

POLICIES OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION IN EDUCATION: POTENTIALS AND LIMITATIONS IN AN EAST-WEST COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE*

Abstract

Compulsory education as one of the major inclusionary policies known for long having unquestionably efficient equalising outcomes across social and ethnic boundaries has shown increasing symptoms of malfunctioning in Europe in recent years. As revealed, sizeable groups of children seem not to receive even primary education; other groups formally complete compulsory schooling without learning even the basics; yet other groups leave school early or drop out prior to acquiring any certificates useable on the job market; yet others are diverted to the side-tracks of mainstream education. Furthermore, these new phenomena are heavily loaded with social and ethnic/racial implications: evidence shows that it is mostly the children of marginalised groups, and most of all, children of poor families of minority ethnic background who are at risk. This paper distinguishes four markedly different phases of compulsory education with diverse causes and manifestations of the shortcomings. By drawing on a range of experiences and policy attempts in countries representing the continent's welfare states, the discussion explores the involved policy dilemmas and possible reconciliatory actions in the respective phases. Through identifying a set of key aspects of designing efficient interventions, this policy paper has the modest aim to put forward a fundamental issue of equal social rights that hardly has been drawn as such on the policy agenda of recent welfare state reforms.

* This paper has grown out of an ongoing cross-country comparative research project entitled “*Ethnic Differences in Education and Diverging Prospects for Urban Youth in an Enlarged Europe. A comparative investigation in ethnically diverse communities with second-generation migrants and Roma*” that is sponsored by the European Union within the FP7 framework for research (Grant Agreement Number 217384). There are nine countries participating in the project: the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. The project employs qualitative and quantitative methods in its community-based empirical investigations, and heavily relies on cross-country comparative analyses to explore those institutional, sub-institutional, cultural, social, political, and economic mechanisms that largely unvaryingly “make” Europe’s school-systems work to the detriment of visible ethnic minorities – regardless of the prevailing principles, structures and routines of their welfare regimes and the meritocratic vs. egalitarian orientation of their educational systems. Details on the regulations and the working of inclusionary educational policies in general and the arrangements of compulsory education in particular were elaborated in a series of Background Papers by teams of experts in the participating countries. The author owes special thanks to David Kostlán (Slovakia), Enikő Magyari-Vincze (Romania), Radim Marada (Czech Republic), Frauke Miera (Germany), Bolette Moldenhawer (Denmark), Mária Neményi (Hungary), Claire Schiff (France), and Sarah Swann (UK) for their precious contributions to the discussion presented in this paper.

The problem: a few introductory words

The right of children to free education that is compulsory in the fundamental stages was first announced with worldwide coverage in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Europe had good reasons to celebrate the birth of this important document as a great civilising achievement and the victory of norms that had regulated its own history from the second half of the 19th century. When the Declaration came about, the right to education as the fundament of social inclusion and civic participation had already been recognised on the continent: laws of the nation-states made compulsory education a cardinal goal and a priority obligation as much for governments as for the citizenry several decades earlier, hence, institutions and measures to set them in motion had been put in place long before. Amidst these conditions, the self-perpetuating character of compulsory education has been taken for granted and the issue, as a perfectly settled one, was taken off the political agenda. Given the structures and customary routines in the post-war era it seemed that policies can navigate within a framework that had been established and is to remain as such, hence, it is not the framework but its content that has to be dealt with in policy-making as well as in the day-to-day management of schooling. Thus, it was the quality of education that came to the forefront of policy debates, and not too much attention has been paid to questions like coverage or attendance that were seen to be routinely managed in an unproblematic and satisfactory way¹.

However, in recent times a set of new phenomena has called for thoroughly revisiting the widely shared belief that the issue of compulsory education had been resolved once and for all. Sizeable groups of children living on European soil seem not to receive even primary education; other groups formally complete compulsory schooling without learning even the basics; yet other groups leave school early or drop out prior to acquiring any certificates useable on the job market; yet others are diverted to the side-tracks of mainstream education. Furthermore, these new phenomena indicating the malfunctioning of compulsory education are heavily loaded with social and ethnic/racial implications: country by country, it is mostly the children of marginalised groups, and most of all, children of poor families of minority ethnic background who are the victims of apparent shortcomings in the workings of the educational systems. Additionally, their falling behind is not a phenomenon standing on its own: given the ever-growing importance of knowledge and qualification, the massive and severe disadvantages of minority ethnic groups

¹ For the historic change of focus, see: Eurydice Network 2004.

indicate dangerous fault-lines in the social structures of a number of European welfare states, and call attention to the evolvement of a vast second-class “colour-bound” citizenry in societies once proud of universalism and equality. (Eurydice Network 2004; OSI EUMAP 2007; OECD 2006, 2007 and 2008; Brind, Harper and Moore 2008)

It seems clear that, to a large extent, unsatisfactory functioning of the established routines and services of the school systems to provide all-round inclusion follows from the inability of the prevailing educational structures to properly respond to important changes in their surrounding social milieus. These systems were set up amidst the conditions of a rather low level of cross-border geographical mobility, and assumed a high degree of cultural homogeneity within the borders of the nation-states. However, due to immense migration and the social change that this has induced, the initial conditions do not prevail any longer. Much of the tensions arise from the fact that Europe’s established national educational systems have been lagging in recognising these deep and lasting changes and adjusting the forms and content of schooling accordingly.

The manifestations of the tensions are not uniform across the continent. The differences stem from the characteristics of migration, earlier inter-ethnic and inter-cultural relations between minority ethnic groups and the respective ethnic majorities, the rigidity/openness of the given educational system, and later opportunities for integration into society beyond education. Along these lines, there seem to be important variations in school attendance, performance, and career opportunities of the affected minority youths.

In broad terms, three major trends can be identified. The first is related to the ongoing intense move from the one-time colonies toward the one-time colonising countries with a concomitant segmentation in the social structure of the latter. These processes face education with increased ethnicisation of diverging school careers and the consequent differentiating opportunities on the labour market. Although language barriers usually play only a limited role here, cultural and religious differences are often translated as symptoms of non-adaptation and are penalised accordingly. (Williams 1989; Kymlicka 2001; Parekh 2006). What follows is the frequent shifting of the frame of reference from cultural to legal interpretations that conclude in responding to irregularities in attendance by social and institutional separation at an early stage of schooling. However, such corrective measures seldom meet the goal driving their conception: early separation on judicial grounds has a tendency to carry on the implied stigma and often

concludes in leave from education ahead of time and/or increases the risks of dropping out at an unfinished stage. (European Commission 2008; Law, Swann et al. 2008)

