ETHOS

Mapping the construction of justice and justice related tensions in Europe – A comparative report

Dorota Lepianka

This Report was written within the framework of Work Package 4 "Political, advocacy and media discourse of justice and fairness''

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the contribution of researchers who have prepared country reports (listed in the Bibliography section): Wanda Tiefenbacher and Livia Perschy (ETC-Graz, Austria), Agnes Kende (CEU, Hungary), Mara Bicas, Maria Paula Meneses and Laura Brito (CES, Portugal), Duygun Ruben and Oğuzhan Hışıl (Bogazici Universitesi, Turkey), Susan Divald (University of Bristol, the United Kingdom) and Jing Hiah, Simon de Jong (the Netherlands). Their contribution, patience in answering questions and advice have been invaluable.

ETHOS

Want to learn more about what we are working on?

Visit us at:

Website: https://ethos-europe.eu

Facebook: www.facebook.com/ethosjustice/

Blog: www.ethosjustice.wordpress.com

Twitter: www.twitter.com/ethosjustice

Hashtag: #ETHOSjustice

Youtube: www.youtube.com/ethosjustice

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

About ETHOS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Executive Summary

The role of education in the realization of (*social*) *justice* is ambiguous. On the one hand, education is considered crucial for the eradication of persistent inequalities and enhancement of social inclusion. On the other, due to its contribution to the (re)production of particular identities and social positioning, education is often seen as an important source of *in*justice. This tension, or contradiction, is hardly surprising considering a general lack of consensus on what kind of *justice ideals* education policies should pursue (redistribution vs. recognition), whose well-being they should prioritize (majority vs. minority), which allocative principles they should follow (need vs. desert vs. ability), and who is ultimately responsible for the *just* 'outcomes' of the educational process (authorities vs. school vs. parents).

The goal of the current paper is to map the various justice-related tensions that are evoked in media debates on education. The role of media in informing and influencing public discourse, including education politics, is hard to overestimate. Through media, politics is able to direct public attention toward some and away from other objective or putative condition and thus contribute to a specific rank-ordering of 'social problems' that demand public attention. Various stakeholders may mobilize media for strategic advantage, for example, during a period of education reform. On the other hand, media may constitute an important outlet for popular discontent with existing educational practices. The questions of what is just, to whom and on what moral grounds are usually crucial in those debates.

The analysis presented in this paper synthetizes the results of studies conducted in six European countries: Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey and the UK. In each country, the analysis encompassed between 23 and 52 carefully selected news items and their multimodal content. In the sampling of the research material, attention was paid to the inclusion of multiplicity of media outlets and perspectives. The results illustrate multiple tensions related to the competing notions of justice in education, and varying ideas as to the scope of justice, mechanisms that impede justice and actors considered responsible for the realization of justice in education.

Table of Content

Introduction

The role of media in informing and influencing public discourse is hard to overestimate. By creating, selecting, steering and shaping information for public consumption, media influence public discourse. They generate points of view, influence perceptions, enhance aspirations, strengthen anxieties, feed moral panics, promote social agendas, frame problems and contribute to strengthening or undermining support for specific policies, practices and ideologies (e.g. Anderson, 2007; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2016; Gerstl-Pepin, 2007; McCombs and Reynolds, 2009). Various authors draw attention to the entanglement of politics, policy making and the media (e.g. Baroutsis, 2019). Through media, politics is able to direct public attention toward some and away from other objective or putative condition and thus contribute to a specific rank-ordering of 'social problems' that demand public attention. On the other hand, media may constitute an important outlet for popular discontent with existing policies and practices. Various stakeholders may also mobilize media, and/or public opinion via media, for strategic advantage, for example, during periods of important social reforms. The questions of what is just, to whom and on what moral grounds are often crucial in those debates.

The goal of the current paper is to map the different facets of justice evoked in the (social) media in the context of educational debates and to identify tensions inherent in the various notions of justice and visions of good life and common good in six countries participating in ETHOS project – Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey and the United Kingdom. Our choice of education-related debates as the focus of a paper on media representation of justice is not accidental. As discussed in ETHOS reports D4.3 and D3.6, the role of education in the realization of *justice* is highly ambiguous (cf. Power, 2012). On the one hand, education constitutes an important economic and social right and is crucial for the eradication of persistent inequalities and enhancement of social inclusion. It also plays a central role in nurturing and transmission of cultural heritage and thus the realisation of cultural rights. Finally, education is a site where individuals and communities are, or at least should be, able to realize their civil rights – freedom of choice and freedom of (religious) expression (cf. Salát, 2019).

At the same time, however, education is often seen as an important source of *in*justice (cf. Anderson et al., 2018; Buğra and Akkan, 2019; Salát, 2019). The focus on excellence, inherent to most educational systems,[1] is per definition exclusionary (Walzer, 1983). Moreover, by forming and transforming individual and social identities, and cultivating specific (dominant) ways of doing and being education is believed to contribute to the (re)production of social identities, positionings and statuses (Walzer, 1983; Vincent, 2003). While this might be enabling – education may contribute to the development of a sense of belonging to the society (cf. Buğra and Akkan, 2019), it may also lead to the freezing of particular statuses and unequal power relations (cf. Anderson et al., 2018).

---

[1] Alternative educational approaches, like Waldorf education, also known as Steiner education, that strive to develop pupils' intellectual, artistic and practical skills in a holistic and integrated manner constitute notable counter examples. However, their position within national educational systems is usually rather marginal.

All in all, education constitutes an important site of *struggles for justice*, where controversies over the primacy of different types of claims to justice, different understandings of similar claims, moral grounds on which claims are made and/or the claims of different social groups are particularly heightened. Indeed, due to its crucial role in the production and reproduction of social identities and positioning (cf. Vincent, 2003), and significance for the formation (and transmission) of values and the ways to understand common good, education seems to constitute a particularly fruitful site for the exploration of the tensions between the plural conceptions of justice. Given the coexistence of conflicting value sets in today's pluralistic societies, the question of what and whose moral values, societal norms and 'knowledge' shall be accommodated (and how?) in the education system is thus of paramount importance. Focusing on the media debates on education allows to tap those aspects of justice and justice-related tensions that have become most salient in various national context and most reflective of the current norms and ways of life (cf. Peeters and d'Haenens, 2005).

In this paper, we focus specifically on debates related to compulsory education, primary and secondary, and the ways (in)justice within formal educational system affects (the future of) children and adolescents. We focus in particular on tensions that arise in debates on justice for youth belonging to ethnic and cultural minorities, that is groups that are more likely to be affected by school failure, school segregation and educational exclusion (see, for example, Pantea, 2015), but also groups for whom the negotiation of identities and the manoeuvring between the various value sets, definitions of 'knowledge' and the standards according to which the 'aptitude' and 'excellence' is being evaluated might be most challenging.

