourses on the "whiteness" of schooling reinforced by "a specific blindness to global and migration issues" are illustrated by statements by a Muslim activist as well as by a non-Muslim teacher and parent: who mentioned that history classes focus on *"the Tudors and the Kings and the Queens': 'It was not about kind of like the British empire or imperialism or colonialism and how that has impacted and shaped the way that minority communities are seen in the UK today"* (p.30).

6) Social cohesion, equal participation in society and capabilities

The themes pursued in this comparative report are discussed in the UK country report by distinguishing between three discursive frames: "social cohesion", "values" and "culture". The UK report mentions that the frame on social cohesion "seems most closely related to the recognition dimension of justice". But it is also observed that "(a) noteworthy aspect of the social cohesion discourse is that it rarely specifies which groups or "communities" are the target of prejudices or hold them. Hence, it reflects an underlying assumption of mutual, symmetrical prejudices" (p.14). With this shift of attention from the groups subjected to injustice to the society as a whole, the inequalities in the position of different groups in social relations are overlooked.

The problematisation of social segregation in all country contexts could be said to entail the perception of social cohesion as an ideal, which calls for the assessment of the characteristics of the society as a whole along with the problems of equal participation in society of specific groups. What, then, is the position of minority groups vis-a-vis the perceptions about social values, culture and the institutional fabric of the society in which they are to participate? Is the "society" open to acknowledge and accommodate their claims which incorporate perceptions of "good life" that might be different from those of the majority? In a different vein, how do the demands and choices

of parents from minority groups relate to the well-being and capabilities of their children? These are the questions that will be pursued in this section.

6.1) Trust and representation

The controversies around school curriculum presented in the previous section point at the feelings of alienation of minority groups who are absent in narratives of history thought at school. The harmful effect of this absence on the feelings of belonging in society and consequently on social cohesion is emphasized in the country report on Portugal which states that " If we consider history as a key factor in constructing the national vision, it provides a framework for civic behaviour to young citizens.... To be citizens means to feel represented in the national project; however, a significant part of the Portuguese population is not represented in History books or, if they are, they are represented as inferior, not fully-citizens, and their history is not part of the "national history" (p. 18).

The inability to develop a sense of belonging in society because of the character of the curriculum or the experiences discrimination in school lead to feelings of alienation and an erosion of trust in the system of education as well as in the society at large. When trust, which is a crucial aspect of the foundations of social co-existence, is undermined, vulnerable groups could develop certain strategies which actually contribute to the exclusionary dynamics that affect students from these groups and lead to the deprivation of their capabilities. This is forcefully stated by the representative of an anti-racist association in Portugal:

> *"Minorities often have a relationship of fear with the State and the school is an institution of the State ...; then they also end up delaying their children's enrolment in school, and, especially, they do not create a relationship of trust. The school has to be concerned about building trust..."* (p.13) .

Where the values reflected in the rules and practices as well as in the curriculum define a value system with exclusionary effects on specific groups, the end result would be an erosion of trust and enhanced segregation in schools and in society to which parents who feel powerless to make their grievances heard also contribute. A Roma activist interviewed in the country report on Hungary refers to this by saying that *"the (Roma) parents themselves cannot be convinced to send their children to mixed schools, primarily because they cannot afford the cost of the public transport, secondly they feel more secured in the nearby segregated schools, and thirdly they are afraid that their children are not able to cope with the higher expectations"* (p. 34).

This tendency to "self-exclude" fostered by the experiences of discrimination against minority children and the internalization of the perceptions of minority values as obstacles to school success was also discussed in its manifestation in the Portuguese context in the previous section. In both country contexts, it was mentioned that the tendency in question could be used to legitimate policies and practices of segregation without a proper assessment of the exclusionary dynamics inherent in the system.

These examples from Hungary and Portugal highlight the representative dimension of injustices along with their redistributive and recognitive dimensions. Given the inequalities of "voice" which block the representation of minority grievances and claims, the minorities might believe that they do not have the possibility to question and

contest the prevailing social institutions and practices. They might therefore accept and adapt to them in whatever way they find to protect the well-being of their children.

