

# The Education of Students with Migratory Background in Greece. Educational politics and pedagogical discourse (*logos*)

Michael Damanakis\*

## RÉSUMÉ

L'auteur de cet article examine les problèmes résultant de l'incorporation des étudiants grecs rapatriés dans le système éducatif grec et dans la société grecque en général. Son analyse se réfère d'une part à la politique éducative de l'État grec et d'autre part au discours pédagogique. Il note que dans la période 1975-1990 la composition de la société grecque a radicalement changé en raison de la migration des Grecs rapatriés, principalement des États-Unis, du Canada, d'Australie et de l'Europe, ainsi que de régions autour de la mer Noire et du Caucase. Ces gens étant d'origine grecque, leur inclusion dans le système éducatif et à la société grecque dans son ensemble, a été accomplie généralement de façon positive. Au contraire, en 1989, la situation a changé et la Grèce fait face à un défi inconnu jusque là, la migration des Balkans, des pays asiatiques et africains. La Grèce est toujours en quête d'une proposition politique convaincante et fonctionnelle afin d'assurer leur intégration.

L'évaluation des politiques éducatives et migratoires de la Grèce, en général, et la poursuite, l'amélioration ou leur changement constituent actuellement des objectifs d'une importance capitale, étant donné que la Grèce va entrer dans une nouvelle période. Cette nouvelle période se caractérise principalement par deux évolutions: d'une part par les effets dynamiques des politiques de la loi 3838/2010 "concernant l'octroiement de la nationalité grecque aux immigrants et leurs enfants, et d'autre part, parce que la Grèce constitue pour les immigrants le pays «d'entrée» numéro un de l'Europe.

## ABSTRACT

In this article the author examines the problems resulting from the inclusion of repatriated Greek and migrant students in the Greek educational system and Greek society in general. His analysis refers on the one hand to the educational policies of the Greek State and on the other hand to the pedagogical logos. He notes that in the period 1975-1990 the composition of Greek society changed dramatically as Greeks returned from the United States, Canada, Australia and Europe, as well as from the Black Sea and

\* University of Crete

broader Caucasus region. Being of Greek origin, their inclusion in the educational system and the Greek society at large has generally been positive. In 1989, however, the situation changed as Greece faced an unprecedented migration challenge: migrants from Balkan, Asian and African countries, for whom Greece is still seeking a persuasive and functional inclusion proposal.

The assessment of educational and immigration policies of Greece, in general, and their continuation, improvement or change are now top priority objectives, as the country enters a new period. This new period can be characterized mainly by two developments: first, the dynamic effects of the policies of Act 3838/2010, regarding the naturalization of immigrants and their children, and two, Greece's perception as the primary "country of entry" for immigrants in Europe.

## **Introduction**

Before we proceed to our main topic, it is necessary to analyze two introductory observations and make some conceptual clarifications.

The first observation concerns the relationship between political and scientific discourse (*logos*), which is connected directly to the aim of this study, in which, an attempt is made to analyze the relationship between educational politics (in terms of its legislation and application) and pedagogical theory using as a comparative example the education of students with a migratory background. The second observation concerns the Greek State and its governments with the immigration phenomenon in general, while specifically referring to the heterogeneity which has evolved through this phenomenon.

The conjunction of political and scientific perspective is a rather rare phenomenon in Greece, especially when referring to educational matters. This occurred once, in 1964, with Evangelos Papanoutsos, the instigator of the '64 reform, who was also the General Secretary for the Ministry of Education. This coupling, between political and pedagogical perspective, was so successful and remembered advantageously, despite the Junta interjection.

Since then the binding of these two matters, political and pedagogical perspective, are either not attempted or efforts are exhausted by "the Wisemen Council," but not necessarily the committee of experts. In Greece, what seems to be considered as an integral part of education in other developed countries is ignored. Educational politics for instance, should be supported by investigatory means which can be derived from either high quality educational investigatory services, for example The Educational Research Centre of Greece, one of which

has been established by the State, or by individual researchers or research groups (i.e. research projects).

Using this as our starting point therefore, that educational politics is nothing more than a bioproduct of this conjunction of political and pedagogical perspective, and is more so, if not entirely, a mere expression of political perspective, we are representing educational politics as such, in this current study and contradistinguishing them from a pedagogical perspective.

Looking at the second observation, concerning the relationship between the Greek society, the Greek state with its governments, and the affect it has from immigration and ethnocultural heterogeneity, let it be noted that Greek society is very familiar with this concept given the fact that Greece has bared witness to major waves of migration in the past, giving the country the big Hellenic Diaspora consciousness. The same thing goes for State's governments and policies, at least from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century where the first wave of immigration was spurred by the economic crisis of 1893 that followed. This familiarization however, concerns the migration and repatriation of native Greeks, and not the movement of non-native people into another country. The latter is a considerably new experience as a result of the deterioration of "real-existing socialism" and the Cold War's dramatic end. Whether it has actually reached its climax that is still unknown.<sup>1</sup> In light of this relatively new experience this current study has emerged, and as mentioned earlier, its main objective is to look at educational politics from a pedagogical perspective in relation to the education of students with a migratory background.

When we look at the term *students with migratory background*, let it be clarified that these people may be closely related to the term *foreign students* or *students-children of immigrants*, but they are not entirely the same. The term *students with migratory background* or *migratory origin* also concerns the repatriated Greeks of Diaspora, considering they too have a migratory background. In other words, the term *students with migratory background*, is an amalgamation of both, repatriated and foreign students.

According to the administrative terminology, the term *foreign students*, refers to people who come from countries outside of the European Union (EU). In highlight of this, they also have a migratory background since they have moved from one country to another.

Hence, on the basis of this clarification we can therefore, identify three categories of students with migratory background: Children of repatriated Greeks, children of working immigrants from the EU, and immigrant children from countries outside of EU.