The second set of typical tensions surrounds economic migration that once manifested itself in the massive influx of guest-workers who (and later: whose families) settled in Europe despite the initial expectations of the temporary nature of their presence. Although stringent immigration policies of the past two decades have attempted to stop the process, legal and illegal migration toward Europe has apparently continued also in recent years.² This has resulted in national educational systems facing new needs to serve children without access to the language of instruction and the required cultural skills that the prevailing routines of mainstream schooling are built on. Due to sluggish responses on the part of school systems, institutional selection on grounds of inadequate performance, discrimination and pronounced segmentation by class and ethnicity, together with high rates of non-attendance are frequent symptoms of the arising conflicts between the affected minority ethnic groups and the schools. (Offe 2004; Phillips 2007; Huttova, McDonald and Harper 2008)

The third process relates in a large part to internal migration and manifests itself mainly in Central and Eastern Europe where policies of forced industrialisation during the decades of state-socialism led to the breaking up of the Roma communities, swept away their traditional occupations and forms of living, but did so without their genuine integration into the new structures of industrialisation and urbanisation. As to education, the lack of integration manifested itself in institutional separation of Roma children in the early years of primary school, their extremely low rates of access to secondary schooling and strong underrepresentation in vocational training. Against these antecedents, swift marginalisation of Roma during the past two decades of post-communist transformation has turned earlier loose integration to effective social exclusion. Widespread long-term unemployment, massive impoverishment and sharp residential segregation along ethnic lines have contributed to twisting earlier separation in education to institutionalised forms of ghettoisation that have led, in turn, to

² It has to be noted that the composition of migration has changed in the past 10-15 years. While decades ago it was mainly economic migration that dominated the stage, in recent times it is mainly the proportion of refugees and asylum seekers that has been on the rise, while migration purely for economic reasons has lost some of its weight among the background factors. Considering their situation and the implications for education, refugees and asylum seekers are often even in a more precarious situation than 'economic' migrants. (Boswell 2005; Miera 2008).

an intense ethnicisation of failures in schooling and resulted in high occurrences of dropping out. (Cahn et al. 1998; Ringold 2000; Kertesi and Kézdi 2005; Kemény and Janky 2005)

This paper emerged from the conviction that the indicated phenomena are not transient in their nature and cannot be properly addressed without a systematic review of their causes and consequences. Although it is the individual countries of the European continent that seek responses within their educational systems and welfare states (and naturally they do it in a highly diverse manner), most of the issues at stake have implications beyond national boundaries and urge for deliberation on the European level³. At this stage, it would be utopian to strive for Europe-wide regulations and novel solutions. My aim is far more modest than that: it is to initiate a dialogue by articulating the need for collective thinking. Drawn from the experience of the nine countries represented in the already mentioned ongoing comparative research project (EDUMIGROM) that addresses the role of education in preparing the soil for structurally embedded divergences in employment careers and later life chances of different post-migrant and Roma groups across Europe, my aim is to introduce the varied manifestations of new needs and challenges toward the established institutions and routines of compulsory education and to present some of the country-level responses attempting to address these needs. Since the countries participating in this research initiative exemplify all classical types of the welfare state as well as the post-communist new member states, I believe that rather firm generalisations can be made beyond the given selection.

Challenges to the established frameworks of compulsory education

A review of the legal arrangements on compulsory education reveals great variations in Europe: some countries define age limits and it is education but not schooling that they make mandatory; some others determine the number of school years (and the type of schooling) with only implied concerns on age limits; yet others combine the two principles. Even more diverse are the definitions on coverage: some countries regard the right and duty a matter of citizenship (with late amendments concerning identified and strictly defined groups of non-citizens); some others embrace legal immigrants and circumscribed other groups of foreigners in addition to citizens but exclude ‘undocumented people’; yet others provide compulsory education on a territorial principle by covering all children being on the soil of the country at any given time. These

³ The European-level concerns and the need for comprehensive actions is strongly argued for in a powerful recent document of the European Commission. See: European Commission: 2008.

variations in regulations reflect great historical diversity: countries with colonial past or with traditionally large groups of denizens and foreigners tend to apply the territorial principle, together with an emphasis on mandatory education (but not schooling), while the once closed and relatively homogenous nation-states are still inclined to take citizenship and the form of schooling as the cornerstone of regulations.

Understandably, these historical traits still influence the ways how national educational systems respond to the challenges that vast movements of populations have brought about during the past decades. Due to great differences in their school systems and the existing regulations on compulsory education, the conceptualisations of the conflicts and the applied policies to tackle them show remarkable variation among countries. The discussion that follows relies on background research and data collected in the nine countries of the EDUMIGROM research project.

Getting in

Much in accordance with the general picture on the continent, regulations vary according to the definition of the child population targeted by compulsory education also among our sample countries. In systems applying the territorial principle, total coverage is taken for granted. Its maintenance is seen as the explicit role of the local educational authority that is entrusted to decide about the form of education (schooling, home-schooling, special institution), while compliance with the regulations is defined as the legal responsibility of the parents (guardians). As the data show, it is the territorial principle that proves most effective in guaranteeing that each child is embraced by the system. (Law, Swann et al. 2008; Moldenhawer and Kallehave 2008; Armagnague et al. 2008) At the same time, it brings ethnic differences and conflicts into the world of education, which, as discussed below, leads to group-specific problems.

A diametric case is represented by countries that try to maintain the prevailing routines of schooling and keep away the most difficult cases by denying compulsory education for ‘illegal’ or ‘undocumented’ groups or leaving their schooling as a matter of case-by-case decision making of the authorities. (Miera 2008; Harbula et al. 2008) In this dubious way, certain cultural and behavioural challenges are kept outside the system, though at the expense of depriving groups of children of one of their basic human rights. It follows from the nature of the phenomenon that it is hard to know how many children are affected. At any rate, the yearly number of illegal migrants landing in Europe is estimated between 120,000 and 500,000 (European Union 2000,

Scott 2004), and since they usually come from countries with fertility rates above the European average, the number of ‘undocumented’ children can be expected to be rather high. If one adds children of parents whose legal permissions have expired or whose stay was never ‘legalised’ for historical reasons, it is probably not an overestimation to speak of several tens of thousands (if not hundreds of thousands) of ‘illegal’ minors whose educational needs might remain fully unmet.

Finally, in countries that apply the citizenship principle with recent amendments toward incorporating certain new groups, full coverage is also not attained. First, although ‘undocumented’ children usually are not ignored, they are not automatically covered either: their school attendance is a matter of formal application processes and the mandatory nature of education does not apply to them. Their ‘right’ for such requests is rather empty, given the risks of appearing for permissions at the authorities. Further, these systems tend to acknowledge a number of exceptions: pregnant teenagers, those whose work is needed at home, those several years above the age of their classmates are either exempted or are transferred to home-schooling – the latter with weak content and loose affiliation to educational institutions. (Drál’ et al. 2008; Molnár and Dupcsik 2008; Katzorová, Marada et al. 2008)

All in all, the prevailing regulations once elaborated for stably settled and properly documented populations do not always guarantee that each and every child in Europe has access to schooling. Children arriving with poor or no documentation, those frequently moving within or among countries, those having difficulties abiding by the prescribed regulations in time and in a proper manner, and those living in remote circumstances where even social services hardly reach out face a high risk of being ‘forgotten’. (Bicocchi 2008) This negligence seems to affect them with the highest probability at the two ends of compulsory education: they either do not get in to schools (or get in only several years later), or leave early on the grounds of various ‘quasi-legal’ reasons. Since (new) migrants from poor countries of the South and Roma of usually severely disadvantaged settlements are overrepresented among the affected groups, lack of access to schooling has a pronounced ethnic dimension across the continent.

