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The social and ethnic composition of the school: Integration ↔ Separation

(1) Integrated school: minority and majority students taught together, in the same school, same classes
(2) Segregated school: ethno-social separation of minority and majority students, separate schools for minority students
(3) internal separation/selection: integration on the school level, selection within the school, reproducing ethno-social differences

The schools’ approaches towards ethno-cultural diversity: Cultural/ diversity blind ↔ Cultural/ diversity conscious

(1) Diversity blind: students are universal objects of the educational process, differences arising from their particular cultural and social background are irrelevant or to be avoided
(2) Diversity conscious: cultural differences are important, either while they cause social conflicts, which should be managed by the school, or because the schools are responsible for the cultural reproduction of minorities
(3) Ambiguous relation: a cultural blind policy veils a fundamentalist thinking of the teachers → causes often conflicts perceived again in cultural terms

Minority students’ experiences of otherness and sameness is not a direct consequence of these intentions and structural features, according our findings they depend on:

(1) how they are treated by teachers (fair, unfair, different or similar)
(2) how their general experience of conflicts, racism and discrimination is managed by the school
(3) how traditions and values of minority families are taken into account by the schools, and the values of the school by the parents
(4) how the peer relations develop, first of all between minority and majority students, but also among different minority youth
(5) the subjective relevance of othering as well as of particular belongings, in relation to the school achievement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity/Together or not</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Internal selection</th>
<th>Segregated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-blind</td>
<td>Integrated schools with higher prestige in the local educational market</td>
<td>Desegregating schools: State or local authorities initiate desegregation – to stop the reproduction of social inequalities in schools</td>
<td>Residual schools: segregated and diversity blind (majority of the examined schools, Germany, France, Denmark, CE countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidance of cultural differences, minority issues because they contradict to universal values (France) are “dangerous”, teachers unable to manage them (CE countries)</td>
<td>Avoidance of cultural differences – seen as condition of success of interventions</td>
<td>← residential segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted but irrelevant in many cases (Sweden and Denmark)</td>
<td>No: It rather depends on the commitment of the school management, on the quality of the pedagogical work, and the social sensitivity of the teachers</td>
<td>← ‘white flight’, “free choice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous-conflict</td>
<td>Mixed schools seemingly colorblind, but the close-up shows Cultural conflict between school and minority families veiled in public, is central in the perception of teachers</td>
<td>Schools merged, but as much as possible maintained from the “pre-merger” segregation state.</td>
<td>Certain residual schools focal points of local conflicts between the majority “loosing” its positions, including the school and the minority gathering new positions through the school (consequence of “white flight”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Everything comes from the family...The school is not able to change...&quot; (Slovakia)</td>
<td>Parallel classes and parallel lives for minority and majority students – Hungary, Slovakia</td>
<td>Many schools in Central Europe (Czech Rep special schools, Hungary, Slovakia. Romania rural ghetto schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second, third generation of immigrants seen still as foreigners, should be taught to adapt (Germany)</td>
<td>Selecting and removal of children with &quot;learning disabilities&quot; and &quot;behavioral problems&quot; – systematic separation of &quot;normal&quot; and &quot;problem students&quot; – among the latter minority children overrepresented</td>
<td>Racist/xenophobic discourse of the teachers part of the symbolic fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The culturalism absent in Sweden and Denmark, seen rather as language issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No minority teachers, majority teachers seen as &quot;victims&quot; of their students who can not be educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-conscious</td>
<td>This would be the case of integrated and diversity conscious alternative, which at the same time does not apply any internal or external separation. It does not seem to be a real alternative in our international sample. Segregation is enormously important and omnipresent, integration is very fragile.</td>
<td>Affirmative or multiculturalist policy combined with meritocratic principles of the education in a mixed environment:</td>
<td>Community schools: working with their student’s families, committed to the local community, not in ethnic terms (Denmark, Sweden), more in ethnic terms (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate classes for students with different talents and achievements → low class minority students end up in the low-prestige and low-motivation classes</td>
<td>Offering positive self-identification for children of underprivileged groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate classes for new immigrants transitory in Denmark, Sweden, never transitory in CE.</td>
<td>Cultural diversity in curriculum and extra-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic minority teachers - crucial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity/Together or not</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Internal selection</th>
<th>Segregated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-blind</td>
<td>Students with more ambitions and more parental</td>
<td>Minority students benefited by desegregation measures,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students of residual schools, living in urban ghettos, aware of their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguous-conflict</strong></td>
<td>Students complain about their teachers' unfriendly behavior, though most of them are committed to the school.</td>
<td>Unlimited conflicts between students within the school: verbal abuse in both directions in ethno-racial categories (prevalent in CE, &quot;Gypsies&quot;, &quot;Hungarians&quot;) Teachers unable to manage these conflicts - essential, immovable (CE countries) Deprecating cultural and religious traditions considered essentially different from the national/&quot;European&quot; traditions (ex. headscarf, arranged marriage, Germany) Exclusion and self-segregation of minority students within the school: they continue to live along the networks rooted in their family and neighborhood relations.</td>
<td>On the absolute periphery of the school system, their presence at school is apparent and transient, usually drop out at an early age (women even earlier than men) Students complain about the hostile relation of the majority, represented by their teachers Opposing to the national/racial supremacy of the majority manifesting in their teachers behavior and talk - conflicts No relations with their majority peers, two reactions: withdrawing in ethnic niches formed around family and neighborhood relations opposing the school and performing a youth counterculture, merging class and ethnic, global and local elements of subversive discourses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity-conscious</strong></td>
<td>Two kind of reactions Minority students who benefit from the meritocratic system (everybody is proud of their achievements) reply positively to the assertive action (&quot;ethnic opinion leaders&quot; in their age group) For those left in the classes for &quot;the rest&quot; - affirmative action interlocks with the perception of discrimination.</td>
<td>Students partly agree with the promotion of cultural diversity and find supportive, partly disagree and feel a constraint (far from what is important for adolescents, irrespectively of their ethnicity) Social status, school achievement and desire for cultural recognition are related (ex. Pakistani students with stronger ties and more chance for mobility, less aware of cultural recognition, while Caribbeans, more affected by deprivation and criminalization are hyper-aware of ethnic disparities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>