This differentiation of classes has as much of legislative effect as it does social, economic and political, keeping in mind that the Greek State holds a different approach and man-handling towards families from either category. Take the children of repatriated Greeks for instance, if they did not acquire Greek citizenship they could be nationalized through quick and efficient procedures. Furthermore, the State instigated specific measures for their integration. In 1990, for instance, the National Institution of Reception and Re-establishment of Greeks of Diaspora (EIYAPOE)<sup>2</sup> was formed and its main objective was the inclusion of repatriated Greeks from countries of the Former Soviet Union to Greece, while with the Act 2790/2000 (FEK 24/16-02-2000) they attempted to ensure their nationalization, even if they returned permanently in countries of former Soviet Union. Furthermore, labour/working immigrants from EU were protected by the Community Right while their children's education was partially regulated by the PD 494/83, by which the Direction of the Council of Ministers 77/486/EOK was incorporated within the Greek legislation and was also ensured by Foreign Schools (French, German Schools, etc.) operating in Greece.

In contrast to the two above categories, the legal regime for immigrants from countries outside EU is determined by the Greek Government on the basis of the immigration policy they wish to follow. Specifically, in the last decade two laws were voted that sought to deal with the admission, residence and inclusion of immigrants from third countries in Greece,<sup>3</sup> whilst in March 2010 the act 3838 was voted in regarding the issuing of Greek citizenship to legally residing immigrants and their children.

The categorisation of people with a migratory background alters depending on whether they class themselves using the *institutional-administrative criterion* or use their *ethnicity as a criterion*. On the basis of the *ethnic criterion* the members were divided into two main groups, immigrants of Greek decent (background) and the alien (of different nationalities). The first group is mainly - but not necessarily - native Greek language speakers, whereas, the second group, consists of speakers of other languages.

Through this bisecting categorization, the importance of the cultural parameter that circled the nation was of great importance. This parameter, as we will see further on, has irreversibly changed the face of education.

## **1. The Development of Both, Policies and Pedagogical Logos**

What stands out in the evolved approaches is the dividing of the subject of our study into chronological periods and phases. However, the scientific question that

comes to surface, in these approaches relate primarily to the criteria by which attempted the periodisation. In this case using the *ethnocultural background criterion* we can identify two main periods:

The first period of integration, which was formally known as the *Repatriate Greek Students*, was defined as the arrangement of students who were either culturally related or similar to Greeks. It commenced in the 70's from the period of military Junta (fall of Junta) up until the end of 1980's, along with the consequences of the Berlin wall and end of the Cold War.

The second period of integration, which commenced in 1990 till the present day, arranged the integration and assimilation of students with a different cultural and ethnic background altogether.

It is obvious that the two methods of integration would differ. In the first case the Greek government and educational system had to deal with people of the same origin, even though, there were cases where, nevertheless, deviated from the general cultural norm, attitudes and values. However, either they themselves or the Greek state did not perceived them as Others. In the second case, on the contrary, the government and political organisations needed to handle the ethnic "others" and therefore, to be faced with the ethnocultural difference.

### ***1.1. The First Period of 1975-1990: The Inclusion of Repatriated Greeks (of the same Ethnic Background) into the Greek Society***

The first period may be divided into two sub-periods or phases. During the first phase (1975-1980) they experienced a few educational and political conflicts which in turn required them to take on different measures, and as a result taking on a more "philanthropic" approach when assessing these types of students, which also included giving them more time for their study requirements (Damanakis, 1997, 57). Some of the measures were, special consideration when being assessed, or undergo no assessment at all during the first two years of their studies in a Greek school, as well as special consideration during any introductory or entry exams. We do not have any related theoretical documentation that argues or rejects these practises, however, if one was to argue or question this, then, the obvious issues that would come to surface would have been regarding the credit of time and leniency given to this category of students.

The highly anticipated failure of these practises, in combination with two active developments, led the Ministry of Education to take on a series of compensative approach and measures that in turn, initiate the second phase of the first period (1980-1990).

The first development is related to the dramatic increase of the number of repatriated students of Greek origin during the first half of the 1980 decade. During the period 1980-1985 around 5.000 were enrolled in schools every year.

The second development is affected by Greece's inclusion to the European Union (then EOK). Greece was obliged to make amendments towards educational legislation and add to its policies the *Council's Guide of 25<sup>th</sup> July 1977* (77/486/EOK). This act was to ensure and overlook "the education of children of migrant workers."<sup>4</sup>

These measures are along the lines of a compensatory education and training and are materialized with the establishment and function of special Reception Classes and Private Tutoring Classes,<sup>5</sup> in which these centres, aim at undertaking a comprehensive assessment and offer specialized classes, designed to facilitate transition to regular classrooms and smooth transition to the Greek language for these *Greek repatriated students*. (N.1404, article 45, par 1, FEK 173/24-11-1983). This aim is materialized, mainly, by intensive teaching and learning of the Greek language.

As mentioned earlier, around the same sub - period the policy *Council's Guide* 77/486/EOK merged with the Greek legislation PD 494 (FEK 186/27-12-1983). In conjunction with other reforms this aimed to ensure that "*the continuation and education of a repatriates' language and culture is integrated within the normal school curriculum, ensuring that students maintain their cultural identity as well as preparing their reinstatement at schools from their country of origin in the case of emigration.*" (PD 494/87, num 2 par. 2b). In this section it is noted that only students who originated from EU countries received this type of education, as opposed to students who originated from other countries.

The way these compensative measures were and are regulated for repatriated and foreign students were based on a silent hypothesis - acceptance, a common ground in the related European theoretical perspective as "the deficit hypothesis". According to this group it was believed that these types of students would be educationally disadvantaged due to the lack of knowledge and command of the Greek language, their migratory lifestyle and discontinuation of their schooling. This deficit must be compensated as soon as possible with educational measures.

Similar notions, attitudes and values regarding educational practices were pushed through to a degree regarding political and pedagogical logos as these were reported and publicised for instance the publication of the first interventional program which was financed by the Ministry of Education and UNESCO and was substantiated during the first half of the 1980's under the title

“The Reintegration of repatriated Students” (Gotovos, Marcou, 1984).

Unfortunately this assimilatory education of these students had as a consequence, among other things, the loss of the language that they carried with them from the country of origin, something that provoked a disagreement by their parents. After a series of pressures and demands, the Ministry of Education established two schools. The first school was established in Athens, in 1984<sup>6</sup> a school specifically for students from English speaking countries and the second school was established in 1985<sup>7</sup> in Thessaloniki for students from German speaking countries (Kondoyianni, 1997 & 2002, and Damanakis, 1997).