Analytical framework

Within ETHOS, distinction is made between analytically separable yet practically interwoven facets of justice included by Nancy Fraser in a tripartite framework of recognition, representation and re-distribution (Knijn et al., 2018). Linked most explicitly to socio-economic arrangements that determine the distribution of burdens and benefits in a society, within the realm of education, redistributive justice is often evoked to denote equality of access to (quality) education and the impact education inequalities exert on the opportunities and life chances of children from various social backgrounds and reproduction of economic dis/advantage. It might relate as well to educational practices and/or pedagogic approaches that via deficit understandings and low expectations about learners from vulnerable groups undermine their academic achievement thus obstructing economic justice. Education policies geared at minimizing maldistribution encompass reallocation of resources (material and non-material) to socio-economically disadvantaged students, or schools serving them, to support these students' school retention, participation and achievement, for example, via compensatory educational programmes (Keddie, 2012; Power, 2012).

Justice understood in recognitive terms is about the relative standing of a person vis-à-vis others (Knijn et al., 2018, pp. 14-15). It implies absence of cultural domination, marginalisation in public sphere, cultural and social invisibility, and disrespect and disparagement in everyday life. As noted in ETHOS deliverable 4.3 (Buğra and Akkan, 2019), recognition related injustices in the realm of education might manifest themselves, among other things, in blindness to cultural differences and/or stigmatization of such differences in school settings, for example by privileging of dominant (white) culture and middle class values and marginalising or even silencing the knowledge of the other

2

(Keddie 2012, pp. 267-69). They may also reveal themselves in 'constructed distinctiveness' of individuals or groups, i.e. ascribing to them (excessive) difference they themselves do not experience.

Finally, as noted in other ETHOS deliverables, the idea of justice as representation touches on effective participation in democratic process and capacity to exercise influence on how society's norms, laws and regulations are being set. Representative justice can be seen as both an end in itself and as a means to achieve distributive and recognitive justice. Within the context of education, representative justice may take the form of incorporating parental voice in the matters of relevance for the education of their children, such as curriculum constriction and organization and management of schools (Cribb and Gewirtz, 2003), or securing equal, or at least proportional, representation of minority teachers in overwhelmingly white middle-class school settings (Keddie 2012). In some research, including ETHOS deliverable 4.3 (Buğra and Akkan, 2019) representative justice is also reflected in respecting parental choice of education for their children – not only in terms of quality but also in terms of education that suits best the cultural and religious sensitivity of the parents/family. Given the provisions of the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (1989) representative justice in the realm of education should also relate to respecting the views of the child in matters that affect them and the possibility to pursue education that respects their freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and expression.[2]

The various facets of justice, while analytically distinct, are in real life interwoven in a complex and often tensioned way. While in some cases claims mutually *reinforce one another*, i.e. 'just' representation might be contingent on recognition and/or 'just' redistribution of resources that enable participation, in other cases the realization of some justice claims *'crowd out'* other claims and/or claims of other members of the community. For example, while parental freedom in choosing "the kind of education that shall be given to their children" is a human right (Art 26),[3] and as such an embodiment of representative justice, it is also a mechanism that could (and does!) help the privileged classes to extend the educational opportunities to their children, often at the expense of children from more vulnerable social milieus. At the same time, the choice of specific type of education for their children (e.g. a vocational school) by parents with low socio-economic status could reflect their adaptive preferences, that is, aspirations and expectations crafted to their (disadvantaged) circumstances, rather than result from their true freedom of choice (see also Buğra and Akkan, 2019, p. 4). Yet, interplay and/or 'crowding' out may take place also within various understandings of the same type of justice claim. For example, when both inattention to difference (and the denial of the uniqueness of a group it implicates) and hypervisibility of specific minority group, for example via essentializing difference, can be a source of recognitive injustice as well as a source of further inequalities. Especially relevant for an educational setting, is the situation in which recognition as a member of a specific minority group (*recognition of difference*) collides with individual need for uniqueness and longing for self-definition that may or may not encompass the minority status (thus recognition of *concrete individuality*) (cf. Knijn and Lepianka, 2018).

Tensions arise as well with respect to the moral grounds of various claims and/or procedural principles that govern different spheres and domains of justice. For example, within popular conceptions of distributive justice three principles are commonly evoked: equity, equality and need (Deutsch 1975; Schwinger 1980; Miller 1992: Miller

---

[2] See in particular the Art 12-14 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989).

[3] Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).

1999). According to Deutsch (1975), which principle is used depends on the nature and goal of social relations. Thus equity (desert, merit) is commonly applied when economic productivity is emphasized; equality in situations when fostering social relations based on mutual respect is prioritized; and need when the goal is the fostering of personal development and personal welfare. Similarly, Walzer (1983) claims that principle of desert/merit is central in the realm of work; equality in the sphere of politics and need in the sphere of security and welfare. However, as discussed in ETHOS reports D2.1 (Rippon et al., 2018) and D2.3 (Knijn et al., 2018), none of such principles is unambiguous. For example, when discussing justice in the sphere of education, Walzer (1983, ch. 8) points to unresolvable tensions between the principle of *simple equality* that requires similar treatment for all children, and the necessity of *differential* treatment, either due to their disadvantage (the questions of need) or because of their interests and capacity (related to desert). To resolve the tension between equality and pluralism, Walzer develops a concept of *complex equality* that recognizes the plurality of criteria for justice. Other authors draw attention to multifaceted nature of equality and differences between equality of welfare, equality of resources, equality of opportunity for welfare or advantage, or equality of capabilities (for a discussion of the concept of 'equality' see Gosepath, 2011). Other moral grounds and/or principles that may govern claims to justice are similarly complex and multifaceted. Miller (1999) distinguishes, for example, between *basic* needs – understood as the conditions required for a decent life in *any* society, and *societal* needs – understood as the larger set of requirements for a decent life in the particular society to which one belongs. While the former is non-negotiable, the latter is variable – its definition will depend, among other things, on dominant conceptions of decent life. As noted by Fraser (1989), what is considered 'legitimate social need' is subject to continuous struggles between groups with unequal resources.

This brings to the fore the issue of tensions between justice claims of various groups. Some of the central questions relate to whether or not the claims of different groups are mutually exclusive and/or whose well-being is prioritized. Relevant here become questions of power relations and domination either via exclusion of certain voices (by ignoring them or missing them out) or via misrepresentation of common interest in a way that imposes a specific vision of common good that serves the interests of the dominant group (Pettit 2004 in Buğra, 2018, p. 22). A related issue is the tension, discussed by Walzer in the context of education, between the well-being of individuals in a society and the collective well-being/well-functioning of the group/community as a whole (Walzer 1983, ch. 8).

Finally, tensions may arise in relation to responsibility for in/justice. This is a complex question. On the one hand, it may relate to responsibility for the creation and/or maintenance of a just society; on the other hand, it arises with respect to who should bear responsibility for vulnerable groups. ETHOS report D2.1 (Rippon et al., 2018) discusses a divide between theories that link the existence of politically just society to "political and social institutions" such as the legal system or the economic structure and theories that emphasize the role of principles that shape private, personal behaviour and actions (p. 17). A similar divide seems to exist with respect to responsibility for the vulnerable: while some theorists emphasize the responsibility of the state as a crucial actor in alleviating vulnerability, others think that anyone who can assist bears that responsibility (Rippon et al., 2018, p. 22). Yet, the question of responsibility in matters of justice relates as well to agency in shaping own life and the lives of one's dependants and to whether or not, or to what extent, an individual can be hold responsible for his/her adverse circumstances or status. Many egalitarians, for example, believe that persons who suffer harm or inequality as a result of their voluntary decisions are themselves responsible and deserve no compensation (other than minimal provisions in case of dire need) (Gosepath, 2011).