Absent or limited minority presence in institutions and policy processes appears as an aspect of the exclusionary character of the education system in different ways in different country contexts. The report on Portugal observes that some of the attempts that are made to include minority representation mainly aim at facilitating the management of ethno-racial diversity in the realm of education. This is reflected in the following quotation from the High Commission on Migration:

> "*The representativeness of all the interlocutors is absolutely decisive for the success in the implementation of public policies. In this way, all mechanisms of hearing and participation must be stimulated in its various aspects: from more formal mechanisms to informal structures such as youth groups or Neighbourhood Associations. It is also necessary to ensure that the presence of more established structures, such as the Migrant Associations, continues to function, promoting, inter alia, the dissemination of training opportunities and funding lines for projects on the ground*"(p. 23).

This particular perspective on representation is problematized because it does not involve any concern for the presence of minorities in leading places in policy making even in the areas which concern them directly. Minority representation is thus seen in relation to their role as mediators, consultants or facilitators in policy processes. For Roma and Afro-descendant community leaders, on the other hand, representation is as the possibility of having power in decision making processes. The State Secretary for Education also makes a similar argument in the following statement quoted in the country report:

> "*Unfortunately, we are still a step back; we are still at the stage of developing national awareness that there is an issue. Because this "we're not racist" story is very convenient. (…) "There is very little representation, if there is any (...). The National Education Council has no association [of minorities], of all unions [of teachers], there are 24 at the table, there is not even one Afro-descendant. We, here in the General Directorate of Education, in the National Strategy for the Integration of Roma Communities, we have 1 or 2 associations present. In the work we carry out in the struggle against racism we have worked with NGOs. But at the decision table we do not have, we do not have representatives (...)*" (p.23).

In Austria, there is a well-developed institutional frame for representation, but as one interviewee observed the demands put forward by the unions of parents and students were not really heard until recently. According to this interviewee, there have been important improvements recently and the impact of unions has increased (pp. 43-44). Some positive examples of cooperation between the government and other actors in the sphere of education were given by mentioning what works well through which mechanisms:

> "*By means of discussions with politicians and elaborating solutions together...What works well at the moment is the openness of the Ministry of Education, especially of the Minister of Education, towards the pupils' representation or in general towards people who are directly affected by the education system. At the moment not only "experts" are invited who are in reality not really affected by the system*" (p.44).

What is worth noting in this assessment of the positive developments in representation is the emphasis of their "newness" and their relationship with the approach adopted by the Ministry of Education and the Minister in person. This draws attention to the importance of the outlook of the ruling government and hence of the political environment in which the possibilities of representation different actors. While there might be steps taken to allow a larger diversity in the voices that are heard in debates around the system of education when a given government is in power, dialogue and mutual understanding can still be impaired by the political controversies and tensions which prevail at the level of society. This point is highlighted by country report on Austria with reference to two civil society representatives who complain that their criticisms are often viewed through the lens of ideology.

> IP2: "*the reproach of being ideological which various critics of the German remedial classes have been confronted, yes.*"

> IP1 (at the same time): "*Yes, and I think it is sad in the context that it is not possible to have certain attitudes without being labelled as party political in the public discourse.... I mean that it is connected to some party. That is actually question certain topics from a, well, ethical point of view or something like this*" (p. 44).

In Hungary and Turkey, two countries ruled by populist parties and marked by an intense political polarization, the political environment appears to be particularly inimical to the expression of critical views in a healthy public debate. This is a point which receives particular emphasis in the report on Hungary where it is pointed out that "All the interviewees stated that there was no visible public debate about the role of education. In Hungary, every social issue is over-politicized and highly divisive along the left and right, the liberal and conservative camps, without any interaction between the two sides.... It seems that the illiberal mechanism of the current government in which all critical voices have to be silenced resulted that my interviewees feel that any kind of alternative ideas or critical thought are rather part of "an underground" discourse than part of the social dialogue with the government, as they feel that it does not make any sense to struggle or to participate in formal meetings where their suggestions are not taken into account at all" (p.31).

