

Voices of Migrants: Education and ‘Racial’ Discrimination

By

Nicos Trimikliniotis, Yiannos Papayiannis and Masoud Kamali

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to identify and locate from the migrant discourses in WorkPackage 2 the experienced discriminatory moments regarding education as they were articulated by migrants themselves. The issue of racial discrimination in education is multidimensional, highly complex and quite contentious as the discriminatory instances can be overt or subtle, direct or indirect, interpersonal, ideological, discursive, as well as institutional and structural. This chapter aims to record and analyse such *perceived moments* or instances of ‘racial’ discrimination emerging from the migrant narratives, on the basis of a selection of key issues by the researchers, who are engaged in a study and critical evaluation of the debates over discrimination in education by migrants themselves.

Education is attributed an immense role in shaping individuals, institutions, even ‘society’ itself. Moreover, the importance of education in the production and reproduction of discriminatory patterns, ideas, discourses, practices and structures is well recognized. Nevertheless, ‘education’, schooling and vocational training ought not to be seen in isolation from the rest of society, rather educational processes should be analyzed, as an integrated part, and in a constant process of re-negotiation, re-articulation - partly in conflict and partly in conformity - with other social structures processes and practices in society. Education, together with the labour market, are among the most important areas at which inclusion, exclusion, belongingness and

discrimination can best be located and appreciated: this paper aims to explore such issues as they are articulated in the narratives told by those who are the subject of such an exclusion, namely immigrants.

Methodology

Following a theoretical analysis regarding education and discrimination, this paper draws on the methodology of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and frame analysis, in order to develop a comparative analysis of the eight case countries under examination. If we accept that ‘language is a social practice’ (Hintikka and Hintikka, 1986 van Dijk, 1993, Linell, 1998¹, Fairclough and Wodak 1997), the investigation of the discourses of migrants can be particularly valuable in shedding some light on the question of racism, a term that necessarily denotes a social relation based on the power to exclude, demean, devalue and oppress a group of persons. The three ‘pillars’ of CDA the concept of power, history and ideology (Wodak 2001: 3) feature quite prominently in this paper:

- a) The power–position of migrants (and other racialised groups) is discussed in this paper in the context of their own accounts and the theoretical and empirical insights from this and other studies
- b) History features in multiple ways – either as the location of the historical specificity at which migrant voices are articulating. Their narratives, a kind emerges from the narratives of belonging and discrimination as articulated.
- c) Ideology is almost everywhere in the grand narrative propounded and ironically opened up by Althusser’s seminal observations (2001). Ideology is no side point; the narratives, the structures and processes, the institutional settings and the discourses are all soaked in ideology. So are our own ‘scientific’ analyses.

Theoretical Intrigues: Sociology of Education and ‘Racial’ Discrimination

The sociology of education has a long tradition since the establishment of the modern education system. Education seized a central place in modernization theories, such as

¹ Per Linell (1998) *Tankar kläs i ord* (Thoughts are clothed in words), Linköping: Tema Communication, Linköping University.

those of Weber, Durkheim, Parsons, etc. One of the most important theoretical developments was the Durkheimian theory of education. Durkheim considered the modern education as the gate for secondary and the most important forms of socialization. It was a process by which the individual becomes a full member of society; the education learn her the necessary skills including the knowledge of norms and rules for living in a society. Even later post structuralist scholars, such as Foucault (1972) recognizes the importance of education as one of the most important means of preparing the individual for living in society, although he calls education for a process of disciplination.

However, we do not intend to explore the sociology of education, but a part of that which has to do with discrimination of ‘the others’. This chapter is about ‘racial’ discrimination, *not* about inequality in society generally; nevertheless to ignore the wider issues that contribute to the systematic discrimination of racialised groups in society would fail to appreciate the complex interrelation between discrimination and social inequality. In fact the very principle of non-discrimination derives from the principle of equality; to be (unlawfully or unjustly) discriminated against means not to be treated equally when one should have been treated so or, to be treated (formally) equally when one should have been treated differently (due to circumstances, social positions, knowledge, status etc). The debates in the sociology of education over the nature, purpose and meaning of education, the notion of the ‘hidden’ and declared curriculum, the issues of access, denial, selection, the role of parents, parental education and interest, social capital, attainment, chances and barriers (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977, Bowles and Gintis, 1976, Halsey, Heath and Ridge 1980) must be modified and directed accordingly towards the issue of belonging and exclusion of migrants and racialised groups in society. Also such debates must be linked with the questions of citizenship, integration and multicultural and plural society, as the European integration process requires a comparative analysis for locating and appreciating such issues.

A Broad Conception of Education in society: Discrimination and Education

A number of different approaches and philosophical models exist as regards the education of migrants and ethnic minorities. These reflect, or are at least to some

extent connected to the prevailing approach adopted regarding participatory and social belonging of migrants from the so-called ‘melting pot’ and other assimilationist perspectives to models of integration, multiculturalism and ‘autonomous’ and pluralist approaches. It is of course beyond the scope of this paper to review extensively the different approaches, as this paper is about *discrimination in education* across the eight countries under examination, as perceived in the migrant narratives. However, it is important to point out the different philosophies result in different regimes, which themselves generate their own social processes of discriminatory and other exclusionary patterns and which have a bearing on conducting comparative educational research. The particular educational systems have evolved in their specific national settings and as such reflect distinct historical factors, concerns and debates, in spite the commonalities and common influences etc. Furthermore, beyond the ‘design’ matters, there are issues that emerge from the practices of actually implementing a schooling policy or a wider educational policy. Schooling in the ghetto is quite a different matter from the schooling in a middle-class suburbia school, to state the obvious. In spite of the various European and international declaration that declare education as a ‘right’ and a ‘public good’, the issue of financing for the education of a child, the general question of education funding has become a major educational issue, at a national and post-national level as part of the generalized assault on the welfare state and this has immediate and direct effects, particularly on poorer sections of migrants and ethnic minority communities.

For the purpose of this research paper, ‘education’ is given as broad a conception as possible and is, at first instance at least, left to the migrants themselves to interpret; should they fail to respond, or are unable to understand as to the ways they experience discriminatory practices in education, then they were directed by the focus group coordinator or interviewer to specific ways in which they were excluded in schooling, secondary and tertiary education and vocational or other training to comment upon². Nevertheless, in our analysis further down we take a more ‘open’ approach to the precise meaning of the term ‘education’ as it takes different forms as a number of informal and non-institutionalised forms; formal and informal copying and rejecting; recognizing and refuting; following and challenging. Education is a highly fluid,

² See Guidelines for WP2.

active and reciprocal and necessarily contradictory process that requires reflection and study that cannot be ‘contained’ in a narrow definition. For this reason we examine some of the more theoretical and historical issues that emerged in classical as well as modern debates.

Education: Virtuous Guidance or Discriminatory Indoctrination?

The fundamental question here is whether education in an emancipatory means of human development, whether at an individual or collective level or whether in fact it is itself a mechanism or tool in which discrimination and inequality is reproduced and maintained. From the days of Aristotle (384-322 BC) education was valued as a necessary ‘ethical virtue’ that ought to be properly implemented for the benefit of society and the individual. Aristotle in book Ten of his *Ethics* (1955: 310) writes:

Like a piece of land, which has to be prepared for the seed to grow there, the mind of the pupil has to be prepared for inculcation of good habits, if it is to like and dislike the things it ought.