The primary goal of this study is to uncover how justice is conceptualized – explicitly and implicitly – in (social) media discourse in the context of educational debates and to identify tensions inherent in the various notions of justice and visions of good life and common good in six countries – Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey and the United Kingdom – characterized by divergent historical heritage, differences in political, social policy and legal traditions as well as dissimilarities in their current socio-economic contexts. While the three Fraser's conceptions of justice constitute the basic reference point of the current study, attention will be also paid to alternative conceptions of justice and/or conceptions that cut across the Fraser's taxonomy (for discussion see also ETHOS reports D2.3 by Knijn et al. (2018) and D7.1 by Knijn and Lepianka (2018)).

Methodology

The analysis presented in this paper synthetizes the results of studies conducted in six European countries: Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey and the UK. In each country, the analysis encompassed between 23 and 52 carefully selected news clips/items that related to an educational controversy or debate. Our interest in *news* media was driven by their relative popularity among various population groups, their strong connection with politics, receptiveness of the most pertinent societal debates and effects news stories have on activating public expression and increasing individual involvement in public discussion of major issues of public policy and politics (cf. Gerstl-Pepn, 2007; King et al., 2017). While the researchers were offered freedom to choose the debate that best reflect justice-related tensions in the realm of education, all were asked to follow similar methodology in data selection and analysis.

In each country, the choice of media was driven by the specificity of the media landscape in a given country, the popularity of specific outlets among the different sections of the population, the ideological profile and the format of the various media (traditional: printed and broadcasted *vs*. digital: in the form of on-line news editions, news blogs, Facebook and Twitter posts). In the selection process balance was sought between: media outlets representing different ideological stance; mainstream media and media addressing a specific target audience; and traditional media and social media.[4] When selecting/sampling media clips/items for the analysis attention was paid to their relevance for the debates; the inclusion of media clips which use different modes (photos, graphs, audio podcasts, video reports, etc.); and the inclusion of the on-line comments made by the audiences.

---

[4] 'Social media' are understood here as digital platforms for the creation and sharing of user-generated content (e.g. Boyd, 2014 quoted in Lomborg, 2017).

(footnote continued)

In the process of qualitative content analysis, the researchers were asked to identify 'frames' used in the media to convey a particular understanding of justice and the legitimacy of various claims and/or claims by various groups.[5] When reconstructing frames, researchers were asked to focus on the reasoning strategies and framing devices.[6] With respect to reasoning strategies the analysis was guided by a set of questions about: (1) *definitions/discursive construction*, explicit and implicit description, of phenomena, concepts, events and actors involved; (2) *causal interpretations*, explanations and/or attributions of responsibility, e.g. for grievances experienced by a specific group (specific minority or majority); presence/absence of agency (who/what is responsible, if anybody/anything); (3) *solutions* advocated, explicitly or implicitly, e.g. to address the grievances; resolve conflicts; prevent or elevate injustice and/or secure justice; and (4) *moral judgments*, including discursive classification of actors, events, phenomena, concepts (positively or negatively) as well as moral arguments evoked to back-up specific standpoints; justify or question the normative rightness of claims. The researchers were asked to map some of the framing (linguistic) devices used, such as: (a) *semantic devices* including the choice of words to denote evaluative attributions of positive or negative traits; synonyms and epithets; collocations; (b) *syntactic devices*, such as impersonal forms (e.g. as a way to refrain from ascribing responsibility); (c) *rhetorical devices*, including allusions, metaphors, illustrations, similes, or irony; periphrases (i.e. indirect ways of expressing ideas, e.g. via extensive use of words); (d) *the content of visual elements*, especially photos but also graphics, cartoons and drawings, short videos and podcasts; and (e) *the presence of content of other texts, e.g.* Twitter and FB messages/entries used as an illustration and/or to structure the story.

The richness, context specificity and uniqueness of various clusters of arguments (combinations of reasoning strategies and framing devices) that constitute the 'frames' in each of the debates studied, make a comparative analysis and/or synthesis of all the results rather challenging. While the various themes, or even arguments, evoked in media debates in various countries are often similar, the constellations of arguments used, i.e. the way they cluster to compose a specific 'frame', differ per country.

The current report constitutes a critical overview of the various conceptualisations of justice that are evoked in education-related debates, the way the tensions between various justice claims and/or claims of various groups are framed, and the way the 'ins' and 'outs' of the various conceptualisations of justice are constructed. While attention is paid to the context (thematic, argumentative, linguistic) in which specific ideas of or claims to justice have been evoked, no attempt is made to construct *meta-frames* that would synthetize the national debates into

---

[5] The concept of 'frame' comes from the work of Goffman (1974), who saw 'frames' as a way of organizing experience. Put simply, 'frames' constitute a specific representation of a problem or phenomenon; they are conceptual tools used by both senders (e.g. media) and receivers (individual members of the public) of messages to convey, interpret and evaluate information (cf. De Vreese, 2005). While journalists inevitably 'frame' the presented reality in order to simplify it and make it accessible to a broad audience, the audience uses frames to give meaning and structure to the incoming information (Valkenburg et al., 1999). The use of frames invariably entails a consistent selection of what is being communicated coupled with the persistent emphasis on some and the exclusion of other elements of the reality.

[6] According to Van Gorp (2005), reasoning devices correspond to the four functions of frames as defined by Entman (1993): they define/describe the problem, they provide the moral evaluation of the problem, offer (or fail to offer) the causal interpretation of the problem and suggest/recommend a solution or treatment to the problem. Framing devices, on the other hand, encompass lexical choices, metaphors, catchphrases and allusions as well as a (thematic) selection of information, its sources, exemplification, choice of stereotypes and dramatic characters (Van Gorp, 2005).

a few (exclusionary) strands. Analytical challenges encountered in the course of the comparative analysis resembled those discussed in ETHOS D4.2 (Lepianka, 2018): the implicitness of justice in the debates analysed and the pitfalls of trying to understand ideas about justice via studying grievances; the entwinement of the various conceptions of justice in the real-life debates; overcoming methodological nationalism and trying to find common vocabulary that would allow mapping the similarities as well as divergences between the national contexts studied.

Overview national reports

In each of the countries under investigation, the researchers were offered freedom to choose the media debate(s) that best reflect justice-related tensions in the realm of education. While certain themes seemed rather universal: in all countries the debates stem from and/or reflect wider disputes in the realm of education about the role of education in the social system, principles that govern access to education, and responsibilities of various (social) actors in the provision and oversight of education, the tensions around the issues of in/justice uncovered in analysed debates were invariably shaped by the socio-political climate in a given country and the historical salience of certain themes. Also the country-specific media landscape, characterized, among other things, by the level of media concentration, ownership, degree of pluralism and the breadth of the ideological spectrum of the mainstream media, as well as the media consumption patterns, has a great influence on the way justice claims and tensions around them are framed.