In the report on Turkey, similar concerns are presented with respect to the silenced demands of the secular middle class. Secular groups confront the government regarding its Islamization attempt in education through the proliferation of the religious schools and introduction of elective courses on religion in the curriculum. The report points to the parents organization's advocacy work and difficulties that they face as the claims of the secular groups are disregarded by the State and the Ministry of Education discards them as partners (p.32). A parent activist interviewed puts it:

> "*We took a signed petition [protesting the conversion of a secular public school to religious public school] to the Parliament. We were met by the police barrier, and were gassed even though we were accompanied by the Parliamentarians from the opposition party [...]. They prefer not to hear different claims than their own beliefs. When the new Minister was elected, we were very excited that a Minister with an education background was elected. We requested an appointment and but did not get any response*" (p.33).

26

The fact that in different contexts diversity is frequently mentioned as a "problem to be managed and dealt with" also makes it difficult to discuss the role of education in contributing to social cohesion in a healthy environment of dialogue with equal representation. In the case of the Muslim minority in the UK, where Muslim schools which are central to the debates around the "balkanization" of the education system as a much emphasized factor in the failure of education to contribute to social cohesion, making the school system reflect the diversity in the society appears to be a widely shared objective. However, controversies around this objective could be hardly avoided given the complex problems posed by different perspectives on religion and secularism which articulate with security concerns.

In relation to "non-discrimination" as a principle, for example, non-Muslim stakeholders portray Islamic extremism as a problem, while it is the problematisation of Islam itself which attracts the criticism of Muslims (p. 60). In some discourses on the problem of segregation in the UK, minority religious schools, Muslim ones in particular, are seen as posing a particular challenge for social cohesion. In these discourses, the emphasis on religious difference causes class-based and/or residential aspects of segregation to be overlooked. The non-Muslim teacher and parent interviewed in the UK report draws attention to the class-related aspect of segregation by saying "I mean, you could turn the degree of separation around and say what about all the Christian schools, or grammar schools and all the prestigious schools that a lot of our politicians went to. How diverse are they? And so how integrated are they in today's society?" (p.16).

While in political and advocacy discourses there is a general agreement that education must not be limited to giving academic knowledge and must inculcate moral values and principles to guide students in their life as members of the society, the way these values articulate with particular faith systems is far from being either clear or shared. Fundamental values could be simultaneously depicted as "British" and at odds with "conservative" religious ideologies. In some discourses, non-discrimination, more specifically gender equality, is mentioned in relation to the conflict between core values and some claims for the recognition of the needs of Muslim students (p. 45).

Such claims are in fact put forward by the Muslim Council of Britain in a language that problematizes the "too secular" character of British schools which makes it difficult for them *"to appreciate and respond positively to meeting the distinctive spiritual, moral, social and cultural needs of Muslim children"* (p. 29). This argument is developed with an extensive list of school practices considered to be inadequate for Muslim children, which create an environment that creates "conflicts of belief or conscience" and may lead the children to assume that they have to compromise or give up "aspects of who they are". The Muslim activist interviewed in the UK report described this process with the metaphor of a *"fractured identity"*: "*It's broken from the beginning, because you never see people like you in all levels of society"* (p.29).

Coming up with a school system, which would not "fracture" the identity of Muslim students while at the same time endorsing non-discriminatory measures, does not seem easy in an environment marked by the concern for religious extremism. These concerns lead to demands for more serious state oversight on schools and are translated into school inspection practices where the attempts to enforce anti-discrimination rules are criticized for introducing discrimination against Muslims. This obviously does not contribute to relations of trust and social cohesion. Against such state enforced measures, anti-racist activists suggest more voluntary reforms centred on the inclusion and accommodation of Islam in school curriculum and practices.