The schools’ curriculum had a bilingual character. These programs were designed to help non-native Greek speakers become bilingual and bicultural and slowly make their transition into the Greek educational system and society a smooth one. As lucrative and effective this bilingual system may have seemed, it also posed a few problems and complexities later down the track, and, mainly, for the following reasons.

Initially, the Ministry of Education had adhered to listen and act upon the needs and demands of migrant parents, which were met. These parents however, felt the need to push for additional initiatives and practises that would initiate their children’s opportunities for higher education by being assessed through special examinations. The Ministry of Education did not respond to their second demand and in conjunction to the increase of numbers of students during the 1990’s this resulted in the re-establishment and re-naming of the schools to *Schools of Intercultural Education*.

From a theoretical point of view, especially during the 80’s it was criticized and argued that these schools had the tendency to juxtapose, marginalize and isolate students by freezing them into ethnocentric identities, a major set back in helping them become successful and confident members of the Greek society.

However, the real underlying issue behind all these developing matters and disputes between the Parent’s Council and Ministry of Education is how these opposing issues on the *difference* were going to be *calculated, engrossed and handled*. This amounted to a series of discussions amongst Greek social scientists specifically during the 1990’s, when in fact this *special consideration and handling* did not apply solely to repatriated Greek students, but also to groups and people from different countries.

After a close evaluation of the period (1975-1990) one can easily see that Greece’s main political educational focus around that time was to structure and organise effective integrated - educational programs for Greek repatriated students. These measures, as mentioned earlier had a compensatory character.

According to special scientists they were, beyond a shadow of a doubt, perceived as imperative, crucial and effective for the needs of these students and were identified with the country's educational trend at the time. Having said this we all know that the main educational trend in Europe and America during the 60's and 70's embraced the whole notion of rights *and equality in opportunities*, which is what the educational system in Greece tried to achieve when the trend finally reached Greece.

This trend along many political matters, were put on a stand still during the Junta occupation. This educational trend influenced the Greek education system overall as well as the developments and re-structuring of programs implemented in 1975 and 1985 such as the language reform( establishing of Demotiki), abolishing entry exams from Primary school to High school and later on from High School to Upper secondary education (Lyceum). The main goals and objectives of these adjustments was to provide a more democratic education for everyone with a particular focus on social cohesion, social inclusion and respect for human rights, and, in this context, pay special attention to the democratic governance of educational institutions, especially the schools for repatriated Greek students, which sought out to amalgamate these students educationally and socially into the Greek society. There compensatory/special measures included in-class support and intensive Greek language lessons. The schools' focus was to establish a positive learning environment where the unification amongst these *special* students was acknowledged and celebrated, thus allowing students to demonstrate their knowledge in a variety of ways and easing their transition into Greek culture and society.

The national identity of these *diverse* students is not perceived as different from educational factors and also from special scientists' point of view and consequently it is not legislated nor is it discussed on a theoretical level. The Greek government and the education system have no reason whatsoever to question or doubt the homogeneity and national identity of these students because these repatriated students are of Greek origin and want to be integrated into the Greek society. The issue regarding the handling and categorisation of these students however, changed drastically upon the mass entry of foreign immigrants and their families in Greece.

### ***1.2. Second Period, 1990 and Hereafter: Perception and Management of Ethno-Cultural Difference***

Let us clarify the term ethno-culturalism. Conversely, ethno-culturalism might be portrayed as the collection of people with identities towards communities which are naturally expressed in language, race or religion and socially

constructed by the very individuals that belong to a given nation as opposed to members of a society whom despite sharing the same country of origin, seem to have different cultural differences i.e. Cretans, Pontians, Epirotans.

When we are looking at areas with a high level of immigration, people with ethno-cultural identities are already a part of the community and understand the social systems and therefore do not demand special consideration or bisector claims.<sup>8</sup> In a case however, where ethno-cultural identity is considered a sovereign and unique element of cultural identity for an immigrant who lives in the frame of a multi-cultural society in an organized national state, then the dangers of socio-cultural intensities and conflicts between the majority and immigrants are high.

The mass entry of immigrants in Greece after 1990 had as a consequence a large number of multi-national students enrolling into various schools around the country, a fact that changed the county's national, social and educational needs. The educational measures that were mentioned earlier applied to foreign students, at least up till 1996, where the bill 2413/96 (FEK 124, vol. A'17-6-1996) was voted in, pertaining to Greek education abroad and intercultural education in Greece. In chapter I of this bill and under the title *Intercultural Education* it is attempted the enactment of the frame regarding the education of young persons *with educational, social, cultural and learning particularities* (article 34, par. 1).

### **1.2.1. How are Drafts of Laws Voted?**

Keeping in mind that the main focus of this study lays between the relationship of political and scientific perspective/logos, it is important that we therefore take as an example Law 2413/96 and attempt to describe how political and scientific approach is incorporated within the framework of a committee experts.

The adjudication and legislation of the Law 2413/96 has a long and interesting history itself and would require a whole research study just on this topic alone. Records indicate that the first government attempts towards this bill began under the New Democracy government and were finally completed in 1996 under the PASOK government.

In this study we will closely look at the chapter 10 (I) of this Law, which aims towards "Intercultural Education." Chapter 10 was inserted in the bill for Greek education abroad, because during the period 1990-95 the Greek education scene transfigured mainly within the Greek Primary school sector. Statistics show that the number of repatriated students in primary and secondary education, in the school year 1995-96 numbered to a total of 27.161 persons and the number of foreign students totalled to a number of 14.015 persons. The increasing number

of foreign students was even more evident and confirmed, especially towards the year 2000. Statistics show that in the year 2006/2007 the number of foreign students enrolled in both levels of education was 94.458 and just 16.782 were repatriated students. Furthermore, in 2007 the number of foreign students (foreign as in administrative term), that were enrolled in the Primary sector were 54.415 students and 40.043 in the Secondary sector (30.607 in Gymnasium, and 9.436 in Lyceum). These numbers correspond to 9.3 % of the total student population that completed the 9 year obligatory education (www.ipode.gr, entry date 11-3-2009). During the mid 90's therefore, on the basis of these developments, a second Committee of Experts emerged alongside the Committee that had already overlooked the bill for *Greek education abroad*, and their main objective was to focus on the framework of "Intercultural Education" in Greece.