Aristotle can be seen as one of the first proponents of the virtue of education in its own right: to become virtuous one must possess a suitable nature, rightly directed by habit and education. Nevertheless, the key to a moral and ethical dimension of education is that it is capable of providing the necessary tools and skills of correctly discriminating between ‘good’ from ‘bad’. ‘Discrimination’, i.e. differentiating an idea, matter, practice, person, from another and ‘valuing’ it, prioritising and, preferring or rejecting it, goes at the heart of Aristotelian *ethical* education. For education is seen as a means of overcoming being “passions slave” and mastering passions on the basis of logic (Aristotle 1953: 310 – 311). Aristotle’s seminal observations have filtered through popular knowledge to such an extent that they are now taken for granted as ‘common sense’. In spite the role of the dark ages, whereby the most interpretation of ‘education’ was more or less equated with dogma, as imposed by the most reactionary interpretations of Christian faith, the notion of education as virtue in fact survived via the very institutes of church – state oppression in the monasteries’ libraries: hence unveiling the inherent contradictions entailed within the very heart of the educational process in that ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ can

never be guarded against or controlled no matter how have those in power try. The Orwellian *Big Brothers* and the various *Jorhe* (Eco's *The Name of the Rose*) can do nothing about it, but they will of their out most to control, direct and use it for their benefit.

Education was taken up passionately by the Enlightenment and given a critical twist in the emancipatory project for saving, advancing and progressing humanity. Now education assumes an all-powerful role of emancipating the whole of humanity. It is no coincidence that Saint-Simon allegedly professes that,

Our education achieved its purpose: it made us revolutionaries (Hamilton 1995: 48)

Education became indeed a liberal ideal via which all members of a (democratic) society have the opportunity and capacity to evolve, develop and attain their roles, jobs and positions in society. The Parsonian world preserved a special function for education in the socialization of members of society via the *meritocratic ideal*. It serves also as a 'vehicle', a mechanism for belonging, and all western liberal democracies invest heavily in education: education is a good in its own right: The Marshallian citizens (and their children) can participate in civic life through education and the working class, as well as migrant communities and ethnic minorities would therefore 'belong' to the wider societal community; at least this is how theory has it.

The Riddles of Definition and Great Debates

A definition of 'education' is not an easy matter given that the term refers to a number of processes in which persons are 'socialised' in society through learning, instructing, discussing, questioning, applying and extending 'knowledge' and skills. Durkheim's concern with integration and homogeneity in society, could not but lead him to examine the role of education: social solidarity is a 'function' of the educating process by building and shaping homogeneous citizens; social integration needs the cement of education. Bourdieu's intrigues as to how *inequality is reproduced* via the educational (and other) systems, whilst whatever process is relatively successful in keeping society together is another dimension of the grand debates. Whether from a 'functionalist' or Marxist perspective, education is seen as a key social process into

society. For modern nation-states to emerge and to be cohesive enough, proper centralized and re-directed educational systems were required to enforce national languages across the countries.

Education entails practices that can be understood via a consideration of its various synonyms: *paideia* (παιδεία), as propounded in the ancient Greek spirit of ‘spiritual and moral education’ by way of instruction. The literally means ‘suffering via learning’ – ‘παιδεύω’ – ‘εκπαιδεύω’, there can be no learning without the labours of the training. The second ‘synonym’ it is ‘morphosis’ (μόρφωση) which literally translates as ‘shaping’, but refers to the shaping of persons mental, spiritual and moral being. Human development is achieved via education. Pierre Bourdieu’s ‘*habitus*’ (i.e. “systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures” of cognitive and motivating structures) is the outcome of the broad conception of education that we are proposing here.

Locating Education *Within* the Social Relations

One of the few “western” thinkers who appreciated the importance (and potential) for education in emancipation, whilst at the same time being well aware and indeed highly critical of the western pedagogical practices, which treated patronisingly both ‘colonial’ subjects and subaltern classes as ‘children’. It is no coincidence that the apartheid regime as well as American racist from the slave day’s treated blacks as ‘boys’ as the racist thinking perceived blacks as lesser breeds IQ analogous to that of children. Gramsci was highly critical of both Labriola and Gentile for maintaining an apologetic approach to the Italian occupation of Libya; Labriola even went as far as claiming that ‘backward’ people ought to be enslaved in order to be civilized! In reply to the racially (loaded) question “how would you go about the moral education of a Papuas?” Labriola replied: “Provisionally I would make a slave of him, and this would be the pedagogy in his case, except to see whether a start could be made on using our pedagogy with his grandsons and great-grandsons” (FSPN p.157). Gramsci’s critique of what he called as a ‘harsh’ position was overlade assessed as not progressive and anti-dialectical. Gramsci had already taken a clear stance of the issue in an unsigned article in L’ Ordine Nuovo 10 January 1920, in reply to the elitist approach of industrialists and political demagogues who treated workers as children,

mirroring colonialist attitudes. He asked: “Do you want those who yesterday were slaves to become men? Start of by treating them like men all the time, for by so doing you will have taken the biggest forward of all”³.

One needs to appreciate the context within which Gramsci was writing to fully comprehend how forward his thinking was, even if he is accused of Eurocentricism – an accusation which is not altogether unfounded, as his thinking was shaped by western European thoughts. He proposes a broad concept of education, he perceives the relationship between teacher and pupil as “active and reciprocal so that every teacher is a pupil and every pupil a teacher” (SPN 349). Furthermore, he insisted that “the educational relationship” is “not restricted to the strictly ‘classroom’ relationships” but in fact exists “thought society as a whole and for every individual relative to other individuals”. Gramsci extended this educational principle to society and power relations:

“Every relationship of ‘hegemony’ is necessarily an educational relationship and occurs not only within a nation, between the various forces of which a nation is composed, but in the international and world-wide field, between complexes on national and continual civilizations”. (SPN 350)

We take Stuart Halls’ suggestion that Gramsci’s work is highly relevant for the study of ‘race’ and ethnicity:

...though Gramsci did not write directly about the problems of racism, the preoccupying themes of his works provide deeper intellectual and theoretical lines of connections to many more of these contemporary issues than a quick glance at his writing would suggest. [Hall, 1986/ 1996: 417]

In fact these insights appeared before publication, at least in English of Gramsci’s writings the ‘Further Selections of Prison Notebooks’, which we are using exactly in the way Hall recommends:

I emphasize that this is not a question of the immediate transfer of Gramsci’s particular ideas to these questions. Rather, it is a matter of bringing in distinctive theoretical

³ Quoted in footnote 17, page 539, FSPN (Further Selections form Prison Notebooks).

perspective to bear on the seminal theoretical and analytic problems, which define the field. [Hall, 1996: 435]

Hall lists a number of pointers that sketch out the Gramscian perspective he is proposing; however for the purposes of this paper we are particularly interested as it has a bearing on this paper. Hall (1996: 438) reminds us that the state, in relation to racial and ethnic class struggles, is “defined in an exclusively coercive, dominative and conspiratorial manner”, whereas Gramsci breaks irrevocably with all three. Hall captures the kind of approach we would propose in our paper, which deals with education:

Gramsci’s domination / direction, distinction, coupled with the ‘educative’ role of the state, its ideological character, its position in the construction of hegemonic struggles – however crude in their original formulation – could transform both the study of the state in relation to racist practices, and the related phenomenon of the ‘post-colonial state’ [Hall 1996: 438]

Hence, the ‘sites’ of struggles, all of which are inherent and prevalent state-related processes, and in particular schooling and institutions which serve some role in transmission of ideas in society (churches, religious organisations, cultural and other ethnically specific associations). This paper will return to the conception of the state and state processes, which forms a retrieval locus of analysis that follows.