In **Austria**, the analysis focused on debates around the educational reform, designed and gradually implemented by the new coalition government (between the conservative People's Party ÖVP and Freedom Party FPÖ) from early 2018. The accompanying public debates, revolved around the normative underpinnings of the reform and the choice of structural measures necessary to realize it. The various strands of the debate touched, among other things, upon the importance of academic performance, cultural otherness (reflected in language, identity and religion) as a barrier to educational attainment, and socio-economic background in determining access to education and shaping educational success.

Media clips selected for the analysis came from a variety of traditional and digital news media as well as social media. The Austrian media system is considered to be highly concentrated in the hands of a few media groups and a single state actor. This raises doubts as to the plurality, political/ideological independence and social inclusiveness of the mainstream media market, which – at least with respect to print media – seems to be dominated by outlets representing right and centre-right standpoints. Alternative media sources, both traditional and new, which represent the interests of specific groups, such as LGBTQ, focus on bringing the group-specific issues to the foreground. A separate space in the media market is occupied by ethnic media, commonly produced and addressed at a specific minority group, often in their own language. Alternative community and ethnic media have a strong participatory profile, which gives their users space to create their own content to share ideas and viewpoints via digitalised platforms. In the selection of the media clips attention was paid to the balance between different sources, formats (written, audio, video) and post types (news piece, talk show, blog post, etc.) as well as between majority and minority media (Tiefenbacher and Perschy, 2019).

In **Hungary**, the debates chosen for the analysis revolved around the question of unequal access to quality education of two vulnerable groups: Roma children and children of low socio-economic status. The analysis focused

on the problem of increasing selectivity within the school system linked to: (1) the freedom of educational choice, exercised in particular by white upper and upper-middle class parents who tend to choose private, usually church-run schools, for their children (the phenomenon of the so-called 'white' and 'upper- and upper-middle class flight'); (2) preferential treatment of religious schools by the government; and (3) policy of 'loving segregation'[7] that reinforces the development of separate educational settings for Roma and non-Roma children.

Media clips selected for the analysis came from a variety of traditional print media (newspapers and news magazines), broadcast news (news editions, talk shows, news analysis programmes) and digital news media (news platforms, news blogs and on-line versions of the traditional newspapers as well as their Facebook sites). The mainstream media market is highly polarized, with conservative and nationalist voices, which echo the political stance of the Fidesz/Christian Democrats alliance, enjoying a near-hegemony in the print and broadcast media, and opposition outlets marginalized through ownership changes, financial pressures or loss of broadcasting licences. The growing concentration of the media in the hands of pro-governmental actors, enhance public demand for independent social media and digital news. Produced by small NGOs and journalism centres such outlets tend to be ephemeral only, vulnerable to financial pressures stemming, among other things, from the exceptionally low trust in the (news) media in Hungary and the reluctance of the public to contribute to independent journalism. The ephemeral character of the independent media made it difficult to follow specific media sources across time. Still, in the selection of the media clips attempt was made to balance between the ideological stance of various media, their reach and the socio-economic characteristics of their audience (Kende, 2019).

Segregation in education was the leitmotif of the debates analysed in **the Netherlands**. The analysis focused on three interrelated strands of the debate: ethnic segregation, socio-economic segregation, and religious segregation. Similarly to Hungary, the increasing selectivity with the school system was discussed in the context of the freedom of educational choice, state support for religious and 'specialized' schools,[8] and the phenomenon of 'white flight.' Interesting in the Dutch debate is the long history of the controversy around the special status of 'specialized' schools, dated to the so-called school pacification (*de school strijd*) that took place between 1848-1917 over the equalization of public financing for religious schools and the special position the freedom of educational choice enjoys in the national creed.

In the selection of the relevant media clips, attention was paid to balance between the ideological stance of various media (left-centre-right and religiously informed vs. secular), their reach and the socio-economic characteristics of their audience: ethnicity and social-class, in particular. In general, despite high concentration and lack of

---

[7] The notion of "loving segregation" or "affectionate segregation" used by the current Conservative-Christian government reflects the idea that segregation within school settings can be permitted, or even beneficial, in the process of closing the gap between Roma and non-Roma students, providing segregation is complemented with affection, skilled teachers, and good pedagogical methods. At the same time, the critical opinion leaders (civil society organizations, academics, government-critical media, etc.) consider segregation as an obsolete practice, treating it as a zero-sum issue and tending to cast it in a more negative light, associating it with the violation of "equal opportunities," "equal treatment" and "human rights."

[8] 'Specialised' schools in the Netherlands encompass denominational schools and schools that apply special pedagogic approaches, such as Montessori, Dalton or Jenaplan. All such schools are financed from the state budget, although they are free to ask additional 'parental' contribution, which arguably contributes to segregation between socio-economic groups.

transparency in media ownership, the Dutch media market seems pluralistic, politically independent and socially inclusive, especially with respect to ethnic minority access to and representation in the media (Rossini, 2018). Interesting in the Dutch news media market is the high popularity of digital news sites and apps, and the digital versions of mainstream outlets, many of which appeal to an equal extent to both ethnic minorities and Dutch natives, and left-wing and right-wing audiences (Lepianka et al., 2019).

In **Portugal**, the theme of segregation of minority groups, was approached via the analysis of debates about the invisibility of racial and ethnic minorities, Afro-descendants and Roma in particular, in the schools system, exemplified by lack of ethnic monitoring, on the one hand, and absences, half-truths and omissions in the school curriculum, on the other. In the analysis special attention was given to minority critique of the assimilationist school system that fails to include minority groups in the national project.

Media clips selected for the analysis came from traditional and new media. Traditional news media are, in the Portuguese context, difficult to associate with a specific political ideology and/or specific type of audience (other than social class). New media, on the other hand, such as online newspapers, web blogs, thematic websites/platforms and Facebook pages, are often used by minority groups to express their perspectives. For the current analysis, selection encompassed social media content published on Facebook pages dedicated to interdependent and alternative journalism, content produced by minority organisations and social movements as well as content published on websites and platforms of organisations and institutions working with Roma, Afro-descendants and African migrants in Portugal (Bicas et al., 2019).

The issue of minoritisation of large sections of the population is central to **Turkish** analysis. Here, the investigation of media discourse focused on the issue of the proliferation of religiously informed *Imam Hatip* schools that, following the 2012 reform in the compulsory education system, replaced secular schools in many neighbourhoods and, due to residence based enrolment scheme, have become the only educational option for many secularly-minded families. The debates analysed focus in particular on two questions: one related to the (desirability of) values passed on by the *Imam Hatip* schools and the other revolving around the state favouritism towards *Imam Hatip* schools reflected, among other things, in the allocation of resources.

Similarly to Hungary, the media landscape in Turkey is heavily polarized, reflecting the political and social divides in the country. The most watched TV channels and most read newspapers are politically affiliated with the government, which by controlling the mainstream media outlets via, among other things, public procurements and tax fine tactics, effectively limits their editorial autonomy (Inceoglu et al., 2019). Against the conservative pro-government outlets, stand the Kemelist and/or leftist media representing secular values. These comprise rather small-sized TV-channels and newspapers. For the current analysis, the selection of sources encompassed one newspaper from each of the ideological camps and a well-established and a widely used social media platform to map the perspectives of ordinary internet users (Ruben and Hişil, 2019).