The terms "*intercultural education*," "*intercultural training*" and "*curricula interculturalisation*" had been used and implemented for the first time in Greece during the mid 80's (Damanakis 1987). Following on in the 1990's, these terms are used in a more topical manner and the term intercultural education is generalized without having its real meaning clarified. And even today, the term *intercultural education* is used to describe the educational situation and as synonym of intercultural theory. In addition, the term *intercultural* seems to be confused with the term *multicultural education*. This ambiguity between the two terms is mainly due to the fact that intercultural education is not a term commonly used in Anglo-Saxon countries as opposed to multicultural education and despite their similar connotations for they both have different educational approaches. Therefore, in the 1990's, this complexity demanded for changes. Members of the Committee had to make adjustments within the legislative framework regarding *intercultural education* in Greece.

The key term in Chapter 10 is documented as *cultural particularity* or otherwise known as *cultural difference*, a theoretical issue the Committee had to face regarding this educational intervention. Questions posed were, for example, about the perception and management of *the cultural diversity* amongst foreign students or otherwise students from migrant families, whose presence in society led to the bill preparation. In this bill however, there was no specific classification for the minority group of students but rather a more general classification was used, *the students with educational, social, and cultural or learning particularities* (bill. 2413/96, article 34, par 1). Under the law 2413/96 anyone from a different cultural background could be integrated within the education system and as we will see further on, alongside these repatriated students and foreign students from migrant families, Muslim and Roma people were added into the equation.

The two theoretical approaches that were discussed and underlined regarding this framework amongst the members of the Committee were as follows:

There is a cultural diversity which deserves to be developed and enhanced. School programs and aides need to be implemented and integrated in schools, either in the public or private sector, to ensure that this preservation of cultural attitudes and values is successfully confronted. School establishments and other organizations such as bodies of local government, church institutions and philanthropic associations of non profitable character may also contribute to this (Law 2413/96, article 35 par. 4).

The second approach relates to the awareness of this cultural diversity which need to be addressed amongst the minority groups themselves if they wish so. The offer of this option by the state actually means more democracy in education. Due to this aim the state provides opportunities within the main stream education, not in separate schools.

As we can see above, these two approaches have some common aspects between them, however, a few philosophical differences are also highlighted.

According to the first approach we can say that cultural distinctiveness is both a starting point and a goal so the bearer may rely on that clue, or may instrumentalize this distinctiveness, in order to seek and organize a separate education for their children. It is exactly the same point of view which was discussed at the same time by the Parent Committee of the Schools for repatriated students and it was pretty much known to the members of the Committee of Experts.

Hence, since these students, of repatriated parents, had separated schools, then what says foreign immigrant students couldn't have effective separated education also.<sup>9</sup>

In the second theory, despite the recognition of the *difference* there are no means or advances around this concept, therefore, separate schools for foreign immigrants are not established, but their integration into mainstream schooling is promoted. Their reasoning was that rather than separating these students into special schools it would be best to promote this social integration in hope that it would increase social cohesion and acknowledge the contributions migrants can make towards society. And what better way to promote this than through education. By doing this, mainstream schooling would be enhanced and through this approach the problems of ethnic divisions and separatisms amongst people in a community would be diminished.

Therefore the Chapter 10 of the Law 2413/96, which refers to the first

approach was drawn up, considering its objectives and targets were politically, theoretically parallel to the Ministry of Educations' ethos.

## **2. The Law 2413/96: its philosophy and implementation<sup>10</sup>**

The key term of the Law 2413/96 was defined as *cultural particularities*. Its framework underlined its legal obligations to establish and operate special public or private schools known as *Intercultural Schools*. The overall co-ordination and solidarity of these schools were to be overlooked by the newly developed organization, the *Institute of Education for the Greeks of Diaspora and Intercultural Education* (Law 2413/96 article 5). During the same period a new position is established within the Ministry of Education, the *Special Secretariat for Intercultural Education* (Y.A ST5/11/6-3-1995, FEK171/18-3-1996). Alongside the already grounded and operating organizations such as the Pedagogical Institute, and Special Secretariat of Primary and Secondary Education, a few other organizations emerged which aimed at initiating these cultural differences and particularities through policies and practices.

It is obvious that this concept of individual differences is pluralized within the social and educational perimeter, as we have on the one hand, migrants with their cultural differences, and on the other hand Greek citizens Roma, as well as Thracian Greek Muslim minority for example, with their own particularities. So the question that generated a great deal of discussion was how the bill was going to be successfully implemented to meet the particularities of these culturally different groups. The transubstantiation of the bill into the implementation of educational policies was incarnated via the so called Programs of Intercultural Education. The Ministry of Education in its implementation of Law 2413/96 included as part of the mission for Intercultural Education, along the B' Supportive Community Based Framework, four new programs under the title "*Programs for Intercultural Education*." The first program aimed at the education of repatriated and foreign students, the second for the education of Muslim children, the third programs' intention was the integration of gypsies (Roma) and the fourth, the education of Greek students in the Diaspora.

The categorization of these diverse Groups in Greece as well as the organization of these relative interventional and supported programs were not made exclusively with the criteria of their cultural particularities but other considerations were taken into account as well. Among Muslim children it was important that their specific religious particularities and the fact that they belonged to a minority group of people (minority status), had to be taken into consideration.<sup>11</sup> In the case of foreigners (meaning children from migrant families), their legal and social rights

prevailed, given the fact that they make up the majority group of people, whereas for gypsy children, their social integration was taken into consideration. Everyone however is legally represented under the umbrella of *Intercultural Education* because Law 2413/196, article 34, par. 1 states the right of their inclusion. The way cultural, or more precisely intercultural particularities, are assessed under certain political criteria is evident in the case for Muslim minorities of Thrace. Pomaks and Roma are not considered as people with linguistic and intercultural particularities and therefore are “equalized” with the Turkish decent group.