The second pointer provided by Hall relates to the centrality Gramsci’s gives to cultural specificity in his analysis, particularly in his analysis of popular culture. Hall (1996: 439) puts it quite succinctly:

By culture I mean the actual, grounded terrain of practices, representations, languages and customs of any specific historical society. I also mean the contradictory “common sense” which have taken root in and helped to shape popular life.

Gramsci’s observation on the contradictions of popular culture is encapsulated in this remark. Stone Age elements and principles of a more advanced science, prejudices from all past phases of history ...and institutions of a future philosophy appear as part

of popular knowledge. (Hall 1996: 439). More recent studies have indicated that Gramsci is particularly relevant to the study of multicultural education:

With a methodological approach familiar us from ethnomethodology and psychoanalysis, Gramsci reverses the angle of vision to that of the “alien himself”. It is not the emigrants that are alien, since the causes for their collective behavior are easily identified; instead it is those groups and social formations that come into being in the large factories (as a consequence of capitalist factory owners’ behavior) that are the alien subjects in the eyes of politicians and political scientists. (Apitzsch, 2002: 294-295)

As much as understanding of the cultures, concerns and position of migrant and other discriminated against groups by the majority or hegemonic groups is warranted, at the end of the day the migrant voices themselves ought to be heard so that authentic claims are articulated. It is in this context that Apitzsch (2002: 295) argues that Gramsci goes a step further than many others and is certainly ahead of his time, as

The members of the dominant minority do not have to “understand” majority subordinated groups who should discover themselves and thereby develop their universal claim to equal civil rights.

Discrimination and the Question of Power, Hegemony and Racialised Structures

Whether we are referring to the notion of hegemony (Gramsci), the processes of the ideological reproduction (Arthusser and Poulantzas), or knowledge – power (Foucault), or and the means of distinction via education through the notions of ‘cultural capital’ and *habitus* (Bourdieu), what is relevant in our debate is the fact that it results in a sharp differentiation and inequality in the representation, by this symbolic, ideological or actual (in access, results, achievements, etc.) not randomly but systematically for certain social groups. The social groups we are interested in are the groups that are ‘racialised’ on the basis of their ethnicity, ‘race’, nationality, culture, and religion.

If *habitus* is ‘produced’ by socialised agencies such as the educational, amongst others, then what happens with social divisions and clearages, as well as deeply-

rooted – socially embedded discriminatory practices and structures that are routinely reproduced in society? Althusser’s notion of ideological state apparatuses’ can be viewed as useful conceptions in the functional agencies and mechanisms of the divide.

Theo Goldberg’s argument is that rather than eradicating “racial thinking and racist articulation” as antithetical to the emancipatory project of modernity since enlightenment, racial co-articulation in fact “emerge only with the institution of modernity” and “have become increasingly normalized and naturalized throughout modernity” (Goldberg 1993: 1). He even goes as far as claiming that “liberalism plays a foundation path in this process” in what he refers to as “the irony of modernity”:

The more explicitly universal modernity’s commitments, the more open it is to and the more determined it is by the likes of racial specificity and racist exclusivity (Goldberg 1993: 2)

Drawing on Foucault’s conception of knowledge – power, and on Said’s paradigm of orientalism, Goldberg constructs a powerful case that knowledge and the production of knowledge is deeply ingrained in racism; Knowledge is soaked and furnished in knowledge – power which has deeply embedded racism, it is a “racial knowledge” (see Goldberg 1993: 184). In such a conception of knowledge, ‘education’ becomes another tool or agency – in the transmission of ‘racial knowledge’. Therefore the reproduction of ‘racial knowledge’, racial discrimination and inequality based on ‘race’, ethnicity, culture, religion occurs via the very ‘content’ of education: knowledge, skills, presumptions, attitudes, ideologies and discourses.

Education therefore from an ‘emancipatory’ ideal, as professed, becomes a means for reproducing racial knowledge and discrimination. The critique of Marxists (by Bowles and Gintis or Louis Althusser) where by education is crudely put as means, an ideological tool for ‘capitalist function’ for reproduction; migrants and ethnic minorities are mere (pawns) in the wider project for ideological reproduction of the system. However, such interpretation of Marxian perspectives would be unfairly crude. In fact, what will be argued in this paper is that the Gramscian–Althusserian

perspective would be an enormously useful framework for addressing structural discrimination – well beyond the flattered post-structuralist approaches.

Goldberg (2002) argues that there is a “co-articulation of race and the modern state” in that the very foundations of modern nation – state is enmeshed, ingrained and conditioned by race:

...race is integral to the emergence, development, and transformations (conceptually, philosophically, materially) of the modern state. Race marks and orders the modern nation – state, and so state projects, more or less from its past of conceptual and institutional emergence. The apparatuses and technologies employed by modern states have served variously to fashion, modify, and reify the terms of racial expression, as well as racist exclusions and subjugation [Goldberg 2004: 4].

This broad racial basis that underlies the modern state is traced from the emergence of modernity, which naturalised and normalised the very ‘racial’ category from the mid 15th century: racist culture (Goldberg 1993) underlies the modern state.

Race was rendered integral to the emergence, proliferations, and reproduction of world systems [Goldberg 2002: 4]

The problem with such a broadly based definition of racial formations, within the inner historical and structural logics of modernity and the modern state form, is that it then becomes almost futile and irrelevant an exercise trying to locate the finer and more sophisticated social mechanisms, practices, ideologies and discourses, that result in racial discrimination. Nor is it rendered in any way academically, and from a political practice point of view, interesting to examine any field of society such as education – as ‘racism is everywhere’ or ‘it’s all racism’. To be fair to Goldberg (1993, 2002) he does not maintain such absurd positions, hence he distinguished between ‘racial’ and ‘racist’.

Current Debates on the Aporias of Anti-racism in Education

It would be over-fetched to embark on an extensive review on the current debates on anti-discrimination, anti-racism within and beyond schooling, as this would be beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is necessary to take certain core issues in this debate if we are to make sense of the migrant narratives on racial discrimination in education. As with education we assume a broad definition of the meaning of discrimination, not too broad that would render the meaning analytically useless (as warned against by Miles' critique of the 'conceptual inflation of racism' (Miles 1989) but not too narrow whereby equally each concept would fail to capture the multifaceted and complex manifestation of 'racial' discrimination. Even when we all accept and take as given that there no such things as 'races', as the numerous UN Resolutions and studies conclusively illustrate⁴ discriminatory patterns in the different forms of exclusions, devaluing, dehumanising, exporting and oppressing on the basis of the *ethnos* axis (see Anthias 1992) are in abundance.

Jacobs and Hai (2002) argue that the complexity of racism and discrimination is such that neither pluralist multiculturalism, nor anti-racism education, as it has so far been constructed, are capable of addressing. It is a case of failure of addressing "the complex situations that arise even more fraught and complex relations in the world 'outside'" (Jacobs and Hai, 2002: 166).