Life while in school

Despite the above-indicated shortcomings of full coverage, the overwhelming majority of children living in Europe are embraced by one or another form of compulsory education. However, formal registration at school is only but the first step: the completion of compulsory

education necessitates a degree of cooperation and the fulfilment of certain minimum requirements usually regulated in the country's law on public education. Our review shows much less differentiation in the content of these laws than among the ones on coverage. As to cooperation, the laws in question regulate school attendance and outline the sanctions in case of non-attendance; concerning fulfilment of the minimum requirements, they determine the forms of assessment and the requisites for advancement within the system; finally, they determine the types of exams and certificates that acknowledge successful completion and attach clearly defined paths of continuation to these accomplishments. In short, regulations on attendance, performance and advancement provide the skeleton of individual school careers, and despite variations according to the structure of the national school systems, there is a high degree of uniformity of the principles.

Following as much from the requirements of efficiency in teaching as from the guarding and child-caring functions of schools, regular attendance is a basic claim. Hence, absenteeism (in its severe form: truancy) is considered a serious failure and a sign of non-cooperation. Most systems make it the parents' duty to rectify non-compliance with this regulation and in case of failing to do so they are faced with legal sanctions. Non-cooperation is thus criminalised, and is translated into personal failures of both parents and child. Moreover, the consequences are punitive with long-term implications: absenteeism is penalised by exclusion from the school and/or by referral to repeating years of schooling – both conclude with high frequency in unattained graduation, early leave and dropping out. Although a great number of studies have pointed out serious cultural conflicts, fears from discrimination, severe material deprivation, and frequent health-problems in the background, the conceptualisation of absenteeism and truancy still retains its criminal traits. (Gibson 1997; Epstein 2001; Huskins 2007; Huttova et al. 2008) Due to the high occurrence of poverty, low educational background of the parents, and, in many cases, also to language barriers, the school often remains an alien and threatening place for minority ethnic students, whose response to the fears and frustration is 'avoidance', i.e. absenteeism and truancy. (Department for Children, School and Family 1999) These symptoms of non-compliance thus easily become ethnicised by the school and the majority and contribute to the repeated reproduction of stereotypes, turning structural and cultural problems into matters of individual behaviour. Stringent corrective measures are introduced to make 'foreign' people more adaptive and more assimilated. The deepening conflicts manifest themselves in several forms. Firstly, as

the scattered data show, the number of children/youth announced ‘absent’ and/or referred to the police for truancy is on the rise in several countries – even if formally placed into an educational institution, these young people can be regarded lost from the perspective of meaningful compulsory schooling. (Law, Swann et al 2008; Miera 2008) Secondly, schools try to make attempts to reconcile internal peace and order: ‘expel’ the non-behaving youth from the institution or place them into a correctional educational unit. Besides increased institutional segregation and the strengthening of inequalities in quality education, these designated ‘stores’ for problem-children provide guardianship at best but not proper educational services. (Wright, Weekes and McGlaughlin 2000)

Regulations on assessment and performance-based advancement are in the heart of public education: these are the traits of schooling that provide the immediate justification for selection, while also work as powerful labels of giftedness, ability and capability by which differentiation is personified. Due to these implications, differential performance has long-term career implications that work as much upward as downward. An ample body of literature and statistical data show that minority ethnic youth tend to perform with worse results than ethnic majorities, and inadequate performance often directly results in not completing compulsory education to its full content or full duration.⁴ In frequent cases, low performance gives ground to ruling on retaking classes, so students are held back at a lower grade. It is rarely hoped that repeating years of study helps them to catch up, however, their personal selection works as a warning and an indirect incentive for others. In other cases, inadequate performance is to be improved through corrective measures: students are either selected into classes for children with special educational needs or are referred to specialists to deal with them in non-school based educational forms. Since these forms of selection mostly affect minority ethnic children, there is a tendency that the services get highly ethnicised and their attendance leads to intra- and inter-institutional segregation. Institutional segregation then works toward emptying the content of compulsory education: as the literature richly demonstrates, special classes and services provide low quality teaching (significantly below the standard of regular schools) that usually does not suffice for re-entering mainstream education, hence just to the contrary to their initiation, they become the very actors of the two major threats of functional illiteracy and early school leave. These experiences

⁴ For details and cross-country data analysis, see: Gibson 1997; OECD 2006. Heath et al. 2008. For country-specific discussions, see: Birnbaum 2007; Drál’ et al. 2008; Molnár and Dupcsik 2008; Strand 2008.

reinforce the conclusion drawn by a number of comparative investigations: the more competitive an educational system is, the more it is inclined to take measures of academic performance as the only legitimate base of selection. Thereby it increases the risk of low-performing students, among them especially minority ethnic students, of falling behind and dropping out. On the other hand, the more integrative a system is, the less emphasis is given to selection according to performance. Thereby the unity of quality training can be maintained and minority ethnic students with low performance remain part of the overarching system of compulsory education. These associations are underscored by robust results of a body of recent literature on the actual causes of high probability of low performance among minority ethnic youth. (Department of Education and Skills 2003; OECD 2007 and 2008; Miera 2008; Moldenhawer and Kallehave 2008; Ogbu 2008) Besides the importance of socioeconomic factors already discussed, bilingualism and cultural differences seem to remain largely unacknowledged by the school that tends to interpret these qualifications as inadequate performance and sanctions them with low grades expressing personal inaptitude. In highly competitive systems, language difficulties thus open a direct route to early leave. At the same time, as it is shown by recent Nordic experience, the recognition and due incorporation of this constituent into the methods of instruction in integrative arrangements helps minority ethnic students to advance within the system along with their majority peers. (Moldenhawer and Kallehave 2008; Boldt 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008)

In sum, European school-systems regulate and sanction attendance and performance largely along uniform principles. Regularity of attendance is required to maintain participation in the system, while advancement bound to performance serves as the most important tool of preparation for later labour market participation. The first set of regulations is insensitive to failures in schooling and criminalises the child's behaviour. The second set is poor in allowing for cultural and linguistic differences and devalues those with slower progress. Due to the intersecting social, cultural and linguistic problems, children from minority ethnic background have a high probability to fail on both dimensions. Although statistical data are not available on the frequency of absenteeism, truancy, repetition of classes or referral to special educational units by ethnicity, local studies and research data indicate a rather frequent – and increasing – occurrence of the mentioned phenomena among minority ethnic groups. (Law, Swann et al. 2008; Miera 2008) Although these different paths do not always end in formal leave, it can be

stated with certainty that they all provide fertile ground for quitting one's studies once beyond mandatory school age, undermining the compulsory nature of education.