The situation, from a political perspective, regarding the education of Muslim students is a delicate one considering it brushes upon the relative conventions between Greece and Turkey (Treaty of Lausanne and educational protocol 1968) and is enhanced through the existing political framework of education and practice where the issues regarding education are referred to between the Greek government, an elite of Turkish decent within the minority in Thrace and Turkey. According to Gotovo’s analysis (2007), this situation is referred to as “*minority nationalism*” and as a response to this the Greek government adopts a policy of “*educational appeasement*”. Within this conflicting framework came upon the establishment of a new program called Program for the Education of Muslim Students (PEMS) and may it be pointed that this program was designed only to assist the Greek linguistic component of their education, for it was noted from the administrators themselves, who were well informed of the conflicts and frictions regarding this issue, (Dragona, Fragoudaki, 2007, 21), that the Turkish linguistic component was to be administrated by Turkey with the collaboration the elite of the minority in Thrace.

An interesting observation to make here, from a pedagogical point of view, is that despite the initial subtlety of the issue regarding the minority group and the provisions’ language intervention regarding the teaching of the Greek language only, it was still nevertheless, regarded as part of the Intercultural Teaching Framework. And the question raised was for example, could this segregated education of the Muslim minority of Thrace be considered as an Intercultural one. The same question was raised regarding the “Polish Intercultural School” in Athens, as well as most of the Intercultural schools in Athens and Thessaloniki (former Schools for Repatriates). Interesting to note that the majority of students are no longer students of repatriated families but that of foreign migrants from different nations.<sup>12</sup>

The answer to the above question is given from two perspectives, a superficial or communicative one and a theoretical one.

From a communicative perspective the term *Intercultural* embodies the inter-

relationships between the diversity of communities, the education of migrants and the comprehension of the cultural diversity in current society, as well as the notions of the need for communication between persons from different cultures, to be seen as move, at least rhetorically, towards understanding globalisation and with this full conception what would be promoted is the democracy of education amongst people where wealth, race or gender is not a factor of division. It is a term which is perceived as an impressive one, one that synthesizes important pedagogical and social principles, avoids social prejudices, recognises and promotes equality of rights and equity, giving it a more politically correct impression. The historical roots of human rights in education and the equality of education in Europe were conceptualized and became a reality in the late 1980's with the ideal of Intercultural Education and Training.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, the integration of this pedagogical framework from a political perspective and its application towards the education of other multicultural minorities and cultural groups was highly anticipated.

From a pedagogical perspective, however, the above question is a bit more complex since Interculturalism does not revolve around pedagogical theory only, but is expanded across the general social spectrum of education and amongst other social sciences.

### **3. The Intercultural Pedagogical Logos and its Relationship with Educational Politics**

#### ***3.1. The Outsets and the First Implementations in Europe***

Whether disaggregated educational approaches could be considered as intercultural education one needs to reflect on its origins and its development in Europe, particularly around central Europe and Northern countries where these countries were mainly affected by the major migratory waves after World War, II.

It is fair to say then, that this intercultural approach to education was a response to the major challenges these countries faced with, such as ethnic diversity and the integration of migrants, and not limited only in the field of education, the students of foreign migrants from different nationalities, which needed to be organised. Particularly during the 60's and 70's, so much was the focus on the integration of these students, that it became a rather controversial topic from an educational and political point of view and as a result, a new educational policy was developed especially for these students, known as *The Pedagogy of Foreigners* (Ausländerpädagogik). This educational approach with regard to intercultural education had a clear compensatory character for these

particular students, who were placed in the *special consideration (deficit hypothesis)* group category, which we mentioned earlier on in this study.

What followed, in response to this educational, political and pedagogical policy, were a few inherent tensions. However, with the dynamic interchange of a few programs funded by UNESCO, the Council of Europe and the Committee of European Union (then EEC)<sup>14</sup> in the mid 70's, and in conjunction to the already existing policy, they initiated the policy's name change from *Pedagogy of Foreigners* to *Intercultural Education*, and the grouping of migrant students from the *hypothesis of deficit* to the *hypothesis of differences*. Therefore, according to the new idea students, who lacked knowledge of the language for example, were not considered as students with a deficit but rather students with special differences. The new hypothesis is not altogether immune of the deficit logic, nor is the difference accepted automatically, as an advantage. With these changes to the educational curriculum and classification of groups of students this still raised a few concerns, not in a negative way but becomes a topic of conversation on many levels, socially, politically and epistemologically.

So, the term *different* and other words with common element such as, otherness, particularity and diversity, were key terms used for this new educational approach that challenged the field of education and continued to grow, especially in the 80's, due to the flow of migration, which according to Frenchman Louis Porcher (1981,1984), German Manfred Hohmann (1983, 1989), profoundly affected education<sup>15</sup> (Porcher 1981, 37 and Hohmann 1989, 15 ch.3). Both believed that this educational approach (intercultural pedagogical perspective - Porcher, intercultural education - Hohmann) was a bridge towards this multicultural pool that was circling European societies and shifted the term from Multicultural to Intercultural education, as it precisely defined this intertwining of cultures and the recognition of differences. Hohmann's (1989, 16) theoretical beliefs were defined in three categories: a) meeting of cultures (cultural encounters) b) the solving of conflicts around the integration of cultures c) cultural exchanges and enrichment.

Conflicts such as prejudices and stereotypes can be, on a social level, reasons for the conflicts amongst people when new cultures emerge due to mass migration. Hohmann (1989, 15), underlines two educational trends around this theoretical belief which could help in assisting these conflicts. The first one was named *Begegnungspädagogik* (Education of Cultural Encounters) and the second *Konfliktpädagogik* (Education of Conflicts). The second ideology is not fully developed in most parts of Europe except in England where planning and implementation of school-based anti-racism education projects is of high priority

and with the exception of a few Central-Northern European countries.

This *cultural enrichment*, which stems from the interaction and inter-twining of cultures, known as “the hypothesis of cultural enrichment”, is what opened the doors towards Intercultural Education which is identified as coeducation. This fusion of cultures within a school environment needs to be “*authentically represented*” and can be done so by the implementation of a carefully planned intercultural program where students can understand and acknowledge these differences (Boos-Nünning et al. 1983, 362).