This paper investigates what are considered to be the key issues emerging in the literature in order to examine whether and how they appear in the narratives of the migrant voices. Literature on educational discrimination based on racial, ethnic, religious and cultural grounds illustrates how six central indicators can be used as a toolbox in the location of racial discriminatory mechanisms, instances and practices: (a) An all fine 'classic' issue is that of 'attainment' and 'access' to higher education, which focuses on the mechanisms and processes both at the educational institutional level, as well as society at large. In fact under-achievement of specific ethnic minority / and migrant groups has been a specific issue of investigation in various countries,

⁴ See the latest UN Declaration in the World Conference Against Racism, Xenophobia and related intolerance to Durban, South Africa 2001.

such as the Swann and Rampton Report in the UK (see Jacobs and Hai 2001: 168-174). Similar concerns have been investigated or at least raised in all of the eight countries under research.

(b) The second issue, closely connected but distinct to the first, is the manifestations of different types of ‘barriers to education’ such those linked to culture (concepts such as cultural capital’, linguistic issues and barriers related to the socio-economic position, class and inequality barriers and their reproductions).

(c) The third relates to issues concerning the processes and institutional practices of ‘schooling’ (news, regulation, implementation).

(d) The fourth issue relates to the context and the ideological factors that are formal or informal within the curriculum.

(e) The fifth issue concerns the actual lack of recognition of skills and habitus of the migrant and ethnic minority communities.

(f) The sixth issue relates to subtle and more sophisticated methods and practices of exclusion that are manifested as ‘hidden’, or indirect, or institutional types of discrimination in education.

Migrant Voices: Empirical Analysis

The Discourse strand for the purpose of this study is Educational Discrimination located in the experiences of immigrants across Europe. Information on the ‘object’, i.e. educational discrimination against immigrants, was selected from the abstracts in work-package 2 but there has been a re-visiting of the existing research described and analyzed in WorkPackage 1. The discourse plane was framed theoretically through a selective procedure of data collection derived from the previous work-packages, a task that adds to the chapter, or rather to the analysis of the dispositives, consistency and the ability to uncover similarities and differences i.e. formulate a coherent theory on educational discrimination by identifying the complexity (polymorphy) of the discourse strand.

Initially we identified the six main themes referred above as manifested in the context of work-package 1 and 2. These key-issues provide the basis of our theory since they are the operational guidelines following the conceptualized categories and issues described in the theory section.

A list was created covering the sub-themes and key-issues above in the form of categorical descriptive variables that capture the main patterns arising from the immigrants' voices. This was achieved by filtering through the abstracts and then allocating the instances of educational discrimination in descriptive statistical categories. Then we proceeded to a finer and deeper analysis by theorizing extensively on 'typical abstracts'. These typical abstracts are analyzed on the basis of their *rhetorical* as well as *ideological meaning*. While the frame analysis (descriptive statistical analysis) gives a broad understanding of what is been said, i.e. the discursive action per se, the critical discourse analysis on typical abstracts is a tool that assists in the re-construction of knowledge. The factors of 'who says so and why' built the background information which illustrates the kind and level knowledge and experience of the subject, matters which precedes the responses and therefore enables the researchers to reach an understanding of the non-discursive practices. In this sense, the critical discourse analysis reveals the cognitive and mental collective structures that appear via the voices as *political codes* and *not as simple linguistic schemas*.

The aim of the methodology is to reach out and understand the manifestations and materializations of immigrant voices. The information arising from the discursive and non-discursive practice was filtered to locate the meaning, or rather *to reconstruct the meaning*, by departing from what is observed (i.e. the voice) and answer 'who and why' is said. This tabulation creates a cycle of explanation building where we begin with a general theory divided in six indicators (operationalized themes for the discourse under investigation), then the text is allocated to these themes through critical discourse analysis of typical abstracts and frame-descriptive analysis. The next step, which is simultaneous, gives an interpretation of the information extended by sociological imagination and viable theorization, and finally if the interpretation supplies assumptions identical to the original theses then the theory is confirmed though new elements are added due to the manifestation process.

Based on the abstracts sent by each country⁵ we have constructed a perceptual quantitative model of analysis. Basic elements of this analysis are the gender, host country, education, and etc⁶. The aim of this quantitative analysis is to sketch out the major discriminatory patterns as far as education is concerned. The methodological mode followed was to make incidents of discrimination the basic level of analysis. There has been a perceptual codification and sorting out of the education abstracts, thus as opposed to the structured codes of survey research, in the case of this study we formulated the codes and general patterns continuously along the reading. A narrative excerpt is treated as a short story revealing many times multiple discriminatory outcomes and therefore an abstract becomes a source of numerous exclusive and exhaustive responses. The abstract below is an illustration of this multiplicity since we have three types of discrimination (ethnic/religious discrimination, verbal abuse, and physical violence) and two perpetrator sources (teachers and students).

I had my children attending a Greek school. Everyday they came home crying. They were beaten either by the teachers or by other students. They were constantly sworn at: “you are a Turk, you are different”. [I.7]

We have hence been able to record and codify 82 instances (see table 1) of educational discrimination by deconstructing the voices of immigrants across Europe. As opposed to survey research the aim was not to build reliability through a representative ‘quote’ sample. After all the quantity of responses varied across countries and the level of analysis – or the statistical population of interest- is the instance per se not the individual. Thus we pursued a descriptive statistics model (rather differential) since the utility of the statistics is to assist the discourse analysis that follows and give a broad description sketch of the issues emerging from the education subject matter. Therefore, the methodology in this specific case, takes the form of frame analysis since it has the elements of inductive reasoning and the codification/categorization of qualitative data into broad quantified categories.

Table 1: Incidents of Educational Discrimination by Country

⁵ We have not been able to obtain any abstracts from France concerning education, but we found an abundance of relevant material in the French WorkPackage 2.

⁶ For a full description of variables and source of quotes see Appendix 1.

	Frequency	Percent
Austria	15	18,3
Cyprus	11	13,4
Italy	5	6,1
Germany	15	18,3
UK	11	13,4
Poland	18	22,0
Sweden	7	8,5
Total	82	100,0

Comparative Statistical Analysis

As mentioned above the aim of this section is to pin-point what we consider as key issue patterns concerning discrimination in the educational system⁷ using descriptive statistics as a tool to frame the qualitative data collected through the migrants' narratives.

The first important issue that arises from the study of immigrant voices, as far as education is concerned, is uncovering of major barriers and discriminatory practices. Is the experienced discrimination similar or different across countries of Europe? What are the major sources and basis of discrimination? As indicated in the table below three major patterns of discrimination emerge: (a) Religious and ethnic prejudice is the most repeated theme emerging from the voice of migrants. Almost a quarter of the recorded incidents concerns religious and ethnic prejudice that operate within the educational framework. (b) *Verbal abuse* also seems to be a recurrent pattern of discrimination, usually in the form of *abusive* or *stereotypical name-calling*, illustrating perhaps interconnected attitudes based on ethnic and religious prejudice. Presumably ethnic and religious prejudice *precedes* verbal abuse, as the latter is merely a consequence or a manifestation of religious/ethnic prejudice, rather than an independent form of discrimination. (c) Finally, the language barrier appears as a key factor adversely influencing the access education. The language barrier is objectified as a negative starting point for a migrant's education as migrants argue that lacking the knowledge of the host country's language creates such conditions that

⁷ Educational system in this case refers to macro elements such as laws, agencies, infrastructure; micro actors involved in the system such as teachers, students; and finally consequences of interaction of these micro and macro actors that produce the patterns of discrimination and the types of barriers.

make extremely difficult to cope with the demands of the education system as well as integrating, or better belonging, with the 'host' population.