Being selected out

Apart from the Nordic countries where integrated basic schooling without intermediate selection is provided for the entire time-span of compulsory education, certain forms of tracking while children meet their legal obligation characterise all the school-systems of the continent. The timing, the forms, the grounds of selection and the authority to choose may vary country by country, but one trend seems uniform: minority ethnic students tend to be selected toward tracks that provide less in terms of marketable knowledge than those paths followed in large numbers by the majority. (Working Committee on Quality Indicators 2000) Further, these tracks are usually bound to vocational training with a limited curriculum and a rather poor quality of teaching and do not render transferable knowledge for applying to other types of secondary education – consequently, these programmes often develop into segregated and self-contained forms of schooling that neither provide graduation, nor facilitate later attempts at catching up. (Armagnague et al.2008; Miera 2008) Additionally, the conditions that surround training for vocations are insecure and depend to a large extent on industries that they themselves often struggle with great difficulties; hence participation in vocational training might be risked by external factors and might conclude in involuntary early leave. (Miera 2008; Molnár and Dupcsik 2008) Such a high degree of precariousness explains a widely experienced phenomenon: instead of integrating, vocational training becomes a high risk terrain of dropping out en masse and thus it proves to be a major arena where students do not pursue compulsory education to its full extent. (Liskó 2008) Here again, it is hard to know the scope of the phenomenon. However, the available proxy indicators signal a rather widespread occurrence. Based on data from 1997, the European educational statistics show that the percentage of those 18-24 year-olds who had no more than lower secondary education while not in school or training was as high as 22.5. (Working Committee on Quality Indicators 2000) In other words, one out of five young people either leaves prior to the compulsory age or at best completes his/her compulsory years but never again continues studying. In light of the above, there is good reason to assume that the rate – if measured – would be significantly higher among minority ethnic students. At this point, failures in compulsory education are directly bound to serious limitations

in the opportunities available to the affected young people. As studies and statistics demonstrate, unfinished schooling in vocational tracks often concludes in long-term unemployment and poverty, and thus becomes one of the major sources of socioeconomic and cultural deprivation that cannot be overcome at a later stage. (Hövels, Rademacker, and Westhoff 1999; Brind, Harper, and Moore 2008) In this sense, it can be stated that tracking proves to be a most powerful vehicle of social class formation that works clearly to the detriment of minority ethnic youth.

Although tracking is perhaps the most visible, it is certainly not the only form of selection with immediate consequences within the mechanism of compulsory education. Another phenomenon with massive impact on minority ethnic youth is selection according to 'abilities': children with special educational needs (defined usually in terms of lacking certain intellectual and behavioural traits that are necessary for successful participation) are referred to institutions apart from mainstream education. As mentioned above and supported by a wide range of studies, services in these separate institutions are, as a rule, poor in quality and quantity, and eventually impede advancement: the certificate received here qualifies students for entering only a seriously limited range of institutions of further education. (UNESCO 1994) Referral to these institutions usually follows a multi-step process with the participation of qualified psychologists, educators, teachers, often even social workers. However, the tests they apply are adjusted to the prevailing school requirements. Hence, it is not a matter of professional bias or prejudices but follows from the very nature of the applied tools that they tend to devalue the performance and ability of children with language difficulties and 'foreign' cultural background. This way children from minority ethnic backgrounds 'objectively' gain a high probability of being sent to these institutions, whereby education according to special needs becomes a robust channel of ethnic/racial segregation and an impediment to receiving meaningful education. This form of selection hits Roma children in the first place: though the proportions vary country by country, it is still a general phenomenon in the Central European region that schools for children with special educational needs are filled up with Roma pupils and vice versa, the proportion of Roma pupils oriented into this segregated form of schooling is several times higher than the averages in the respective cohorts. (Berth and Klingner 2005; OSI EUMAP 2007; Katzorová, Marada et al. 2008; Molnár and Dupcsik 2008; Harbula et al. 2008; Drál' et al. 2008)

To sum up, although tracking to different institutional paths is a built-in constituent of all national school-systems, the actual ways of selection show great variations in forms and timing. It can be stated that the earlier the tracks of separation, the higher the likelihood that children from disadvantaged backgrounds are directed to certain closed segments of the system that practically block later advancement. These segments either do not come up to the standard of compulsory education for the majority, or conclude in an impasse that induces, in turn, early leave and final departure from schooling thereby entailing the danger of longer-term social exclusion. In addition, early institutional selection has a tendency to develop highly segregated educational units that are imbued with ethnicisation of non- or low performance and halt reintegration into mainstream schooling.

Select key policy interventions

As discussed above, meaningful compulsory education as the cornerstone of social citizenship is endangered from several angles. In its present forms in Europe, it neither provides full coverage, nor does it render quality service for all, nor does it protect against failures with lifelong consequences. What is more, all the severe shortcomings point in the same direction: minority ethnic youth is multiply disadvantaged and is hit from all directions. Further, failures in compulsory education are usually as much the outcome of socioeconomic disadvantages as the consequence of overt or covert cultural conflicts. What follows from this intersectionality is the frequent ethnicisation of poverty that, in the process of schooling, gets its justification by turning the prevailing tensions into low performance and individual failures in adaptation. Thus, policies that aim at assuring meaningful compulsory education for all have to take into account as much the complexity of socioeconomic factors and their interplay with ethnic differentiation in the background as the ethnicised manifestations of failures in schooling. This requires concerted efforts in education, employment, welfare, and housing – to name the most important areas where severe inequalities by class and ethnicity manifest themselves in the most concentrated forms. While acknowledging the need for such broadly conceived policies and actions, given the limitations of the current paper, the brief account below of certain policy dilemmas and domains of straightforward action confines itself to the immediate arena of education. It is my aim to introduce in short those recent attempts whereby educational services in countries have been working out, though in a rather unspoken and often haphazard manner, certain policies and measures for re-establishing inclusion within their reach. These policies and measures have

remained but rather isolated and, as shown above, none of them have been efficient enough to heal the new diseases of compulsory education and to re-establish the foundations of social inclusion for all. Nevertheless, a brief overview of them might bring us closer to outline a more general framework for discussion, and help to bind the issues at stake in compulsory education to the more encompassing issues of social inclusion on the level of the welfare states.