Intercultural education is identified as coeducation which means, *equal education for all*. This was clearly mentioned in the Swann Report, which was put together and published in England in the early 1980's. Lord Swann, the president of the Committee, stated, in his updated version of the report, that “Awareness is the most integral part of any change and the question as to, how is the education system going to educate students from ethnic minorities, was that needed speculation, however, the real challenge was how was the education system going to address the needs of *all students*.” (Swann Report 1985, 10).

### **3.2. Applications in Greece**

We mentioned earlier, the *separate education* program was the program practised in minority schools of Thrace, the Polish school, and the former Schools for Repatriates, where students with a migratory background were enrolled. The answer to the question as to whether this type of educational approach was Intercultural, was a negative one, and the only reason why it was included under the umbrella of Interculturalism, was due to two main developments that were emerging at the time which left Greece open to examine this relevant issue regarding education.

During the mid 80's and especially during the early 90's, the term *difference*, the core element behind intercultural education did not only refer to the difference among migrants but also the ethno-cultural diverse people and other groups which resulted to the provisional name change from Intercultural Education to *Education of Diversity* (Pädagogik der Vielfalt).<sup>16</sup>

The concrete attempts in addressing the *recognition of differences* and the *equal opportunity with recognition of difference* subsequently affected the social and political movements of the time thus, becoming a major critical topic that was expanded by social scientists and philosophers.<sup>17</sup> This resulted to the development of the theoretically and epistemologically based analytical programs and tools that were used towards the understanding and the cultivation of a positive attitude towards the values of a diverse communal life with its dissimilarities and differences.

Programs and initiatives through such an educational system, where these differences and particularities were on a social and communicative level rightfully acknowledged and owned. Based on this principle and logic Intercultural Education, its content and its organizational structure, was adjusted accordingly because there were many different approaches towards Intercultural Education. Any new approach was closely analysed in Greece and was connected to some type of political activism.<sup>18</sup>

Another reason that makes the education of the immigrants a goal of intercultural pedagogical approach is that this approach emerged, through migration environments and multicultural conditions. Therefore immigrants can not be outside the scope of this approach whether they co-existed and co-educated with the dominant group or they are in a ghetto.

Therefore, the Intercultural Schools where students of immigrant or Roma only families graduated from, they actually do not provide intercultural education and training as such, but they are themselves a case study for Intercultural Education

The education of the Muslim minority in Thrace was also a different case. The education of this minority group in regards to intercultural education was to be speculated because this wider audience of people, each with their own religious, cultural, language and socio-economic dispositions needed to be educated. However, this intercultural approach was not the best solution at the time because politically the education of the Muslim minority or anything pertaining to them was, to a degree, a very controversial matter and therefore programs to function towards this minority were not developed as such to deal with these frictions. In other words, initiatives towards intercultural education had its limits and boundaries.<sup>19</sup> This Intercultural approach has, to a degree, an element of weakness as it presupposes what it aims to achieve. It aims at peaceful coexistence, interaction and mutual enhancement within a multicultural society. However, good will is required for coexistence and interaction from both sides as well as a minimum of consent and peace in order to safeguard cultural coexistence. The actualization of such an aim is very difficult, if not impossible.

All the intercultural programs and activities mentioned aim to develop, through education and meetings, an understanding of other cultural traditions and ways of life, to extend knowledge of fundamental human and civil rights and to make the addressees capable of developing humanitarian and democratic values. Intercultural and democratic skills, peace and understanding are mutually dependent in this respect and can only be successfully accomplished if the parties involved contribute and political efforts are reciprocated.

What is important to remember here is that this particular minority in Thrace was not assimilated because of migration, but due to the pressing political and historical circumstances that revolved around the birth of the two states. So, up until today Intercultural Education had not formed models of training that could be implemented into schools that operate within a national state (state of subordination, according to Gotovos, 2007) for these recognized minorities, which are under the influence of another national state (state of reference) or would rather use an elite which functions as an “extended hand” of a national state of reference. Hence, the political decision to incorporate the education of Muslim students under the umbrella of Intercultural Education was not an issue that was theoretically, educationally and politically emancipated from confabulation.

The incorporation of minority education under the umbrella of Intercultural Education was favored by the Law 2413/96, which according to one of its policies the establishment of separate schools by “non profitable philanthropic organizations” were permitted (B.2413/96, art 35, par 4). In other words, amidst this invocation of cultural “diferences,” what was being legalized was the operation of parallel school networks for culturally different people.

The particular engagement towards *difference* (see chapter 1.2.1), it’s institutional consolidation and by law implementation allowed for the development of educational means to support ethnic or/and national, cultural and religious minorities whilst weakening the coeducation within the mainstream schooling frameworks.

In light of this, what were financed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Social Support Services (1997-2008) were the three programs mentioned earlier. The integration of repatriated, migrants and Roma students and the education of Muslim students. These actions would in time, transubstantiate the law into a formal educational practice. The funding of these interventional programs for either group took a conscious effort in the 90’s, mainly because of the lack of resources, knowledge and experience at the time. However, the funding of these novel programs and the promotion of scientific researches in the field, aimed towards domestic epistemological research and knowledge.

### **3. Assessment and Prospects**

What should have happened after the funding of these programs, in August 2008, and from what it seems, still remains incomplete, is the assessment of these programs which would have resulted to a more increasing schematic awareness of this approach, which can be driven through the results of these assessments.

On that note we will end this study and sum up everything that has been mentioned so that we are clear and have understood the timing within which we find ourselves.

During the period 1975-1990 the composition of Greek society had changed drastically due to the migration of repatriated Greeks, mainly from the United States, Canada, Australia and Europe, as well as from areas around the Black Sea and broader Caucasus area to Greece. With the understanding that the majority of these people had children who did not acquire Greek language skills and were therefore disadvantaged socially and linguistically and needed a smooth transition into the Greek system, compensatory measures were required, such as the Reception Classes, Tutorial Courses for the teaching and learning of the Greek language. It was a way to successfully assist these students in achieving this transition, educationally and socially. Because the said population consisted of conationals, willing to join the national mainstream, their cultural distinctiveness was not considered by them as an ethnic or national difference. And as we previously pointed out the national state and its educational system didn't have any reason to worry about their homogeneity and identity.

In 1989 however the situation changed as Greece faced a never known before migration challenge. Migrants from Balkan, African and Asian countries sought refuge, for the inclusion which Greece is still seeking a persuasive and a functional proposal.