Such reforms for a more inclusive education system could be welcome by most minority associations and parents in all country contexts. But the reform process would be successful to the extent that it adequately addresses the controversies around the type of education that could positively respond to the need for belonging and develop the capabilities of children.

6.2) Well-being and capabilities

The reports on six countries discuss the exclusionary dynamics in the realm of education which manifest themselves in relation to economic resources, cultural recognition and the channels of expression of representation. In the reports on six countries, social exclusion is discussed as it relates to capability deprivation and highlights the relational aspect of the question of capabilities.

If children from minority groups are discriminated against, alienated or are overwhelmed by the subjects they are asked to master, that would obviously have a negative effect on their happiness and well-being.

The importance of children's being "happy" at school is mentioned by one of the interviewees in the Austrian report who refer to the potential positive role of "elementary pedagogy" in helping to foster access to education at an earlier age:

> *"This setting, especially in primary school, is decisive, because when children are happy to be in school, not to go to school, but be there, ten something comes out of it. Something comes out of it"* (p. 47).

A school system where children do not feel to belong can indeed make children unhappy, and parents can respond to this by seeking separate niches in the education system which they think would serve the needs of their children and positively contribute to their happiness and well-being. However, the parents' choices are often informed by the desire to educate their children in accordance with their own values" and their right to do so is rarely contested in most European contexts. Conflicts and controversies emerge when the right in question is expressed with references to the impact of education on identity formation and demands for an education which would foster the children's feelings of belonging in the cultural milieu of the family and close community.

Happiness and well-being are closely related to feeling of belonging, but what is the socio-cultural context in which children are expected to belong? Are they expected to live in conformity with the value universe of their parents or that of the wider society? If these value universes are seen to have incompatible characteristics reflecting different conceptualizations of good life, the transmission culture would appear as a particularly difficult problem to be solved by balancing the demands of the family and the society.

The controversies around this problem are exacerbated by the tendency to identify identity and culture with religion, as extensively discussed in the report on the UK. In this regard, the report refers to the association British Muslims for Secular Democracy that denounces educators who "have overemphasized Muslimness at the expense of Britishness and the whole child" (p. 26).

The Muslim teacher and parent interviewed in the report also problematize the interventions of Muslim parents in relation to sexuality-related taboos, but also in relation to problems associated with time or energy consuming rituals that Muslim children are expected to perform:

> "*Last year there were Somali students who started to practice praying and they had to pray on a specific time so some of them wanted to leave their lesson to do their praying. And because I'm a Muslim Chaplain here, the teachers came to me and asked 'Is that Ok?' I said, 'No. Don't allow them to leave the lesson. We have lunch time. They can tale 5 minutes'. During Ramadan, some of the wanted to fast and it was a long day in summer, a school day. 'Oh, I have a headache. I want to go home'. 'Why?' 'Because I'm fasting'. I said 'No. They're only 11 years old so they can break their fast. Don't send them home.' So I phone the families, explained to them. They can't do that because of the faith. They are not allowed to skip school*"(p.31).

It is probably not possible to have exact prescriptions about the extent the existing rules can be bent or religious beliefs that seem to conflict with gender discrimination can be accommodated in practice without compromising the children's present well-being as well as their future choices about the life they wish to live. The controversies that emerge here are not necessarily between Muslims and non-Muslims but between people with different views about the values to be transmitted in education. There might be a way of addressing them without overlooking the underling inequalities that affect the children's position in the education system in the present and the terms of their participation in society in the future. This would require accepting to reconsider the existing rules and practices as well as the curriculum.

The same observation can be made in relation to the controversies that are reflected in different discourses on the problems of and expectations from education in different country contexts. The discussion presented in this section indicates that the relationship between social cohesion and an inclusive system of education is a two-way one. Different dimensions of injustice that are highlighted in different discourses on education constitute an obstacle against the positive contribution education is expected to make to social cohesion. At the same time, in the societies divided along the lines of class, ethnicity, religion or race, the inequalities that characterize social relations define the exclusionary dynamics observed in the realm of education.