However, a preliminary note has to be made here. Any attempts at a deeper understanding and efforts for a more efficient policy-making would have an unmistakable precondition: organised knowledge about the phenomenon itself. It seems clear that a first step toward designing any powerful interventions has to be the recognition of the fact that although defects in compulsory education are widely experienced, systematic knowledge to inform and orient truly meaningful actions has been largely missing to date. Due to a large extent to the very nature of the phenomenon, even the exact numbers of children failing to complete compulsory education are unknown. Further, very little information is available about their age-distribution, socioeconomic conditions, ethnic background, even about their geographic dispersion. Additionally, there is only sporadic evidence on the manifold manifestations of failures in compulsory education: locally collected information on non-attendance, truancy, exclusion, early leave, repetition, etc. are very seldom processed to produce statistics, and one hardly ever finds in-depth data-analyses that would reveal associations between the various forms of failures in compulsory education and the varied socioeconomic, demographic, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and geographic characteristics in the background. Therefore, one of the basic claims comes as a commonplace: one hardly can refrain from rather loudly calling for the launching of European-level research initiatives and carefully designed systematic data collections with the aims of mapping the occurrences, the manifestations and the major determinants of failures in compulsory education and to explore the multifarious character of the phenomenon.

The ideas below that have been rather spontaneously developing in recent years in different parts of the continent have to be read as first attempts that should be – and certainly will be – refined in the light of concerted interdisciplinary research. As to their systematic overview, it seems worth taking a pragmatic perspective and clustering them according to the changing nature of the problem itself. From this perspective, there seem to be four distinct, markedly different phases in the process of compulsory education, with their own causes and manifestations of shortcomings. The first is the point of entrance where the great issue at stake is

coverage. The second is the first years of schooling with potential short- and longer-term consequences of the accumulation of early failures in performance. The third phase is advancing in compulsory school with the implied risks of non-attendance, truancy, referral for repeating classes (with overaged attendance), exclusion, and, in extreme cases, of early leave. The fourth phase is early tracking (timewise it might also overlap with earlier forms of institutional selection) that entails the risks of leaving with unattained certificates and/or ultimately dropping out. Given the differences in the nature of the involved tensions and also in the age of the affected students, different sets of policies are framed and designed accordingly.

Coverage

It can hardly be disputed that the most seriously at risk are those children who fall out of the systems of compulsory education even without being recognised: they are the forgotten group of ‘undocumented’ children. It seems it is only the territorial principle of providing compulsory education that reaches out to this group as well and allows for their unconditional inclusion into elementary schooling. With recent amendments in their initially citizenship-based regulations, many countries have actually taken steps toward substantially extending coverage. In light of such convergence in the practical implications of the regulations, it is perhaps feasible that within the foreseeable future all European countries turn to the territorial principle in their regulations and forgo the differentiation between ‘documented’ (entitled) and ‘undocumented’ (non-entitled) children. This way, at least in the legal sense, children’s fundamental human right to free compulsory education could be reconstructed on the continent.⁵

Early stage

To reduce the risks of early failures that might result in repeating years of study and may easily become the cradle also of later non-attendance, truancy, exclusion, and ultimate dropping out, a set of policies on early intervention have been put on trial.

The most powerful sphere of policy seems to be investments into preschooling. Recently, some countries have expanded mandatory attendance also to the last year prior to commencing

⁵ It goes without saying that despite the easing of the technical and legal conditions, the matter remains a ‘hot issue’ on the political agenda. As the results of the last European elections show in many countries of the continent (East and West alike), increasing influence of the xenophobic far-right movements and rather widespread dislike of the ‘foreigners’ signal disturbingly unfavourable political condition to the introduction of such continent-wide reforms within the near future.

compulsory education, thereby making attempts to overcome earlier disparities in preschool attendance. Since preschools usually prepare for school through mobilising also sets of skills other than the ones required later in education, culturally they are easily accessible even for children struggling with language difficulties and/or coming from socially disadvantaged backgrounds. The *expansion of preschool education* and its deliberate targeting toward minority ethnic children can be an important safeguard against early school failures due to language and cultural hindrances and it can establish later successful advancement by developing early communication skills.

Poor command of the language of instruction at school is one of the frequent causes of early failure. At the same time, there is widespread fear that acknowledging the multilingual character of society and offering education solely in minority languages may lead to institutional separation and ethnic segregation. However, recent attempts in the Nordic countries at making bilingual teaching an organic part of mainstream education have brought about promising results in improving the school assessment of minority ethnic youth and reducing their dropout rates toward the end of compulsory education, while the integrity of schooling has still been maintained. The *extension of multilingual and multicultural teaching* at the early stage of schooling seems to provide efficient protection against early frustration and experiences of undervaluation, and assists in reducing ethnic inequalities in performance. Beyond the obvious immediate advantages, such schemes and programmes work also as efficient forms of prevention by reducing the risks of longer-term accumulation of school failures due to language barriers.

Children with language difficulties, limited social skills and certain behavioural problems poorly tolerated by mass education are often oriented to schools/classes for ‘students with special educational needs’. As mentioned above and indicated by a rich set of research data, children with minority backgrounds face a higher than average risk to be assessed as ‘in special educational need’, whereby many of them are separated from their ‘unproblematic’ peers early on. This separated form of schooling is thus ethnicised, and what is more, the stigma attached to ‘special needs’ gets imbued with pronounced ethnic content. Furthermore, referral to this form of schooling proves irreversible: as data show, there is little chance of returning to the ‘normal’ track at a later stage. Given all the implied disadvantages and dangers, a re-conceptualisation of ‘special educational needs’ and a profound reorganisation of such services are needed. According to the results of a number of experiments (mainly in the Nordic countries, but also in

Hungary), *integrated teaching in combination with extracurricular 'catching-up'* services for the affected children helps to avoid the listed traps, while it improves the inter-ethnic relations among children, thereby also assisting inclusion in an indirect way. These new experiments take it as their point of departure that separation by 'special needs' due to behavioural and linguistic problems has widely proven counter-effective: instead of helping inclusion, such arrangements tend to turn into exclusion, and instead of catching up, they contribute to the early institutionalisation of the stigma of 'otherness' and the undervaluation of different cultures and skills. If separation still cannot be avoided, all local experiments show that the dangers are smaller, if selection takes place at a rather late stage of schooling and in a way that facilitates easy return to mainstream education.

Advancing in compulsory school

As the pedagogical literature reveals, it is usually not one single cause, but the interplay of a number of social, cultural and psychological factors that conclude first in failures in performance, then in frequent non-attendance, truancy and ultimate dropping out. On the part of the school, it is commonly a set of 'disciplining' tools that are applied in response. However, punishment, referral to class repetition or exclusion hardly eliminate the problem, on the contrary, sometimes they even deepen it. In addition, they nearly inevitably lead to the criminalisation of these failures that easily results in stigmatising those most affected: minority ethnic youth and their families. Thus, as shown by recent innovative experiments, policies aiming at lasting efficiency and rising quality attainments have to work in two directions: on the one hand, they should assist in avoiding criminalisation; on the other hand, complex support has to be given to the child and the family as well that reach the causes of the enduring school failures and help to eliminate them.