Table 2: Patterns of Discrimination by Host Country

	COUNTRY							Total
	Austria	Cyprus	Italy	Germany	UK	Poland	Sweden	
language barrier	21,4%			20,0%	18,2%	27,3%	14,3%	16,2%
religious/ethnic prejudice	21,4%	18,2%	20,0%	13,3%	36,4%	36,4%	14,3%	23,0%
verbal abuse	14,3%	27,3%	20,0%	13,3%	9,1%	36,4%		17,6%
unfair treatment, grades and tests		9,1%	20,0%	13,3%	18,2%		14,3%	9,5%
work overload				6,7%				1,4%
curriculum	7,1%		20,0%		9,1%			4,1%
discriminatory admissions	35,7%		20,0%					8,1%
Lack of infra-structure and support ⁸				13,3%			42,9%	6,8%
Cost				6,7%	9,1%			2,7%
physical violence		18,2%						2,7%
no recognition of diploma		27,3%		13,3%			14,3%	8,1%
Total	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Table 3 reaffirms and strengthens the previous comment on the connection of ethnicity / religion and discrimination. We can see that more than half of the discriminatory incidents are reported by non-Europeans. Furthermore, this percentage is increased even further by the fact that the ‘students of professional school’ category is comprised of immigrants with non-European origin background, specifically by immigrants who are Moslems. The general conclusion is that ethnicity and religion- as well as color-, are strong determinants and sources of discrimination as far as education is concerned. Interesting is also the fact that the category reporting most of the incidents are the Highly Educated Non-Europeans. There are two sources of logical assumptions drawn from this observation. It is argued that modern societies

⁸ Lack of infra structure and support refers to conditions such as poor teaching staff, poor facilities, and overloaded classes.

are highly secularized and that factors and resources such as education assist populations to depart from traditional structures of identity. Mobility, according to these arguments, is defined by the ability to attain high education, which then becomes the tool for socio-economic prosperity, and this prosperity detaches the population from religious/ethnic status, or at least it makes that position secondary, to the new status, which is monetary defined. Contrary to this notion, the observation made in this study, shows that even with the prerequisite of high education, the identity as 'an immigrant' is a status by itself defined by ingredients of 'otherness' which encompass codes of ethnic and religious differentiation, which are by their own right justifications for discrimination. The second logical assumption derives from the object itself. Although it is sample specific that most of our data comes from people with high education, the high percent of discriminatory practices reported by highly educated Non-Europeans indicates to a hypothesis that deserves more research. Even if we consider discrimination as a relatively stable phenomenon, the perceptual dynamic of the object is magnified through the educational attainment. In other words, education per se may not be a sufficient factor to escape discrimination, yet it is an empowerment tool, which provides the lenses to identify discrimination and therefore battle it.

Table 3: Country and Education/ Origin of Immigrant

	Austria	Cyprus	Italy	Germany	UK	Poland	Sweden	Total
European Highly Educated	33,3%			33,3%	9,1%	27,8%		19,5%
Non-European Highly Educated	33,3%	27,3%	100,0%	66,7%	63,6%	16,7%	14,3%	41,5%
European Less Highly Educated						11,1%		2,4%
Non-European Less Highly Educated		9,1%			27,3%	11,1%	57,1%	12,2%
Youth Groups students professional school	33,3%							6,1%
special cases student		63,6%						8,5%
						27,8%		6,1%
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Seen below is a tabulation of the patterns of educational discrimination by origin/education. Comparing across the origin categories we see that by far the Non-Europeans are experiencing the highest rates of handicap across all types of discriminatory practices. We can therefore set a generalized comment of discussion build on the foundation that discriminatory practices may differ yet they have between them links of communication and a core origin generated by the ethno-religious differentiation of the 'We' versus the 'Other'. It is also obvious that there is a stratified (within the immigrant group) formal and informal discrimination operating selectively against Non-Europeans. As far as formal discrimination is concerned viewing the 'lack of infra-structure and support', the 'non-recognition of diploma', and the 'curriculum' category we identify striking uniformity upon whom these discriminatory practices are expressed. The same can be said in the case of informal discriminatory practices as in the case of 'unfair treatment, grades, and tests'. The non-European category is by degree the most victimized group. The fact that the level

of education does not influence the outburst of the discriminatory action indicates that socio-economic status –of which educational attainment is a key element - plays a minimal role. We therefore argue that access to upper mobility is prevented systematically within the movement. We reject the notion that institutional discrimination – formal or informal- manifests itself in a linear fashion. Rather there is a third axis which creates a three dimensional effect adding depth to the victimization since at every level of upper mobility, due to higher educational attainment, the immigrant is not immune to the subordination imposed by discrimination but rather the discrimination itself mutates in new forms.

Table 4: Patterns of Discrimination and Origin/ Education

	Language barrier	Religious/ethnic prejudice	Verbal abuse	Unfair treatment, grades and tests	Curriculum	Discriminatory admissions	Lack of infrastructure and support	Cost	No recognition of diploma
European Highly Educated	16,7%	29,4%	7,7%			50,0%		50,0%	16,7%
Non-European Highly Educated	25,0%	35,3%	38,5%	85,7%	66,7%	50,0%	40,0%	50,0%	50,0%
European Less Highly Educated	8,3%								
Non-European Less Highly Educated	25,0%	5,9%	7,7%		33,3%		60,0%		16,7%
Youth Groups		5,9%		14,3%					
Students professional school	8,3%	11,8%	15,4%						
Special cases		11,8%	15,4%						16,7%
Students	16,7%		15,4%						

	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
--	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

In order to make the tri-axis hypothesis clearer, it is better to analyze the implications that derive from table 5. We can see that in kinder-garden the two forms of discrimination are verbal abuse and discriminatory admissions. This reveals two bipolar victimization practices. One pole is interpersonal but it lacks the ideological weight as it is expressed by ethnic and religious prejudice. The second pole is formal and institutional and it has to do with the restriction to access the first and basic level of education. In primary education the discriminatory practices become more diffused, they are diversified and are intertwined with ideological codes such as ethnic/religious prejudice and the institutional discrimination shifts from formality and becomes subtle in the form of lack of infra-structure and support. We argue in this case about the informality of institutional discrimination in the sense that teaching understaffing, student overstaffing, and generally ‘unhealthy’ class conditions are attributed as a result of spatial and racial segregation as if the ghetto itself produces these conditions, or as if the factors leading to the deficiencies in the infra-structure are institutionally exogenous. Instead, and this emerges from the immigrants experiences, the spatial and educational characteristics are features of the ‘inner-city’ analogy that operate hand in hand as to enclose the immigrants in a reservation of immobility of which one wheel is also the education issue. In secondary education the new features arising is that the immigrant no longer faces the language barrier, however discrimination becomes extremely ideological. Furthermore, victimization in this case shifts from the infra-structure- since the immigrant population enters the same classroom as the indigenous one- and the restrictions try to attack and undermine performance (unfair grades) and curriculum issues appear as a barrier. On a university level we observe the most diversified field of discriminatory action. It is an image of co-coordinated forces acting on inter-personal, structural, institutional, formal, and informal manner. The *pluralism* of discrimination suggests that there is resistance to accept the immigrant, even when his/her mobility supposedly upgrades his/her status. Hence, a viable explanation for this would be that the perceived antagonism and the power relations of the ‘we’ against the ‘other’ shifts correspondingly as the positions of the two groups is parallel; the immigrant moves up-ward in comparison to his own group but in terms of equality within the same educational attainment category he/she represents the under-privileged group.