Finally, in **the United Kingdom**, the analysis focused on the Trojan Horse controversy that erupted in 2014 when an alleged plot by hardline Islamists to "Islamicise" schools in Birmingham was made public. The allegation, eventually declared false, resulted in a media frenzy, fueled by several government investigations, professional misconduct hearings and the dissolution of an educational trust in Birmingham. The media debates revolved, among other things, around the questions of truth and authenticity in public debates, the position of Muslim community within

and beyond the school system, the role of education for attainment and passing on values, and the questions of security and trust.

Media covered in the analyses were chosen based on their ideological profile (right, centre, left), target audience (in terms of educational level, age, profession, cultural background and geographical distribution) and media type (specialised and generalist, tabloids and broadsheets, dailies and weeklies, online and printed). Particularly important in the process of media selection was the balancing of their political profile. In the British context, the political centre usually identifies as liberal, the right as conservative, and the left, which comes in a greater variety of ideological variants, mostly gravitates around the Labour Party (Divald, 2019).

Results

Main controversies underpinning the analysed debates

The media debates selected for the analysis, even if related to a specific issue, like proliferation of religiously informed *Imam Hatip* schools in Turkey, or a particular controversy, like the Trojan Horse case in the UK, stem from and/or reflect long-standing disputes in the realm of education, related to three broad issues: the role of education in the social system, principles that govern access to education, and responsibilities of various (social) actors in the provision and oversight of education.

Role education

One of the central controversies underpinning debates in the analysed media relates to the role of education. Is the ultimate, or primary, goal of education to raise the educational attainment and thus the life chances of children or is the primary role of education to pass on values? If the primary role of education is to enhance educational attainment, the attainment of which social groups should be prioritized – should the educational system focus on the educational attainment and life chances of the greatest number and/or focus in particular on pupils from vulnerable groups? If the role of education is the promotion of values, the question often raises: whose values should be promoted – the values of the greater society (e.g. the numerical majority), the socio-culturally dominant group (i.e. the elite), or the values shared by specific religious or cultural communities, which may – on certain points – be at odds with values that are considered to form the 'normative core' of the society in question. If the role of education is to enhance the educational attainment of students from 'vulnerable groups', which groups are they? After all, 'vulnerability' is socially constructed and often a consequence of specific (policy or political) interpretations of socio-economic and historical, but also medical, developments. Moreover, who is considered vulnerable and why might be context-related. While present in all countries under study, the controversy over the role of education seems particularly strong in Turkey and in Austria.

Connected to the above debates are questions about the role of education in enhancing the well-being of the society, or rather, the well-being of a specific *type*, or idealized visions, of society. While some discourses focus on the role of education in promoting inclusivity and embracing diversity as means to achieve social cohesion, other stress the need to enhance the well-being of specific groups, in particular those who have suffered injustice or may feel neglected by the past or present educational practices. Central here are the questions about whose well-being, if anyone's, is prioritized, on what moral grounds and how it is to be achieved. Especially in Turkey, the highly

polarized debates around the role of education stem from a clash between two fundamentally different visions of common good.

Curriculum

Crucial in such struggles are questions about the content of the curriculum as well as who should have a right to contribute to the definition of the educational core. The fundamental question about whose norms and values are promoted is supplemented with questions about how, at what cost and with what consequences this happens. To what extent, for example, does the promotion of a specific, often idealised, vision of the imagined community of value via textbooks and educational programmes takes place through omissions of uncomfortable facts, misinterpretation or silencing of alternative perspectives, and discrediting of the critics. While in the analysed material clashes around the content of the curriculum seem most pronounced in Portugal, they are present in all countries under investigation.

Access to (quality) education and segregation

In Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands and Portugal, the debates about whose well-being is prioritized by the educational system, touch upon the issue of un/desirability of educational segregation and the detrimental effect of mixed vs. segregated education on the various groups in society and the well-being of the society as a whole. In Portugal, the debate revolves around the question of acknowledgement vs. denial of segregation in education and/or absence of minority groups – Roma and Afro-descendants in particular – in educational settings that, like general education high schools and universities, enhance educational advancement and social mobility. In Portugal, the Netherlands and Austria, such absence or underrepresentation of vulnerable groups in more prestigious and/or quality schools is discussed in the context of the early education tracking system that channels children into various educational paths based on achievement and disregarding the social context they come from. As will be shown in this report, the debates touch upon the question of principles that govern the distribution of education as public good and the different visions of common good.

A related issue is the role of religious or otherwise specialised schools in the educational system, the freedom such schools enjoy in shaping their admission policy and curricula, and the effects this has on individual access to quality education and segregation within the education system as a whole. Such debates take place in the Netherlands, Hungary and the UK.

Role and responsibilities of various (social) actors in the provision and oversight of education

One of the questions that arises touches upon the scope of responsibility of various social actors and the division of competences between the various levels of governance: national and local authorities and schools as specific institutions. While the role of the state in securing (quality) education is unanimously acknowledged, the question of how the state fulfils that role and to whom exactly it delegates the realisation of specific tasks is an object of heated debates. For example, what is the freedom of local authorities and school boards, including their fiscal capacity, in shaping the enrolment policies, the composition of the student and the teacher bodies and/or school management within particular schools and/or localities? Who has a say in shaping not only the admission policies but also the curriculum of specific (types of) schools? The debates around those issues often touch on the legal foundation of the educational system, for example in the Netherlands and Hungary, and the accountability of the state for the well-being of citizens, for example in the UK.

How is Fraser's typology present?

Redistribution

As observed by Keddie, a distributive understanding of justice has been significant in shaping the schooling policies and practices in Western countries for some time (Keddie, 2012, p. 266). Unsurprisingly then, in virtually all national contexts analysed, redistributive claims to justice seem to dominate, for example, in discussions about access to *quality* education, affected by discriminatory school admission practices and education tracking system that result in the within- or between-school segregation along the lines of ethnicity (in the Netherlands, Hungary, Portugal), culture and religion (in the Netherlands, Austria) or socio-economic status (in the Netherlands, Hungary), and the concertation of pupils from vulnerable groups in notoriously underinvested educational settings.

In Hungary and the Netherlands, limited access of pupils from vulnerable groups to quality education is linked to the unique position of religious or otherwise 'specialised' schools, which – through their educational (and/or ideological) profile and (implicit) admission policies, often tailored to meet the expectations of white middle class parents – lead to the creation of socio-economically homogeneous school environments and reinforce the processes of 'white flight', 'intelligence flight' or 'middle class flight'. Depending on the political standpoint represented by the media and their audiences, the ensuing educational segregation is seen either as a source of harm for the vulnerable groups robbing them of educational opportunities and chances for social mobility (more leftist media) or as a blessing that enables children from various milieus to develop according to their interests and abilities, and in line with the value systems of their parents (more conservative, right-wing media). In Hungary, for example, the pro-government, more conservative, media refer to "loving segregation" that allows Roma children to avoid the humiliation of "being the stupid of the class" through "forced integration"[9] (Kende, 2019; cf. Zemandl, 2018).