The very same (mostly British) experiments indicate that, in order to avoid criminalising non-attendance, and most importantly, to help the student to remain involved, the forms of punishment have to be profoundly revisited. Instead of the discriminatory measures of exclusion, referral to class repetition, and assigning fines, efforts for inclusion have to be offered through *individual case-management* with the involvement of trained counsellors, psychologists, youth welfare workers. Additionally, the penalising edict certainly must not imply terminal rules: return to the school and the class community has to remain an open option and has to be guaranteed upon improvement. Furthermore, all the measures have to avoid penalising parents,

least through suspending their welfare assistance – an important source of living in most of the affected families. Instead, it is a lesson of these innovative approaches that they work best if teachers and social workers seek ways of getting parents involved in their child's school affairs and gain their consent and collaboration in reviving the child's lost interest in schooling.

Non-attendance is usually the outcome of a longer preceding process: the child receives bad marks, his/her performance is undervalued or remains unnoticed; these negative experiences then lower performance which, in turn, concludes in falling self-esteem and intensifying fears of further frustrations – all these give rise to a self-perpetuating damaging spiral. It is worth noting that marking plays an important role here by attaching expressive numeric values to performance. Though the practice of marking is a built-in element of all educational systems and is considered a necessary incentive in competition, there are significant variations across countries in its application. Experiments show that the longer the schools follow the routines of detailed verbal assessment and qualitative evaluation, the better the opportunities of low-performing children to catch up and to preserve a healthy self-respect. Since all forms of absenteeism and early leave are in close association with shame and frustration caused by low marks, the *postponement of marking* can be an effective measure in maintaining meaningful participation in education.

Since it is often the parents' own failures and their consequent disinterest in schooling that play an important role in the background of non-attendance and dropping out, in many cases, it is family counselling with the participation of adults and children alike that promises some efficient results. In frequent cases, the causes can be identified in extreme poverty: either that families cannot meet the costs of education, or the labour of the young one is needed at home, or h/she has to engage in earning for livelihood. In these cases, there is no hope of eliminating the problem without providing ample support and services to the family as a whole. This requires *coordinated actions* between teachers, social workers, community development experts, and often even the local medical staff. Hence, the role of the local educational authorities proves crucial in assisting the schools in developing established and well organised forms of collaboration with a range of *local social and child protection services*. In addition, the municipalities and/or the state are the proper organs of providing and managing the funding of the initiatives in question by assisting the schools to maintain the involved, otherwise rather fragile, institutional arrangements and collaborative schemes.

Selection

Educational systems across Europe show great variations in the timing and forms of tracking. But whatever arrangements are applied, there is a surprisingly high degree of uniformity in the impact selection has on minority ethnic youth: country by country, tracking becomes the point of departure within the school structure where their relative disadvantages in comparison to their peers suddenly increase. They tend to be selected to forms of schooling that provide less valuable certificates than the ones attended by the ethnic majorities, additionally, their risks of dropping out increase exponentially. In light of these associations, a straightforward conclusion can be drawn: the later is tracking postponed and the smaller is the degree of the rigidity in institutional selection, the better are the chances for maintaining the chances of mobility and longer-term inclusion. Given that in most cases the necessary changes into these directions would require fundamental structural reforms in education that can hardly gain short-term political support, realistic recommendations should not go that far but remain within the realm of the existing frameworks. With this limitation in mind, two sets of policies have been developing in the past years: firstly, well designed interventions have been launched to help to enrich the content of schooling in the ‘devalued’ track and assist horizontal mobility between the various forms of schooling (such local experiments have proven efficient especially in Germany and France); secondly, a set of measures and services have been designed to target the dropouts and provide extra-school education to reduce their immediate and future disadvantages (with quickly spreading and promising results in the UK and in the Nordic countries).

Upon selection it is usually the varying schemes of lower secondary level vocational training that minority ethnic youth are most likely oriented towards. Although the content of such trainings varies country by country, it is a general feature that traditional subjects of schooling are represented with very low weight, and this very fact hinders change among school-tracks and/or the later completion of secondary education. At the same time, the acquisition of marketable skills and qualifications is highly dependent on the forms and intensity of collaboration between the schools and industry. Given these features, it is the *improvement of the quality of vocational training* that proves decisive in aiming at achieving better results in compulsory education. A key to the relative success is if education in vocational schools makes

accessible knowledge that qualifies for change among tracks (an important recent focus in Germany and France). Besides, institutional interventions of the educational authorities to help to establish direct contacts between the schools and industry and arrange for utilisable apprenticeship for each and every student prove efficient. Despite earlier fears and prejudices, local industry seems welcoming such interventions and, on many occasions, it becomes a trustworthy cooperative partner in job-creation well beyond apprenticeship (Local authority collaborative schemes in the UK, Germany and France provide a rich set of recent promising examples.) This way early leave because of the apparent ‘uselessness’ of the training and high dropout rates due to failures in finding proper apprenticeship can be reduced.

The sudden increase in dropout rates upon tracking can be attributed to several factors. Beside the above-discussed shortcomings of the present forms of vocational training, it is mainly the accumulation of earlier failures, a deeply felt frustration because of being personally devalued, and an often unmitigated anger toward the school as a hostile institution that give the motivations for leaving. Against this emotional background, rigid enforcement of the prevailing rules of compulsory education may cause more harm than improvement. Additionally, it may induce criminalisation with all its accompanying dangers discussed above. In order to avoid such traps and still maintain at least loose ties with education, *new flexible forms of teaching* have been developed in the UK, the Nordic countries and some Länder of Germany that take as their fundamental drive the due acknowledgement of the newly gained ‘personal freedom’ of the young, but still provide utilisable knowledge in a framework of ‘adult-like’ contract and rules of cooperation. Such provisions are often offered in whole-day services or else in the form of the recently widely introduced ‘second chance’ programmes. Additionally, well-funded and well-staffed *adult education programmes* assist in later return to the framework of formal schooling and acquiring the necessary certificates at a later stage. While these practical solutions are beneficial in reducing the harm suffered by early leave and they protect against extreme marginalisation, at the same time, their strength is also their weakness. Firstly, since it is mostly minority ethnic youth whom they serve, these extra-school arrangements easily get ethnicised and segregated on ethnic grounds. Secondly, by giving a certain degree of legitimating early leave from schooling, despite all efforts, they hardly prove helpful in assisting in return to school. With these drawbacks in mind, it is above all the prevention of early leave that should be

addressed by policies on compulsory education, and it is primarily the schools themselves that can and should be the leading actors in their implementation.