7) Conclusion

To which extent can education be considered as a space of inclusion where the tension between equality and difference can be resolved in a way to contribute to the children's well-being and the development of their capabilities as substantive freedoms to achieve actual *functionings*, or "various things a person may value being or doing"? This is the central question pursued in this comparative report against a general overview of the legal and institutional structure of education in six countries presented in the third section "The Panorama", which follows the introduction and the second section on "The Analytical Frame and Methodology".

The studies on the six country cases show that different dimensions of injustice related to redistribution, recognition and redistribution, which are reflected in various forms of exclusion, define the position of the students

from minorities and vulnerable groups in the system of education and thus constitute a barrier to the development of their capabilities. In all country reports, the problem of capability deprivation associated with the differences of class, ethnicity, religion or race is highlighted in some of the discourses examined. In these discourses, the problem is often discussed in relation to the "segregated" character of the education system and the inequalities of access to education often with reference to the spatial dimension of inequality where the quality of schools differ according to the characteristics of the neighbourhoods divided along the intersecting lines of class and ethnicity. References to residency-based registration rules and the admission criteria of better quality schools are mentioned as factors fostering the inequalities in access to education, but it remains difficult to reach a conclusion concerning the way equal access could be improved by policy intervention especially since the inequalities, in their spatial dimension, continue to be important regardless of the type of rules that regulate registration and school admission. Especially in a historical conjuncture marked by market-oriented trends in policy choices, the impact of socio-economic differences could hardly be alleviated.

 Perspectives on the inequality of access to education discussed in the fourth section of this report share a common concern with the problem of segregation. This concern is expressed in different discourses where the reality of social diversity is addressed in different ways. The country reports show that in these discourses, diversity often appears as "a problem to be managed". It is against the background set by this perception of diversity that the fifth section of this report explores the ways in which the relationship between equality and difference is conceptualized by considering recognition as a dimension of justice. With reference to the discourses examined in the country reports, injustices related to recognition, which constitute an important factor defining the inequalities in education, are discussed by highlighting the problems of "difference blindness" and "misrecognition", as well as third problem which cannot be separated from the first two but nevertheless pertains more directly to "the attitudes toward the worth of different cultures".

Socio-economic inequalities and cultural differences which are not adequately addressed define the limitations of education in meeting the expectations about capability development. They also create doubts about the contribution of education to social cohesion. The last section of this report on "Social Cohesion, Equal Participation in Society and Capabilities" discusses a series of problems highlighted in the country reports in relation to social cohesion: The combined effect of injustices related to redistribution and recognition make the minorities feel discriminated against, alienated or excluded, and consequently lead to an erosion of trust in society. Where their values are interpreted to be in conflict with the way society's values are defined, their claims for cultural recognition are seen as a threat to social cohesion. Their access to channels of representation is often limited and they do not have the opportunity to adequately express their grievances and claims and to contest stereotyping and stigmatising tendencies concerning about their values or their culture.

The country reports show that in dominant official and political discourses, the arguments on social cohesion are often framed in ways which make the above-mentioned problems difficult to be discussed in a meaningful dialogue between different stakeholders. Apart from the preconceptions about values and culture (of both the minorities and the society) which often inform the approaches to social cohesion, the perceptions of culture and identity as fixed and unchanging might not serve the development of capabilities as the core objective of education. The parents' freedom of choosing the type of education which they find in conformity with the values underlying their conception of good life might not be in conformity with the children's freedom to choose and affect their life

chances. There is, therefore, a need to question the given views on values, cultures and conceptions of good life in a transformative approach that addresses the underlying injustices that lead to capability deprivation.