Faced with this increasing and changing diversity, Greek society and state along with previous experience with the integration of repatriated Greeks and the law already in legislation 2413/96, they were able to quickly respond to this pressing matter and expressing the need of intercultural approach to education. The most important advancement made by the Ministry of Education made after the enactment of the Law 2413/96, was the funding of the previous mentioned programs, the three intercultural educational programs that would in time, make the term *intercultural education* materialize into an actual formal educational practice. These programs, which in fact required a great deal of organization and the input of copious amounts of time only known to the developers themselves, operated for 10 years. There were, unfortunately, no holistic picture and supervision concerning their effectiveness, since no assessments have been made that would have been indicative towards the effectiveness. This practice is theoretically inconsistent with the ethos of international practice. According to the results of these novel programs, which would have been assessed by external evaluators, and in turn the results would be utilized in the consolidation of Greece's political approach towards education.

Following the next twelve years, what contributed to this problematic relationship between politics and scientific considerations in Greece, was lack or no evaluation and overall assessment of these programs, as well as programs that were funded in within the framework of the Operational Program of Education and Initial Occupational Training (known as ΕΠΕΑΕΚ). The difficulty here from a pedagogical perspective is that Greece has not developed a political culture that supports the amalgamation of political and pedagogical perspective and therefore comes as no surprise that politicians seem blase and unmoved by the results of the educational and researching programs they initially funded in the first place.

All the same, this non evaluation and lack of assessment of the Intercultural Educational Programs along with the application of the Law 2413/96, is what contributed to the structural organization and implementation of the three programs mentioned earlier, in 2010. This development on the one hand, supported the ad hoc political view which was the categorization of each group individually, and on the other, opened doors of opportunities for mainstream schooling to progress and advance and find its rightful place in education and not left around the outskirts of this complex yet fascinating spectrum.

The assessment of educational and immigratory policies of Greece, in general, and the continuation, improvement or change in politics constitute currently objectives of paramount importance, given that Greece is going to enter in a new period. This new period can be characterized mainly by two developments: firstly from the dynamic effects of the Law 3838/2010's policies regarding the issuing of Greek citizenship to immigrants and their children, and secondly, from the fact that Greece is perceived as the number one "country of entry" for immigrants.

## NOTES

1. Regarding the latest developments we have indicatively provided studies which have been uploaded on the IMEPO website on [www.imepo.gr](http://www.imepo.gr) in the studies by Fakiolas 1994 and Fakiolas, King 1996 as well as in EKE's 2003 special bibliographical edition.
2. The constitution of the beneficiary to the public institution EYIAPPOE was formed with PD 13/90 (FEK 782/1990) but it was settled under the Act 3072/2002.
3. See acts a) 2910/01 (FEK 91/02.05.2001) Entry and residence of foreigners in Greek society. The establishment of Greek Citizenship and other provisions b) 338/05 (FEK 212/23.08.2005), Entry, residence and social integration of Third Country (non - EU) citizens in Greek society.

4. The Guide act refers to three main topics a) the obtainment of free education and placement, addressing students' induction into the education system, b) the initial and the on going training of the teachers of those students and c) the teaching of the native language and the culture of their country.
5. The most integral part of these learning centers was to design and facilitate the right aides and classes to establish a positive learning environment. They were therefore divided into two levels, Reception Class (RC) I and II. Students in RC I need to follow this special program for one year whilst simultaneously following a few of the mainstream subjects that are taught in regular classrooms without too much emphasis given on the native language (Greek). Students in RC. II, are students who are placed into normal/mainstream classes, depending on their age and level and remain there up to three years. The main objective of RC I is to provide comprehensive and effective programs for migrant children/families. In order for an RC I class to operate the minimum requirement is nine students. If there are over 17 students, then a second IC I class is organized. Tutoring Classes operate "out of school" hours and three students are required to attend in order for a group to emerge. Any more than eight students qualify for the generation of a second group/class.
6. Presidential Decree 435/84, FEK 154, vol. A' 10-10-1984.
7. Presidential Decree 369/85, FEK. Let it be noted that these types of schools had already occurred since 1974, with the establishment of "Gymnasium for migrant Greeks" a high school, which aimed at ensuring Greek attitudes and values and its Christian culture is embedded to for the Greeks of Diaspora through their education. (N.D 339/74, FEK61/11.3.1974 and P. D. 339/74).
8. In regards to this complex issue you may see our reports analytically regarding the ethno-cultural identity/Greek identity in the Greek Diaspora. (Damanakis, 2007, esp. chapter 7).
9. This awareness played a critical role even for the Polish community in Athens, who had established and still maintain their own ethnic school since 1997.
10. When we are referring to the implementation of bills, we mean the measures Ministry of Education has to make in order for the educational legislations to be transubstantiated and applied in educational policy. This means the analysis of the particular procedures that happen between legislation and its application to educational policy and it does not, at any given point, involve the actual educational practice. Furthermore, we would like to point out that here we are attempting to intra-connect the perspective politics of education (legislation and application) with pedagogical theory.
11. As we will see further on, the *minority* status affects the politics of education and may in fact become an "obstacle", preventing a cultural encounter.
12. The same *question* can be raised regarding the unmixed Greek Schools in Germany

which despite their non affiliation with Intercultural education are included in the bill 2413/96. May it be reminded that with the bill 2413/96 former Schools for Repatriated students were re-named to Intercultural Schools. In addition to this many other intercultural government schools were established. According to IPODE. ([www.ipode.gr](http://www.ipode.gr), date of entry 30.3.09) 24 government schools of intercultural education operated during the school years 2008/09, 12 Primary schools, 8 Gymnasiums and 4 Lyceums.