General implications

The claim for attaining (perhaps one should say: re-establishing) high levels of inclusion in all major domains of social life has undoubtedly become one of the primary concerns of European-level policies in recent times. Due to the importance of schooling as well in early socialisation as in shaping access to labour market and, via one's work, also to social positions, the issue of education occupies a central role in these policies. While such a pronounced placement of the principle of inclusion in education expresses commitments to the European values of universalism and equality, it also reflects the amassing experience that the established structures of schooling and the customarily applied methods of instruction can only imperfectly tackle those deep-going changes that societies of the continent have undergone during the past two-three decades. As discussed earlier, it is widely recognised that these structures and methods were born in an era when European states displayed a relatively high degree of internal ethnic/cultural homogeneity and experienced low turnouts of cross-border moves. However, massive flows of postcolonial and economic migration as well as high rates of Roma intra-country mobility due to industrialisation and urbanisation have fundamentally changed the initial conditions, challenging the systems of education with new needs for *multicultural responses and intercultural recognition*. (Nagata 2004; Bleszynska 2008; Huttova, McDonald, and Harper 2008) As I attempted to shown in this paper, the prevailing institutional arrangements and the customary routines of instruction are but sluggishly responding making education this way a terrain of frequent conflicts of cultural misunderstanding, clashing behavioural principles, and what is more, of a system that, instead of mitigating, intensifies otherwise existing socioeconomic inequalities by adding ethnicised aspects and interpretations to them. As the above discussion indicates, incompatibility between the given structures and the new needs has grown to such a degree that it endangers one of the fundamental human rights: the unconditional right of children to free and meaningful schooling. (European Commission 2008; Szalai et al. 2009)

While acknowledging the implied severe injustices and serious dangers, it has to be emphasised that beyond the inertia of the existing structures and routines, adaptation of the new

policies of inclusion is further complicated by a set of limitations beyond education. These partly follow from the varied historical legacies of the welfare states with their embedded diverse school structures that usually allow only for gradual and partial modifications. At the same time, attempts at change are restricted also by the interplay of important economic, social, political, and cultural processes that all intervene into education as the “own” terrain of the most powerful actors behind and thus put forth divergent principles and goals for the claimed adjustments. Amidst such a complexity of conditions it is no wonder that attempts at inclusion in education have not brought about any breakthrough so far: all across the continent, statistics indicate a rather high degree of inequalities in attendance, performance, and educational careers and signal a constancy in the composition of the social groups worst affected – all to the detriment of the varied groups with minority ethnic backgrounds. (Eurydice Network 2004; OSI EUMAP 2007; OECD 2008; Brind, Harper, and Moore) While an all-round panacea for all the social diseases at play has not been found – and most probably cannot be found at all –, important advancements have been achieved toward inclusion by several countries in a range of arenas. As the above sketchy overview intended to highlight and as a number of recently born reports give insights even into miniscule details, there has been a genuine ‘movement’ in education with recognizable developments in elaborating a wide range of new initiatives and measures in welfare and within the prevailing educational practices that seem to prove effective in combating poverty, self-degradation and marginalisation as the most widespread ills that hinder the affected groups of young people to keep pace with their more fortunate peers. (Department of Education and Skills 2003; OECD 2006; Szalai et al. 2009; Huttova et al. 2008) The mentioned discussions also reveal that positive impacts – as well as failures in implementation – are not haphazard developments: success follows from the compliance of the given modifications with some broader streams of policy-making that, in turn, are guided by certain established values and sets of rules.

This strong interdependence between the attainments of educational policies of inclusion and the broader determinations of the prevailing welfare regimes makes it necessary to call forth a closer exploration of the major principles that guide the working of the latter. As it can be revealed, three well-defined foci can be distinguished that are present at varying degrees in the national arrangements. The first among them is the classical notion of citizenship that emphasises equal membership and the deliberate extension of social rights as the foundations of

policies and measures. (Titmuss 1963; Marshall 1964; Esping-Andersen 1990) In the second approach, it is a range of interventions in the broadly perceived area of redistribution that are designed to correct actually experienced inequalities in social rights by aiming at reducing socioeconomic inequalities, ensure fairness and enhance equal opportunities. (Goodin 1988; Sen 1992; Fraser 1997) The third approach takes pronounced note of the ethnic/cultural character of the prevailing malfunctions in a range of social, political, and cultural institutions: by recognising the fact that it is people of minority ethnic background who are at the highest risk to suffer disadvantages and exclusion, it emphasises efforts in the arenas of political representation, culture and cultural exchange as effective policy tools. (Williams 1989; Banting 2005) While all the three approaches are present in the policies that the nation-states apply in shaping their welfare regimes and the working of education, a deeper analysis can bring up remarkable differences as much in the emphases, as in the practical interpretations of the key concepts and, what follows, in the actual attempts at implementation. Hence, more encompassing and far-sighted educational reforms to re-establish inclusion and equal rights cannot be outlined in separation from the basic structures of the given welfare regimes: their varied foundations and strong traditions are as much the source as the limitation of any radical change. Given the deep-rooted structural diversities, it seems important to acknowledge: European-wide policies for inclusionary education and the EU-level working out of effective arrangements of compulsory education as their foundation cannot be put on the political agenda with the hope of short-term reality.

This policy paper was drafted with the modest aim to initiate a dialogue for rethinking the conditions of re-establishing inclusion by focusing on one of its cornerstone, i.e. the issue of compulsory education. It was my attempt to highlight that such a dialogue can take place only by recognising and duly admitting with all its implications that the existing arrangements of compulsory schooling do not serve all children of the continent, and some fundamental reforms are necessary in order to take powerful corrective action. The interventions briefly introduced above were presented with the goal in mind that the necessary reforms should embrace all phases and all formations of compulsory education. However, by doing so, they deeply intervene into the given structures and widely practiced routines of education at large. The implied controversies carry rather severe limitations. Firstly, there are great variations in the school systems that allow for different degrees of structural modifications. Secondly, the groups at

highest risk of dropping out from compulsory education or completing it in an unsatisfactory way vary country by country, hence educational policies have to take into account highly differing socioeconomic conditions, cultural environments and a great diversity in inter-ethnic relations. Thirdly, although it is the schools that can become the key agents in achieving improvement in school attendance of the groups at risk, this task easily conflicts with their other commitments amidst the intensifying competition in education. Lastly, the issue of compulsory education is deeply embedded into the prevailing social and inter-ethnic relations of societies, hence policies for its improvement have to tackle a wide range of phenomena well beyond schooling. This makes the matter an important political claim, with varying degrees of foreseeable acceptance and support on the stages of national politics. Given these circumstances, the modest experiments and policy-initiatives brought up by this paper remain but on a rather general level. At the same time, I strongly hope that they are potent enough to provoke discussion that once may conclude in outlining some common principles of an all-European policy to make inclusion a central vehicle of schooling and to re-establish its very foundation: compulsory education that is *accessible and meaningful for all*.

References

- Armagnague, Maïtena, Barbara Fouquet, Joelle Perroton, and Claire Schiff (2008) 'Country Report on Education: France.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Banting, Keith G. (2005): 'The Multicultural Welfare State: International Experience and North American Narrative.' *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol.39, No 2, pp. 98-115.
- Bleszynska, Krystyna M. (2008): 'Constructing Intercultural Education.' *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 537-545.
- Harry, Berth and Janette K. Klingner (2005): *Why Are So Many Minority Students in Special Education?: Understanding Race & Disability in Schools*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Bicocchi, Luca (2008) 'Undocumented Children: Invisible Victims of Immigration Control.' Brussels: PICUM.
- Boldt, Lars Esben (2008) 'Tosprogede elever i grundskolen 2006/07.' [Bilingual Pupils in Grundskolen 2006/07]. Copenhagen: The Ministry of Education.
- Boswell, Christina (2005) 'Migration in Europe.' Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM).