The studies on the six country cases focus on different minority groups that are faced with different dynamics of exclusion shaped by the characteristics of the group as well as the institutional frame of the education system. However, the case studies together draw attention to the tendency to overlook the intertwined character of injustices related to redistribution, recognition and representation as an impediment to effective policy intervention for the inclusion of minorities. While they draw attention to the blindness to cultural difference as a factor accentuating inequalities in education, they also insist on the misrecognition of minority groups where they are attributed cultural characteristics seen to be inimical to academic achievement and social integration. In a parallel vein, the need to avoid the identification of individual children with the cultural group while recognizing cultural difference emerges as a policy relevant point made in the studies. While the relational aspect of the capability approach calls for the acknowledgement of the need for community, feelings of belonging in the cultural group should be considered in relation to the future choices about the types of "being and doing" which an individual might have reason to value. In policy making, this calls for a careful balancing of the choices parents might make for an education which conforms to their cultural value universe with the development of children's substantive freedoms.

The concern about children's capabilities is not absent in the discourses around education analysed in the country reports. However, these discourses are situated in a historical context marked by the anxieties about immigration or the fear of Islamic extremism which contribute to the interrelated trends toward the rise of populist politics and political polarization. The ways in which justice is framed in different approaches to education often reflect the characteristics of this context where it does not seem easy to go beyond the discussion of affirmative remedies against discrimination and exclusion and consider transformative remedies in meaningful debates in conformity with the norms of just representation.

Bibliography

Allen, D. and Reich, R. (eds.) (2013). *Education, Justice, and democracy*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Gewirtz, S. (2006). Towards a Contextualized Analysis of Social Justice in Education. *Education Philosophy and Theory* 38(1): 69-81.

Fraser, N. (2003). Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation. In: Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (eds) *Redistribution or Recognition: A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso, pp. 7–109.

Fraser, N. (2008). From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a Postsocialist Age. In: Olson, K. (ed) *Adding Insult to Injury*. London: Verso, pp. 11–41.

Fraser, N. (2001). Recognition without Ethics? *Theory, Culture and Society* 18(2–3): 21–42.

Fraser, N. (2014). *Justice interruptus: Critical Reflections on the" Postsocialist" condition*. New York: Routledge.

Huttunen, R. (2007). Critical Adult Education and the Political-Philosophical Debate between Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth. *Educational Theory* 57(4): 423–433.

Keddie, A. (2012a). *Educating for Diversity and Social Justice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Keddie, A. (2012b). Schooling and Social Justice through the Lenses of Nancy Fraser. *Critical Studies in Education* 53(3): 263-279.

Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist Perspective.* Cheltenham: New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lynch, K. and Baker, J. (2005). Equality in Education: An Equality of Condition Perspective. *School Field 3*(2): 131-164.

Pettit, P. (2014). *Just Freedom: A Moral Compass for a Complex World*. New York:WW Norton & Company

Phillips, A. (1999). *Which Equalities Matter*. Cambridge: Polity.

Power, S. (2012). From Redistribution to Recognition to Representation: Social Injustice and the Changing Politics of Education, *Globalization, Societies and Education* 10(4):473-492.

Power, S. and Frandji, D. (2010). Education Markets, the New Politics of Recognition and the Increasing Fatalism towards Inequality, *Journal of Education Policy* 25(3):385-396.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sen, A. (2000). Social Exclusion: Concept Application and Scrutiny, Social Development Papers No.1, Asian Development Bank, https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29778/social-exclusion.pdf

Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2003). Cultural Recognition or Social Redistribution: Predicaments of Minority Education. *Education of minorities and peace education in pluralistic societies*, 15-28.

Tikly, L. and Barrett, A. M. (2011). Social Justice, Capabilities and the Quality of Education in Low Income Countries, *International Journal of Education Development*, 31:3-14.

Unterhalter, E. (2003). The Capabilities Approach and Gendered Education, *Theory and Research in Education* 1(1): 7–22.

Walker, M. (2006). Towards a Capability-Based Theory of Social Justice for Education Policy-making, *Journal of Education Policy* 21(2): 163-185.

Walker, M. and Unterhalter, E. (2007). *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice in Education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.