Table 5: Discriminatory action by School Type where incident is referred

	SCHOOL					Total
	kinder garden	primary education	secondary education	university	generalized educational system	
language barrier		26,7%		13,6%		12,3%
Religious /ethnic prejudice		26,7%	36,4%	22,7%	50,0%	26,3%
verbal abuse	20,0%	13,3%	36,4%	18,2%		19,3%
unfair treatment, grades and tests			18,2%	18,2%		10,5%
curriculum			9,1%	4,5%		3,5%
discriminatory admissions	80,0%			4,5%		8,8%
Lack of infrastructure and support		20,0%			50,0%	8,8%
Cost				4,5%		1,8%
physical violence		13,3%				3,5%
no recognition of diploma				13,6%		5,3%
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Furthermore, not only the nature of discriminatory action changes but the also source, or the perpetrator, along the lines of educational mobility. In kinder-garden it is primarily the agencies that provide such educational service that try to exclude the immigrant children. When the last enter the school they face discrimination exerted by the indigenous population children. In primary education the ‘we’ students victimize the most and this indicates a re-production of the racist culture and attitude that is nested not only in school but has an additional starting point which is ‘home’ and that is why (see table 5) the type of discrimination becomes ideologically mature with connotations of ethnic and religious prejudice. Although the role of teachers as gatekeepers is important in primary education, we observe that in secondary education they almost monopolize the discriminatory instances while in university they are occupants of half of the field. This property and power rested upon the teachers and professors must not be perceived as a mere condition of power abuse. Tutors are the vessel in which discrimination- the formal/institutional/structural- takes form and

kinetics. The success of the discriminatory action depends on the flexibility of the agent to inflict the specific action, therefore the structural arrangements are embodied by the tutor who due to his ability for face to face, on a daily basis, interaction which can be the most appropriate carrier of racist ideology and practice and can eventually create sufficient blocks to exclude an immigrant from achieving full educational potential. Another striking observation, concerning incidents of discrimination occurring at a university level, is that they pin-point the ministry of education as well as agencies as being the perpetrators. This signifies a comment made earlier that firstly higher education enriches the focal capability of the victim to understand and locate the precise content and texture of his/her perpetrator while at the same time we , the researchers , can further investigate and hypothesize whether the discrimination acquires structural and formal forms as the immigrant climbs up the educational hierarchy.

Table 6: Perpetrator by type of School where incident is referred

	SCHOOL					Total
	Kinder-garden	primary education	secondary education	university	generalized educational system	
generalized educational system ⁹	20,0%	30,8%	9,1%	20,0%	50,0%	22,6%
co-students	20,0%	46,2%	9,1%			15,1%
teachers	20,0%	23,1%	81,8%	55,0%	50,0%	49,1%
other officials/agencies	40,0%			15,0%		9,4%
ministry of education				10,0%		3,8%
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

⁹ Generalized educational system is a term used to capture the description of the immigrants' voices as incidents of discrimination produced by a vague structure and not directly address the agency or the perpetrator.

Critical Reflections on Discourses in Migrant Voices

Abstract 1

SCH-F6: - “In secondary school we had the subject domestic science and (.) Our female teacher always cooked pork (.) yes (.) and there were only Turkish children (.) they were foreigners and she always cooked pork and the children always said we are not allowed to eat it we don’t want to eat it (.) and she always threatened us (.) yes (.) you have to you have to eat it otherwise you’ll get a five [worst mark in the Austrian school system] (.) you have to eat it and the children always hid the food and threw it away (.) and I had one girl friend she was fighting with her she said I don’t eat it she [the teacher] said either you get extra work or a five (.) and she [the student] said I’ll do nothing and then she [the student] called her sister and the sister was also fighting with her [the teacher] and then the girl left the school (.) and still today the female teacher forces and threatens children to eat pork.”

Firstly we ought to sketch the setting-or the site of engagement- as it appears in the immigrant voice above. The action in this case is located in a classroom comprised of Turkish female students and an Austrian tutor, and the dialectic of relations operates within the framework set by the prerequisite course. Domestic science is a subject that creates lines across gender; it teaches patterns of behavior that women should follow in their households. Thus in the abstract above we have the mediation of engendered education personified on the face of the female teacher; the coercive nature of the curriculum takes form and action as it is filled by and is filtered through the teacher. There are three sources of power possessed by the tutor. The first source is positioned horizontally; while the teacher is female she produces –through the teaching subject- a systematic compromising imposed on the female students. Hence, while the gender trait is uniform between the actors, the identification along the gender line creates a disproportion of power relations since the teacher is in alliance with the forces that reproduce a subordinate position for women. The other two sources of power are vertical; the first is derived from her position as a teacher and the second from her status as an Austrian (i.e. as a member of the ‘we’). Interpersonally the prime status is the ethnic one since it precedes the occupational and becomes the ideological basis for educational discrimination. Subsequently, the discriminatory action is assisted by the immunity provided by the secondary status as a teacher. This positioning creates a stratified structure on which the immigrant is dispossessed the right to choose a course (i.e. a discriminatory deficiency which is institutional) but also the right to

bargain the way the course operates via its agent. Hence the relationship of teacher versus student underlies the relationship of master versus servant, or at least superior versus inferior. There is a collective realization of this exploited position. The immigrant identifies the root of discrimination by locating herself as member of the 'other' (i.e. of the Turkish group). There is a solidarity element in this case; the group behaves collectively by rejecting eating pork. This resistance links the immigrant to the cultural and religious heritage; she is no longer a foreigner but member of a cohesive group defined ethnically and therefore there is an ideological mapping of the 'common enemy' for both the perpetrator and the victim. Additionally, the victim develops strategies of resistance as to relocate herself back to the ethnic and religious heritage; the hiding and throwing of pork becomes a symbolism of cleansing and a ritual that defines the immigrants as the dispossessed yet the 'we shall overcome' group. The coercion imposed by the teacher is symbolic since it targets the overt exhibition of ethnic/race superiority by uprooting the immigrant from her right to exercise her 'otherness' and in an effort to impose disrespect to the immigrant's cultural and religious back-ground. Furthermore, the teacher is conscious of the means that she can utilize in order to apply the discriminatory action (low grades/extra work) and this power is structural since it attaches itself to the *para-educational* mechanisms that allow discrimination. This is made obvious by the fact that the teacher holds her position even after there has been complaints against her.

Abstract 2

France: - "There come the daily problems that arise for those who don't know French...To feel insulted when entering a shop to buy something, I felt abused...and also the problems with my child. I remember one. It was very serious. He didn't know French neither. I remember he was four years old, and at school, the only way to communicate with the other kids was by pushing each other around, of playing hard. And the teacher would beat him; she would beat the kid and so we had a big problem at school, at the first school where he was placed. The teacher would simply tell us that the boy was bad and that his relationship to the other kids was aggressive, an aggressive relationship. And we would try to explain to her that his problem was that he didn't know the language and that this was his way of adapting. Finally we moved him from that first school, and then, we moved to another district. We spend a lot of time looking

for an apartment. It was very complicated. French people also have these problems but as Latin Americans it was even more difficult.”