Grievances about the maldistribution of life chances are present as well in complains about the (early) educational tracking system and especially how the biased perception of minority children by their educators affects their educational careers. For example, in Portugal, "[t]here is still the idea that Afro-descendants like more practical things [and] they are thought not to like philosophy, history, mathematics, chemistry, physics,"[10] and that Roma, due to their nomadic way of life, do not value education (Bicas et al., 2019). As a consequence, children with minority backgrounds are more often directed into vocational training than their white colleagues. Also in the

---

[9] Hanthy, Kinga (2016) "Kecskekő, Az igazi problémát Gyöngyöspata szülte." *Magyar Idők* (9/10/2016). Available at: https://www.magyaridok.hu/lugas/kecskeko-1066615/

[10] Roldão, Cristina; Abrantes, Pedro (2016) "Racismo na Escola." *Fumaça* (15/09/2016). Available at: https://fumaca.pt/cristina-roldao-pedro-abrantes-racismo-escola/

(footnote continued)

Netherlands, attention is drawn to the Dutch education as a missed chance; a system, where social inequalities, instead of being reduced, tend to be *reproduced*, not only directly, through differential (implicitly: discriminatory) treatment of children from weaker social milieus, but also indirectly through tempering their ambitions. Especially the more leftist media, emphasize a discrepancy between the normative ideals of equality and meritocracy, which are supposed to underpin the educational system, and the grim reality, in which privilege is often confused with talent and talent wasted. This paradox is aptly summarized by the following observation: "Research after research shows that the Netherlands is an equal society with unequal opportunities."[11]

Important in all those debates is the underpinning belief that educational attainment is a means to alleviate social inequality and to lift particular vulnerable communities (Muslims in the UK, people of colour and/or low socio-economic status in the Netherlands, Afro-descendants in Portugal, or Roma – in Portugal and Hungary) out of socio-economic disadvantage. Education is seen here as a 'vehicle' for advancement, a drive for social mobility.

Redistributive claims to justice are voiced particularly strongly in debates around the allocation of state resources among various types of schools and/or schools that accommodate various population groups. Contentious in those debates is not only the choice of specific allocation principles (e.g. achievement vs. need vs. ideological stance of schools) and the visions of justice that underpin it, but also the consequences the prioritization of specific types of schools or pupils may have for other groups of students. For example, in Turkey the allocation of state resources that favours religiously informed schools (*Imam Hatips schools*) and vocational schools at the expense of good-quality (and religiously more neutral) 'scientific' high schools, which nota bene are in high demand among students and parents, is seen as limiting the educational choices, and eventually also educational attainment and life chances, of a large number of youth, and especially youth of non-religious background and/or those who – due to their scarce financial resources – are prevented from seeking access to private education. The paradox of the system, fed by the ideologically informed mal-distribution of public resources, is well captured by the following quote from *Cumhuriyet*: "Imam-Hatip school, which was built at the cost of 7 million liras, started the new semester with 45 students."[12]

In Hungary, governmental support for religious schools is seen as a mechanism that enhances the well-being of the well-off 'elite' children at the expense of the less well-off, usually Roma, pupils doomed to poorly financed public schools. On the other hand, however, the allocation of resources to educational setting and remedial programmes that serve the advancement of children with minority and/or migration background are framed by certain, usually right-wing, media and their audiences as undue and violating the principle of equality (the Netherlands) or meritocracy (Austria), and experienced as reverse discrimination by the members of ethnic (white) majority. "Always just adapting to the minorities", says a Dutch media user, "by which ordinary and talented pupils are [o]pressed."[13]

---

[11] Thomas, Casper (2016) "Sociale scheidslijnen in Nederland: Generatie ongelijk." *De Groene Amsterdammer* (20/04/2016). Available at: https://www.groene.nl/artikel/generatie-ongelijk

[12] "7 Milyon Lira Harcanarak Yapılan İmam Hatip Yeni Döneme 45 öğrenci Ile Başladı." *Cumhuriyet* (20/09/2017)

[13] A comment by a reader to a blogpost "'Slechte schoolprestaties allochtone leerlingen = Schuld van Ongelijkheid'." *Geenstijl.nl* (07/01/2018). Available at: https://www.geenstijl.nl/5140158/steenhuis-ga-weg-bij-dat-vod/

Recognition

Within the analysed media debates education is often framed as "an enabler for (…) integration" into the (greater) society (Divald, 2019, p. 13). Depending on what exactly this "integration" implies for minority members – assimilation vs. capacity to flourish within the majoritarian culture – education may either stand in the way of recognition, understood as respect for and accommodation of difference, or constitute a *condition sine qua* non for recognition. Our investigation shows that while the latter constitutes the craved for ideal, that former remains the grim reality of educational system, at least as represented in the debates analysed.

The invisibility and the violence of assimilation

The Portuguese example shows how colour blindness and lack of ethnic monitoring is constructed in the media as a form of making a large part of the population invisible. Such invisibility is interpreted as a denial of identity and history, and as a factor that reinforces distributive injustice, especially in educational settings, where ethnic monitoring might be necessary to secure equal access to *quality* education, e.g., via quotas or additional resource allocations to vulnerable populations or schools that serve them. Ethnic monitoring is seen here as necessary to abolish the myth of educational inequality as rooted exclusively in the social-class structure and to grand the issue of racial and ethnic inequality in education, and beyond, a status of a social problem that requires structural solutions. It is also seen as a form of recognizing the ethno-racial diversity of Portuguese society.

Often, however, albeit frequently only tacitly, the inattention to difference, especially in educational settings, is interpreted through the lenses of (forced) assimilation, implicit in tendencies towards uniformization and homogenization of language, standards, procedures and (Eurocentric) curricula. In Austrian minority media, for example, attention is drawn to the non-recognition of the multiple linguistic, cultural and religious backgrounds as enrichment rather than viewing them through the lens of norm-crossing and disadvantage. Important here are also debates about values that are to be transferred through educational system and whose (or what kind of) values these should be. In Austria, Britain and the Netherlands, our analysis exposes a concern, widespread especially on the right, about the educational system passing on of the values that are deemed "separatist" or "extremist" and thus at odds with the national core.