13. This intercultural pedagogical idea was finally acquired within the space of 15 years, something fairly logical, considering that the majority of migrants who entered Greece did so in the beginning of the 1990's.
14. Documents regarding these programs can be viewed in Boos Nünning et al. 1983, Council of Europe 1983, Porcher 1981 and Jones, Kimberly 1986.
15. We make reference to these two social scientists, or more specifically pedagogues /educators, because they influenced the programs drawn by the Greek Committee and the Committee of EOK. Along with some co-workers they revolutionized this trend called Intercultural Education. As for our choices in bibliography we have limited them to older sources as we are trying to reflect on the history and first implementation of Intercultural Education, its foundation and reasons for its development and its connection to the education of students with immigrant background, the key focus of our study.
16. The term is a title of one of the most important monographies in the German language field. In this monography and under the title *Pädagogik der Vielfalt*, three pedagogical trends are analyzed: the Intercultural Education, Feministic Education and Special Education. The last term refers to Special education of children with disabilities in normal schools (Prengel 1995).
17. Let it be reminded that in 1992 the monography of Charles Taylor with the title *Multiculturalism and the "The politics of Recognition"* was published in Canada. It referred to the *recognition* of the French Canadians' differences and their ethnic identities and indirectly granting them the right to secession from the Canadian Federal Government.
18. The assessment and overall development of the intercultural approach in Greece is itself a very complex and special issue, which we are not able to even indicatively cover, which is the reason as to why we have not referred to its Greek bibliography in this study. Doing so could have resorted to erroneous misconceptions regarding various writers/authors.
19. More examples regarding the limits and the boundaries that revolve around situations of conflict have been discussed, as for example the situation with Cyprus (Damanakis, 2002).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gotovos Athanasios, Markou George (ed.) (1984), *School Reintegration of Repatriate Native Greek Students: Problems and Prospects*, Ministry of Education, UNESCO, Athens (In Greek).
- Gotovos Athanasios (2007), «Minority education and European context. Criticism of the educational program of minority nationalism and the education of appeasement», in: *Comparative and International Education Review*, vol 9 / 2007, Publications, Pataki, Athens (pp. 13-56) (In Greek).
- Damanakis Michael (1987), *Migration and Education*, Gutenberg, Athens.
- Damanakis Michael (1997), *The education of repatriated and foreign students in Greece. Intercultural Approach*, Gutenberg. Athens (In Greek).
- Damanakis Michael (2002), «Limits and strengths of intercultural pedagogical approach in conflict situations. The case of Cyprus», in: *Epistimes tis Agogis* (Sciences of Education), Special issue 2002 (p. 73-85).
- Damanakis Michael (2007), *Identities and Education in the Diaspora*, Gutenberg, Athens (In Greek).
- Dragona Thalia, Frangoudaki Anna (ed.) (2007), *Addition no Substraction, Multiplication Rather than Division. The Reforme Intervention in Education of the Minority in Thrace*, Metahmio, Athens( In Greek).
- National Institute for Reception and Rehabilitation of Repatriated Greek Immigrants (1995), *Report of Proceedings 1991-1995*, EIYAPOE (EIYAPIOE), Athens.
- National Centre for Social Research (2003), *Recent Immigration Flows to Greece Contemporary migration to Greece*, Athens (Special Issue, edited by Marina Petronoti, Anna Triandafyllidou).
- Kontogiannis Dionysia (1997), «The Case of the Elementary School for Repatriated in Thessaloniki», in: Michael Damanakis 1997 (p. 213-223).
- Kontogiannis Dionysia (2002), *Bicultural-Bilingual Education in Greece. The Case of the "Schools of Repatriated"* , University of Crete, Rethymnon (doctoral thesis).
- Bill 2413: *The Greek Education Abroad, Intercultural Education and other Provisions* (FEK 124/17-06-1996).
- Bill 3838: *Provisions for Modern Greek Citizenship and Political Involving of Expatriates and Legal Resident Immigrants and other Settings* (FEK 49 / 24-3-2010).
- Boos-Nünning Ursula, Hohmann Manfred, Reich Hans H, Wittek Fritz (1983), *Aufnahmeunterricht Muttersprachlicher Unterricht Interkultureller Unterricht*, Oldenbourg Verlag, München.

Council of Europe, Council for cultural Co-operation. School Education Division (1983), *Education of migrants' children. Compendium of information on intercultural education schemes in Europe*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Fakiolas Rassetos (1994), *Migration from and to Greece during the last four decades*, in: Alogoskoufis/Kollintzas/Provopoulos (eds), *Essays in honour of Constantine Drakatos*, Papazissis Publishers, Athens 1994 (pp 571-591).

Fakiolas Rossetos, King Russell (1996), «Emigration, Return, Immigration: A Review and Evaluation of Greece's Postwar Experience of International Migration», in: *International Journal of Population Geography*, Vol 2 1996 (pp 171-190).

Hohmann Manfred (Hrsg.) (1976), *Unterricht Mit Ausländischen Kindern*, Schwann, Düsseldorf.

Hohmann Manfred (1983), «Interkultureller Erziehung-Versuch einer Bestandsaufnahme», in: *Ausländerkinder in Schule und Kindergarten*, 4/1983 (S.4-8).

Hohmann Manfred, Reich Hans H (Hrsg.) (1989), *Ein Europa Für Mehrheiten und Minderheiten. Diskussionen um Interkulturelle Erziehung*, Waxmann Wissenschaft, Münster/New York.

Jones Crispin, Kimberley Keith (1986), *The CDCC's Project No.7: The Education and Cultural Development of Migrants. Intercultural Education. Concept, Context, Curriculum Practice*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Porcher Louis (1981), *The Education of the Children of Migrant Workers in Europe: Interculturalism and Teacher Training*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Porcher Louis (1984), «Glanz und Elend des Interkulturellen?», in: Reich H./Wittek F. (HRSG.) *Migration Bildungspolitik Pädagogik*, Alfa, Essen/Landau.

Prenzel Annedore (1995), *Pädagogik der Vielfalt*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.

Reich Hans H, Wittek Fritz (Hrsg.) (1984), *Migration Bildungspolitik Pädagogik*, Alfa, Essen/Landau.

Reich Hans H, (1994), «Interkulturelle Pädagogik-eine Zwischendilanz» in: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, Heft 1/94, (S. 9-27).

Steiner-Khamsi Gita (1992), *Multikulturelle Bildungspolitik in der Postmoderne*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.

Swann Report (1985), *Education for All. A Brief Guide to the Main Issues of the Report*, by Lord Swann, FRS, FRSE, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London.

Taylor Charles (1992), *Multiculturalism and "The politics of Recognition"*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.