The site of engagement unfolds in a French district where a Latino mother, who has language problems, expresses her despair on the fact that her son had problems in school due to linguistic barriers. In this setting there is a periphery and a core of action. The district itself is an inhospitable ground; the mother faces daily problems of verbal abuse and the son tries to adjust to the environment by being aggressive. Hence, what is described here is the ‘street culture’ a characteristic of the ghettos where relationships operate by laws of toughness, and respect –as well as integration– is gained by physical violence. The core of action is the school; it is the place where the immigrant boy tries to become ‘ordinary’ by communicating through physical violence, yet the teacher restricts this access to integration. Thus while the ‘beating-up’ represents a sub-cultural phenomenon, being exercised by the immigrant is defined as an up-normality, and therefore the true problem (i.e. the language barrier) and the structural and institutional deficiencies that re-produce the problem, are ignored. The expert, in this case the teacher, diagnoses the problem as being due to a psychological predisposition of the child, yet the remedy is identical to the presumed problem (i.e. the teacher beats up the boy). The mother does not criticise the teacher for the physical abuse she inflicts on her child; rather she tries to convince the tutor for the innocence of her boy. Thus there is a degree of internalising subordination on behalf of the mother since the expertise status, rested upon the teacher, becomes a sufficient reason to ignore the prejudiced implications and motives of the teacher’s actions. Finally, there is the issue of insufficient infrastructure networks. The language problem is not dealt within the core of action (i.e. the specific school) nor by the local authorities. The family had to relocate, a type of immigration as a process of being constantly on the move even within the host country, which is another form of de-humanization, victimization, as well as of exclusion.

Abstract 3

Colombian female in France: -“Then, I had problems with the institution. As a PhD student, I am an anthropologist, and when I got here, I already had a Master’s Degree in history from Colombia’s National University, and the first problem I had to face in France, or maybe it was just at the school, was that there is some kind of academic

leveling. When one gets here with some Latino-American degree, which in itself is not worth much, then they tell you have a Master's Degree, so you have to do a DEA. DEA is postgraduate studies, and I already had one that was hard enough from there. But this is not such a big problem because it is an opportunity as well to learn the language and many other things. But anyway, this was quite a shock, the fact that being Latino-American and you've come from some Latino-American university, they won't acknowledge your DEA level..."

Accreditation of diplomas is a *hot* issue since it involves multiple vested interests (academic, governmental, and economic) operating at various levels (legal and structural). Accreditation is therefore a procedure equalizing the educational status of the immigrant with the one of the indigenous population and it provides a qualitative status that is then translated as monetary since higher educational attainment is synonymous to better employment opportunities. Thus in the abstract above we observe that bureaucratic contradictions build blocks to the academic recognition of diplomas for immigrants. Thus the diploma per se, which can be evaluated using objective criteria (such as syllabus material), is discredited due to its immigrant origin. Hence, there is an ethno-centric force operating at a structural level - whether that applies only within the legal framework of the specific university or the generalized education system. The immigrant perceives that there is an institutional dysfunction that is embedded within the country's educational system. The exam is not based on the logic of qualitative standards set about by the bureaucracy, but rather on ideological codes that proclaim the host country's schooling and educational system as superior compared to that of the immigrant's.

Abstract 4

IMMP3: I have decided, I do not have the energy to continue to stay in school, it is the last week now.

L: Why do you not want to go to school anymore?

IMMP3: I do not think I will come to find a job afterwards, I know, as all the other immigrants who have graduated. If I am Swedish, ok then you know you have a chance at least. *What should I have an education for, I work now and make money. It feels like it does not pay off.*

L: You feel that you will not find a job after you have gotten an education?

IMMP3: No. There are many who have gone out and still do not have a job.

L: What happens to them after they go out?

IMMP3: They sit at home and get welfare money. 2300 kronor after the rent.

The abstract above is the voice of a Palestinian man, 19 years old, attaining upper secondary education that came to Sweden in 1998 an asylum seeker. We see that there is a self –defeating attitude that it normalizes the decision to drop out from school. The idea here is that the immigrant status is a weakening element for finding employment even with a high level of education. The immigrant uses a stereotype that, even if there is objective evidence for it, justifies the dropping out option without addressing the problems that create the employment exclusion of the educated immigrants. While the immigrant has an understanding that the phenomenon (i.e. education not paying off) is a product of discriminatory practices that favour the indigenous population, he compromises his under-privileged position by the fact that he found a job. This is another level of self-handicap since employment is perceived as a matter of transactions rather than as a right. This transactional description of employment, that lacks the emotional and qualitative traits attached to a specific occupation, lead to ‘shallow’ interpretation of the Welfare system. The unemployed immigrant becomes, even through the voice of an immigrant, the stereotype of ‘welfare recipient skimming the system’ , and thus the position and the reasons producing the unfortunate conditions are reversed to ‘blame the victim’ explanations.

Abstract 5

Racist Discrimination as Normality in wider society

It is interesting that we hear comments about racism in hostels for example:

[Poland, NEE 8]:

...there was a problem with students hostels and there was some discriminations, but there were always too little places and they didn't want to give places to foreigners, told us to rent on my own but as to officials, it was normal.

This recognition, understanding even that this type of discrimination is normal is quite astonishing at a level of anti-discrimination social action, but it is on the level of everydayness, for which social theory is interested in analysing, perhaps not so

intriguing. This sort of attitude is reflected by many groups and has been repeated in one way or another by a significant portion of immigrants that have taken part in this research from all eight countries. Immigrants are the recipients of everyday racism and perhaps more than policy-makers, and activists even devise every strategies of nationalising and coping. This resigned passivity is also a resource, a kind of popular stoicism that appreciates the Olympian tasks of caressing or reversing the everydayness of racism. However, two issues are worth discussing here:

First, the issue of what sort of migrants take such a stand, because it is apparent that this approach is not only not tolerated by the activist or combatant migrants / ethnic minorities, who stress the injustice of it all, the need to combat racism etc., even the ‘stoics’ themselves, who may well appear “understanding” about why it discrimination occurs, but may equally stress the ‘injustice’ of it and the need to combat these practices, attitudes, policies etc. Related to this is the issue of the ‘locus’ of the immigrant himself: The ethnic origin, social position, age, gender, ideological outlook, experience, class may well have a bearing. Are educated white Europeans more content with such practices or alternatively are they more demanding and verbal as regards discrimination? The second issue needs to be addressed here relates to the question of how this everydayness or racism filters or is manifested at the educational level, education institutions and practices, and more directly connected to ‘immigrant voices’ how immigrants themselves experience and rationalize such realities. Two responses “it’s normal” or “it’s different on the street” (i.e. much worse, more raw, more violent).

Abstract 6- Street racism and Laugh at migrants

SCH-F2 in secondary school my former headmaster talked to me (.) well he asked if we have to wear the head scarf (.) if we can’t take it off (.) and I said no this is our religion and well he wanted that (.) he was not that xenophobic (.) but (.) he wanted that we take off the head scarf (.) but (.) it was just a question (.) otherwise in secondary school everything was ok mhm because in wearing a head scarf I didn’t have any problems (.) but it’s different on the street

We see that the location, age and social standing of migrant creates a distinctive view, a matter which is not surprising of course: The pupil has the classroom as a central point of reference, whereas an adult educated European who is a migrant has a different vantage point as he or she sees it “from” outside. This is also confirmed in the case of Poland where negative experiences are expressed by pupils, students, parents and children.