The symbolic violence (of the curriculum) and historical non-recognition

By ethnic and racial minorities, especially those whose presence is historically extended (such as Roma in Hungary and Portugal) and/or related to the history of colonial domination and slavery, absences and half-truths in the curriculum are experienced as a form of non- or mis-recognition and a manifestation of continued oppression (for example, in the Netherlands and Portugal). In Portugal, the grievances touch upon the lie inherent in the dominant narratives of Portuguese colonisation as benevolent, missionary and charitable rather than oppressive and inherently racist. The deep-rootedness of the lie is well reflected in the quote from Fernanda Câncio:

> *It was overwhelming because it was then that I understood that Portugal started the traffic of African slaves to Europe. All my schooling took place after the 25th of April,[14] but we never really talked about slavery. We always talked about the 'Discoveries' and after that, we jumped to being pioneers in abolishing*

---

[14] '25th of April' relates to the Carnation Revolution, a military coup on the 25th of April 1974 which overthrew the authoritarian *Estado Navo* regime.

it [slavery]. We never talked about the forced work imposed on Africa until the 60's, we never talked about racism and the legal status of racism that is the 'Status of Indigenous'. I only knew all this when I started research for this work. Because the post-25th of April was not capable to take down the ideas related to the Portuguese colonialism. It maintained the discourse … of the glorification, of lusotropicalism, the dogma that we are incapable of being racist, that we mixed, that our colonialism was better that of the others.[15]

The harm of the Eurocentric curriculum is not limited to the promotion of a smug, albeit false, image of Europeans as forerunners of civilisation and the portraying of Europe as an embodiment of democracy, development, erudition, citizenship and human rights, but extends to the silencing of the testimonies of oppression and the non-referencing of minority groups' contribution to the nation's (or broader: Europe's) development and well-being. In Portugal, for example, attention is drawn to the 'erasure' from collective memory of the atrocities suffered by Roma throughout their over 500-year-presence in the country and the 'never talk' that devalues and silences the legacy of colonialism and a failure to integrate any "process of truth and reconciliation" into the national project of citizenship building. The "rethinking the narratives of the history of Portuguese colonialism as a benevolent process"[16] is thus seen as a condition sine qua non of justice (Bicas et al., 2019, pp. 16-17).

Grievances about the Eurocentrism of schools are reflected as well in complains about the unequal status of Western and non-Western languages, for example, in the Netherlands:

At school, we limit ourselves to European languages, especially English, German and French. Languages used by ethnic minorities rarely make it to the curriculum. Speaking those languages in school is actually forbidden. In case of pupils of colour you rarely speak of multilingualism, but rather about language disadvantage. It looks as if they possessed not more but less social capital because they speak an additional language.[17]

Similar arguments are raised in Portugal, where attention is drawn to the differential status of the vernacular versions of Portuguese, their exclusion from school curricula and how speaking non-standard version of Portuguese, such as Care Verdean Creole is likely to disqualify one as a discursive partner (Bicas et al., 2019, pp. 17-18). Voices that emphasize how bullying and discrimination against minority children are entwined with blindness to the

---

[15] Câncio, Fernanda (2017) "Passado Colonial. "Não sabemos o lado verdadeiro da nossa história."*Diário de Notícias* (01/05/2017). Available at: https://www.dn.pt/sociedade/interior/o-que-sabem-os-portugueses-do-seu-passado-colonial-6257659.html

[16] Araújo, Marta (2016) "Manuais escolares narram o colonialismo, a escravatura e o Racismo." *Fumaça* (12/10/2016). Available at: https://fumaca.pt/marta-araujo-manuais-escolares/

[17] Agirdag, Orhan and Merry, Michael S. (2016) "Zwarte school is nog niet zwart genoeg." *Trouw (*06/09/2016). Available at: https://www.trouw.nl/opinie/zwarte-school-is-nog-niet-zwart-genoeg~b98aeb15/

(footnote continued)

benefits of multilingualism and the value of growing-up in diverse backgrounds are raised also in Austria (Tiefenbacher and Perschy, 2019, p. 20).

Yet, harmful is not only the very absence of minorities in the curriculum, but especially the consequences of "the whitening of the programme and the silencing of blacks as thinkers"[18] on the sense of belonging of minority children. This is very-well illustrated by a Portuguese mother and a social scientist quoted in *Jornal Público*:

> *'The central person is always the white child who is showing his world.' (…) In a geography textbook where cities are being analysed, the idea expressed is that non-whites 'appeared' in the country 'spontaneously'. Non-white children continue to be treated as foreign and not Portuguese. Therefore, 'a non-white, born in Portugal reads that and questions: why do I need to be integrated?' (…) Based on what right are non-white children deleted from schoolbooks? The right to exist in your own country? I am supposed to trust my country, not to scrutinize the textbooks that are given at school, and not to think that my daughter is being targeted by racism through the manuals.*[19]

Moreover, since "racism is not individual and exceptional, but the fruit of what [the history textbooks] do not teach us,"[20] presence of uncontested colonial references in educational space is seen as interconnected with present day racism, xenophobia, islamophobia and romophobia (Bicas et al., 2019, p. 8).

On the other hand, grievances related to manipulative, false or incomplete curriculum are not exclusive to minority groups. In the Netherlands, similar recognitive grievances are reflected in majoritarian complains about a growing number of 'controversial issues' that teachers – afraid of radicalizing youth – no longer discuss at multi-ethnic/multi-cultural school: "Until recently, it was the Second World War, the Holocaust, Judaism and terrorism that were not discussed, nowadays this also applies to IS, Syria, Saint Nicolas,[21] racism and slavery."[22]

---

[18] Henriques, Joana Gorjão (2017) "As várias faces do ativismo negro." *Jornal Público* (16/09/2017). Available at: https://www.publico.pt/2017/09/16/sociedade/noticia/as-varias-faces-do-activismo-negro-1785487

[19] Henriques, Joana Gorjão (2017) "Com que direito se apagam as crianças brancas dos manuais." *Jornal Público* (9/09/2017). Available at: https://www.publico.pt/2017/09/09/sociedade/noticia/com-que-direito-se-apagam-as-criancas-naobrancas-dos-manuais-1784746

[20] Rodrigues, António (2017) "Racismo. Isto 'não é um problema de polícias ignorantes' mas de impunidade." *Jornal SOL* (12/07/2017). Available at: https://sol.sapo.pt/artigo/571875/racismo-isto-nao-e-um-problema-de-policias-ignorantes-mas-de-impunidade

[21] The Dutch tradition of Saint Nicolas (Dutch: Sinterklaas) constitutes one of the most contentious issues in the contemporary Netherlands, mainly due to the controversial figure of Black Pete that constitutes its crucial element, while being also fervently criticized as a symbol of unacknowledged racism that pervades (contemporary) Dutch society.

[22] Marbe, Nausicaa (2017) "Politici, voer actie tegen segregatie!" *Telegraaf* (02/02/2017). Available at: https://www.telegraaf.nl/watuzegt/53696/politici-voer-actie-tegen-segregatie

(footnote continued)

In Turkey, a sense of injustice related to the content of curriculum and norms and values imposed by school dwells on both sides of the highly polarized ideological scene. On the one hand, in the secular, leftist *Cumhuriyet*, voices are raised against the symbolic violence in the form of replacement and/or erasure of historical figures, narratives, names and symbols of the secular values of the early republic[23] with religious figures, symbols and practices that prioritize the religious norms and values. Grievances include the renaming of schools but also the re-installing of the public character of religious practices. Sense of harm is clearly echoed in the headlines from Cumhuriyet: "They are erasing Atatürk", "*Imam Hatip* principal swears to secularism: All the thieves and bastards are seculars" or "Student Oath is forbidden, praying is free," (Ruben and Hişil, 2019) and accounts of the transforming of important monuments of the republic into religious, medrese-like *Imam Hatip* schools. On the other hand, in the conservative, pro-government *Sabah*, *Imam Hatip* schools are seen as a response to the historical grievance of misrecognition experienced in the times of secular republic by those who adhere to traditional values. The sense of injustice underpinning this type of grievances is well captured in a quote from Erdoğan:

> *[in times of secular republic] children and young people [were raised] in a way in which they were disconnected from their history, their land, all their national and moral values. Severing a nation, a civilization from their own toots, from their own soul, their essence, their history and ancestry means destroying that nation in its entirety* (cited in *Sabath*, 2014).[24]

The violence of 'othering'

Recognitive grievances are reflected as well in complains about labelling and 'othering' of ethnic minority members, their homogenization and the generalization of negative stereotypes. In the Netherlands, for example, the indiscriminate application of the term *black* to children with Moroccan, Syrian, Iranian, Surinamese, Latin American and African background, inherent in the application of the term *black* to denote schools in which at least 50 per cent of students have a 'non-Western' migrant background,[25] is interpreted as a sign of *mis*recognition and

---

[23] Early Republican era in Turkey usually refers to the period from 1920s that the country was founded until 1938.