- Brinbaum, Yaël (2007) 'The School Careers of Ethnic Minority Youth in France.' *Ethnicities* 7 (3): pp. 445-474.
- Brind, Tom, Caroline Harper, and Karen Moore (2008): *Education for Migrant, Minority, and Marginalised Children in Europe*. New York: OSI ESP.
- Cahn, Claude et al. (1998) *Roma in the Educational Systems of Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest: European Roma Rights Centre.
- Department for Children, School and Family, UK (1999) 'Pupil Absence and Truancy from Schools in England: 1998/1999.' London: DfEE.
- Department of Education and Skills, UK (2003) 'Aiming High: Raising the Achievements of Minority Ethnic Pupils.' London: DfES.
- Drál, Peter, David Kostlán, and Zuzana Kusá (2008) 'Country Report on Education: Slovakia.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Epstein, Joyce (2001) *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- European Commission (2008) 'Green Paper on Migration & Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities for EU Education Systems.' *Communication COM (2008)0423*. Brussels.
- European Union (2000) *European Union's Communication COM (2000)757 on a 'Community Immigration Policy'*. Brussels.
- European Union (2007) 'Community Immigration Policy' *Communication COM (2007)757*. Brussels.
- Eurydice Network (2004) 'Evaluation of Schools Providing Compulsory Education in Europe.' Brussels: Eurydice European Unit, DG Education and Culture.
- Fraser, Nancy (1997): 'From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a „Postsocialist” Age?' In: Nancy Fraser: *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the „Postsocialist” Condition*. New York & London: Routledge, pp. 11-40.
- Fry, Gary, Shona Hunter, Ian Law, Audrey Osler, Sarah Swann, Rodanthi Tzanelli, and Fiona Williams (2008) 'Country Report on Education: United Kingdom.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Gibson, Margaret A. (1997) 'Exploring and Explaining the Variability: Cross-National Perspectives on the School Performance of Minority Students.' *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 28 (3): pp. 318-329.
- Goodin, Robert E. (1988): 'Equality'. In: Robert E. Goodin: *Reasons for Welfare. The Political Theory of the Welfare State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 51-70.
- Harbula, Hajnalka, Nándor Magyari, Enikő Magyari-Vincze, and Letiția Mark (2008) 'Country Report on Education: Romania.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

- Heath, Anthony F., Catherine Rethon, and Elina Kilpi (2008) 'The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment'. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: pp. 211-235.
- Huskins, John (2007) *Priority steps to Inclusion*. Bristol: JH Edition.
- Hövels, Ben, Hermann Rademacker, and Guy Westhoff, eds. (1999) *Early School-leaving, Qualifications and Youth Unemployment*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publisher.
- Huttova, Jana, Christina McDonald, and Caroline Harper (2008): *Making the Mark?: An Overview of Current Challenges in the Education for Migrant, Minority, and Marginalised Children in Europe*. New York: OSI ESP.
- Katzorová, Denisa, Radim Marada, Kateřina Sidiropulu Janků, and Arnošt Svoboda (2008) 'Country Report on Education: Czech Republic.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Kemény, István and Béla Janky (2005) 'Roma and Education' in: *Roma of Hungary*. (ed.: István Kemény), Highland Lakes, NJ: Boulder, Colorado Atlantic Research and Publications, Inc., pp. 144-167.
- Kertesi, Gábor and Gábor Kézdi (2005) 'Roma children in the transformational recession - Widening ethnic schooling gap and Roma poverty in post-communist Hungary,' *Working Papers*, Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Kymlicka, Will (2001): *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Liskó, Ilona 2008 'Szakképzés és lemorzsolódás' [Vocational training and drop-out], in Köllő, János and Varga, Júlia (eds.) *Zöld könyv a magyar közoktatás megújításáért* [Green book on the reform of the Hungarian public education], Budapest: Magyarország Holnap Oktatás és Gyermekesély Kerekasztal, pp. 92-122.
- Marshall, Thomas H. (1964), 'Citizenship and Social Class', in *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development: Essays by T.H. Marshall*, Chapter IV, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 65-122
- Miera, Frauke (2008) 'Country Report on Education: Germany.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Moldenhawer, Bolette and Tina Kallehave (2008) 'Country Report on Education: Nordic (Denmark and Sweden).' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Molnár, Emilia and Csaba Dupcsik (2008) 'Country Report on Education: Hungary.' *EDUMIGROM Background Paper*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.
- Nagata, Adair L. (2004): 'Promoting Self-Reflexivity in Intercultural Education.' *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, No.8, pp. 139-167.
- OECD (2006) *Where Immigrant Students Succeed. A Comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2007) *PISA 2006 Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*. Paris: OECD.

- OECD (2008) *Education at a Glance 2008: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD.
- Offe, Claus (2004) *Social Protection in a Supranational Context. European Integration and the Fates of the „European Social Model”*. Berlin: Humboldt University, mimeo.
- Ogbu, John (2008): *Minority Status, Oppositional Culture and Schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- OSI EUMAP (2007) ‘Overview’. In: *Equal Access to Quality Education for Roma. Vol. 2.* (eds.: Penelope Farrar, Katy Negrin et al.). Budapest: OSI, pp. 17-72 .
- Parekh, Bhikhu (2006): *Rethinking Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Phillips, Anne (2007): *Multiculturalism without Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ringold, Dena (2000) *Roma and the Transition in Central Europe: Trends and Challenges*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Scott, Penelope (2004) ‘Undocumented Migrants in Germany and Britain: The Human “Rights” and “Wrongs” Regarding Access to Health Care.’ *Electronic Journal of Sociology*.
- Sen, Amartya (1992): *Inequality Reexamined*. New York-Oxford: Russel Sage Foundation-Clarendon Press, pp. 102-117.
- Sen, Amartya (2006): *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. New York: WW Norton and Company.
- Strand, Steve (2008) ‘Minority Ethnic Pupils in the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England.’ *Research Report No. DCSF-RR029*. Coventry: University of Warwick.
- Szalai, Júlia, Marcus Carson, Zuzana Kusá, Enikő Magyari-Vincze and Viola Zentai (2009) *Comparative Report on Educational Policies of Inclusion*. Budapest: CEU CPS.
- Titmuss, Richard M. (1963): *Essays on ‘The Welfare State’*. London:George Allen and Unwin.
- Unesco (1994) ‘The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education.’ Paris: UNESCO.
- Williams, Fiona (1989): *Social Policy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Working Committee on Quality Indicators (2000) ‘European Report on Quality School Education.’ Brussels: European Commission.
- Wright, Cecile, DebbieWeekes, and Alex McGlaughlin (2000) ‘Race’, *Class, and Gender in Exclusion from School*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.