The reference to the notion of “street racism” requires a closer examination. The manifestation from the voice’s lack of defining ‘ what is different in the streets’ reveals the form of this discrimination type: Raw, overt, everyday abuse on the streets that youngsters seem to be more aware of as they are the recipients or potential victims of such racism. Of course the so-called “street racism” is not just on the street. Many times it perpetrates the school and “street racism” is translated as “playground racism” or an every day racism that may, or may not, be suppressed during formal teaching but it is still there beneath and finds expressions in different ‘breaks’ (during time-break, jokes, innocent remarks, taken for granted stereotypes, language etc.)

It is the victim, in other words the recipient who feels this; the others who are the hegemonic group who are therefore normalized, may not feel or appreciate it. Similarly, a standard ‘excuse’ cited by people to explain racism is that ,“It’ s only a joke”: Here, what is happening is that on many occasions migrants and other marginalized groups feel that they are laughed *at* and this laughing is received as medium to finger-point the victim and thus joking is in fact not a light matter. It is part of human existence connected to the most fundamental expressions of being, feeling and living. Laughter is in many ways synonymous to life itself. The ‘Name of the Rose’, in Eco’s celebrated novel is indeed the quest for the right to laughter, something so apparent for Aristotle, but so dangerous for the solemn forces who ruled during the dark ages that they would attempt to suppress the very knowledge related to this: For to know about laughter and use it, one is able to doubt and this ability (or capacity) means to question the powers that be. The joke then is no light matter, even if it somehow allows the possibility to lighten up a solemn and dull life.

Bibliography

- Althusser, L. (2001) "ideology and Ideological state, Apparatuses, Notes towards an investigation", Althusser, L., *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Monthly Review Press, New York, p.p. 85 – 126.
- Althusser, L. (2003) *The Humanist Controversy and Other Writings*, (ed) Matheron, F., Verso, London and New York
- Apitzsch, U. (2002) "Gramsci and the Current Debate on Multicultural Education", Littlefield Publishers, Oxford
- Aristotle (1953) *Ethics*, Penguin Books.
- Bourdieu, P. (1978) *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford University Press and Polity Press
- Boothman, D. (1995) "General Introduction", Gramsci, A. (1995) *Further Selections on Prison Notebooks*, Lawrence and Wishart, London.
- Borg, D., Buttigieg, J., Mayo, P., (2002) "Introduction, Gramsci and Education: A Holistic Approach", Borg, C. (ed) *Gramsci and Education*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Oxford
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, Sage, London.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Routledge, London.
- Bulmer, M. and Solomos, J. (1996) "Race, ethnicity and Curriculum", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19 (4): 277-88
- Eagleton, T., (1991) *Ideology – An Introduction*, Verso, London and New York.
- Entwisle, H. (1979) *Antonio Gramsci: Conservative School for Radical Politics*.
- Fairclough and Wodak, (1997) "Critical Discourse Analysis", van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Vol. 2, Sage, London.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Tavistock, London.
- Gramsci, A. (1995) *Further Selections from Prison Notebooks*, Boothman, D. (edited and translation), Lawrence and Wishart, London.
- Hall, S. (1998) 'Introduction: re-thinking ethnic and racial studies', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (5): 819-37.
- Hall, S. (1985 / 1996) Gramsci's Relevance for the study of race and ethnicity, Morely, D. and Chen, K – H (ed) *Stuart Hall – Critical Dialogues in Cultural studies*, Routledge, London.
- Halsey, A. H., Heath, A. F. and Ridge, J. M. (1980) *Origins and destinations: Family,*

- Class and Education in Modern Britain*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hammilton, P. (1995) ‘The Enlightenment and the Birth of Social sciences’, Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D., Thompson, K. (ed) *Modernity – an Introduction to Modern Societies*, Open University Press, Cambridge
- Lombardi, F. (1971) *Idee Pedagogiche di Antonio Gramsci* (Greek translation, Παπατηρητής, Thessaloniki, 1986).
- Malik, K., (1996) *The Meaning of Race*, Palgrave, New York
- Seja Dei, G. J. (1996) *Anti-racism Education – Theory and Practice*, Fernwood Publishing, Blifox, Canada.
- van Dijk, T.A. (1993) ‘Principles of discourse analysis’, *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), pp. 243-89.
- Hintikka, M. B. and Hintikka, J. (1986) *Investigating Wittgenstein*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Wodak, R. (2001) ‘What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its development’.
- Wright, C., McGlanghlin (2000) ‘*Race*’, *class and Gender in Exclusion from schools*, Falmer Press, London and New York

Appendix

I: Variable Codes

Name	Position
SECTION section cited Measurement Level: Nominal Column Width: 30 Alignment: Left Print Format: A25 Write Format: A25	1
COUNTRY Host country Measurement Level: Nominal Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right Print Format: F8 Write Format: F8	5
Value Label	
1 Austria	
2 Cyprus	
3 France	
4 Italy	
5 Germany	
6 UK	
7 Poland	
8 Sweden	
IMMCODE Immigrants' focus group code Measurement Level: Nominal Column Width: 12 Alignment: Left Print Format: A15 Write Format: A15	6
FOCUS Focus Group Category Measurement Level: Ordinal Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right Print Format: F8 Write Format: F8	8
Value Label	
1 European Highly Educated	
2 Non-European Highly Educated	
3 European Less Highly Educated	
4 Non-European Less Highly Educated	
5 Irregular immigrants	
6 Youth Groups	
7 young immigrants/second generations	
8 students in professional school	
9 special cases	
10 students	

—

<p>GENDER Gender</p> <p>Measurement Level: Nominal Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right Print Format: F8 Write Format: F8</p> <p>Value Label</p> <p>1 male 2 female</p>	<p>9</p>
<p>SCHOOL School type referred in incident</p> <p>Measurement Level: Ordinal Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right Print Format: F8 Write Format: F8 Missing Values: 99</p> <p>Value Label</p> <p>1 kinder garden 2 primary educations 3 secondary educations 4 technical/Professional school 5 universities 6 other 7 generalized educational system 99 M N/A</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>SATIS Satisfaction with Educational System</p> <p>Measurement Level: Nominal Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right Print Format: F8 Write Format: F8 Missing Values: 99</p> <p>Value Label</p> <p>1 yes 2 no 99 M N/A</p> <p>—</p>	<p>11</p>
<p>DISCRIM Discrimination type</p> <p>Measurement Level: Nominal Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right Print Format: F8 Write Format: F8 Missing Values: 99</p> <p>Value Label</p> <p>1 language barrier 2 religious/ethnic prejudice 3 verbal abuses 4 unfair treatment, grades and tests</p>	<p>12</p>

- 5 work overload
- 6 curriculum
- 7 discriminatory admissions
- 8 Lack of infra-structure and support
- 9 Cost
- 10 physical violence
- 11 no recognition of diploma
- 99 M N/A

PERP Perpetrator 13

Measurement Level: Nominal
 Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right
 Print Format: F8
 Write Format: F8
 Missing Values: 99

Value Label

- 1 generalized educational system
- 2 co-students
- 3 teachers
- 4 other officials/agencies
- 5 ministry of education
- 6 other
- 99 M N/A

SATISFA Reasons of satisfaction 14

Measurement Level: Nominal
 Column Width: 8 Alignment: Right
 Print Format: F8
 Write Format: F8
 Missing Values: 99

Value Label

- 1 low cost or no cost
- 2 quality of schooling
- 3 positive experiences with teachers
- 4 positive experiences with officials
- 99 M N/A