[24] Haberleri, Gündem (2014) "Yeni bir çalışma başlatıyoruz." *Sabah* (5/7/2014). Available at: https://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2014/07/05/yeni-bir-calisma-baslatiyoruz

[25] In the Netherlands a distinction is made between people with Western and non-Western migration background; the latter category comprises persons with roots in African, Latin American and Asian counties (with the exception of Indonesia and Japan) or Turkey (source: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/onze-diensten/methoden/begrippen?tab=p#id=persoon-met-een-niet-westerse-migratieachtergrond).

(footnote continued)

exclusion from the community of value: ''By calling specific groups black, you actually say: you're not really Dutch."[26]

In Portugal, the violence of 'othering' is reflected in the relevance of insulting and pejorative images that present Africans as 'primitive peoples' with no history of their own, but also in the (discursive) inclusion Roma and Afro-descendants, who enjoy full Portuguese citizenship, in the all-encompassing category of immigrants (Bicas et al., 2019, pp. 23-24). Protection offered to those groups of population by the High Commission of *Migration* seems painfully ironic; in itself an act of recognitive violence.

In Hungary, the misrecognition of Roma is reflected in some of the pro-governmental rhetoric of care and "loving segregation" that attempts to justify the necessity of segregated education by "cultural otherness" and special educational needs of Roma children "to practice the different rules of human co-existence" and "[to learn] how to wash their hands and use the toothbrush"[27], which could be interpreted as a form of naturalization of the supposed inferiority of ethnic and racial minorities observed in Portugal (cf. Bicas et al., 2019, p. 22).

Complains about symbolic violence are also echoed in the criticism of the biased administrative structure of schools. While the discussion of the underrepresentation of specific societal groups within the institutional structure of schools suggests some concern with the unequal distribution of power and thus might be more readily linked to representative understanding of justice, the grievances about the under-representation of ethnic or racial minorities in the teacher body and/or the school boards in the Netherlands point as well to the far-reaching consequences of the absence of diversity might have for recognitive justice, namely the implicit message it conveys that pupils "can learn only from *white* teachers."[28] In the media clips analyzed it is actually suggested that, if internalized, such a biased message is likely to negatively affect the self-esteem of the children of colour and/or reinforce their societal mis-recognition.

Indeed, in virtually all countries, media reports include complains about micro-violence in the form of derogation and/or dehumanization, like in Portugal, where one of the minority pupils complained: "When we were studying the origin of humanity [in school] and there were images of the ancestors of the man they said [the white students] that it was us, that we were like the monkeys."[29] Telling here is also an example taken from a Portuguese textbook, where the following sentence "H is for Helena, she is black, but she says that she is a brunette" strengthens the derogative meaning of 'black' and the apparent non-reliability of assertions make by people of colour (Bicas et al., 2018, p. 22).

Unjustified accusations

---

[26] van Gelder, Lorianne (2016) "Zwarte en witte scholen, het lijkt wel apartheid." *Parool* (13/12/2016). Available at: https://www.parool.nl/nieuws/zwarte-en-witte-scholen-het-lijkt-wel-apartheid~b6b311c1/

[27] Szilvay, Gergely (2015) "Roma-magyar együttélés: mi számít szegregációnak?" *Mandiner.keresztény* (4/06/2015). Available at: https://kereszteny.mandiner.hu/cikk/20150604_roma_magyar_egyutteles_mi_szamit_szegregacionak

[28] Agirdag, Orhan and Merry, Michael S. (2016) "Zwarte school is nog niet zwart genoeg." *Trouw* (06/09/2016). Available at: https://www.trouw.nl/opinie/zwarte-school-is-nog-niet-zwart-genoeg~b98aeb15/

[29] Câncio, Fernanda (2017) "É preciso descolonizar Portugal." *Diário de Notícias* (13/06/2017). Available at: https://www.dn.pt/portugal/interior/racismo-e-preciso-descolonizar-portugal-8558961.html

One of the central mis-recognition grievances relates to the unjust accusations of misconduct and/or the stigmatization of those (unjustly) accused. Who is considered the actual victim of misrecognition depends very much on the discursive frame used and/or the ideological perspective/colour of the media outlets where the grievances are voiced.

In the UK Trojan horse case, the Muslim community experiences stigmatization through unjustified and indiscriminate surveillance all community members, including children as young as four years old, have been subjected to. Important here are the feelings of being demonized, scapegoated and exposed to a "witch hunt"; the harm the stigmatizing surveillance causes to the (cultural) identity of Muslims in the UK; and how the mistrust institutionalised in the adopted surveillance measures reflect the symbolic status of Muslim citizens within the British society. As observed in *the Guardian*:

> *It remains impossible to separate the way the Trojan horse allegations were treated from the wider context of how Muslims are viewed in British society: as a potential threat, a fifth column.*[30]

In Turkey, a sense of injustice is conveyed in protests, voiced by the conservative *Sabah*, against the misrepresentation of the conservative sections of the society, the *Imam-Hatip* students in particular:

> *The reports and discourses which say that conservatives or Imam-Hatip students are sliding towards 'deism' are a dirty operation, a dirty attack and a dirty trap. It seems that those who are disturbed by the [that fact that] generations [are] raised by Imam-Hatip schools and conservatives … [want to] disrepute them and, in the end, move them away from Islam* [31]

As the above quotes show, important as source of injustice is not only the very act of forming allegedly unfounded accusations, but also their assumed consequences for the group being smeared.

The minoritization of the (alleged) majority

Against the recognitive grievances of minority members stand the feelings of misrecognition experienced by the members of the alleged (ethnic, religious, cultural) majority that result from both: the (perceived) disdain with which (ethnic, religious, cultural) minorities treat (supposedly) majoritarian values and their way of life and the undue recognition of the minority claims by the government and/or state institutions – either now or in the past. On the one hand, attention is thus drawn to homophobic comments and/or unfair treatment of girls and women by Muslims that violate the (supposedly) majoritarian values (for example in the UK and the Netherlands). On the

---

[30] Shackle, Samira (2017) "Trojan Horse: The Real Story behind the Fake 'Islamic Plot' to Take over Schools." *The Guardian* (1/09/2017). Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/sep/01/trojan-horse-the-real-story-behind-the-fake-islamic-plot-to-take-over-schools

[31] Haberleri, Gündem (2018) 'Bekir Bozdağ:Deizm iddiaları kirli bir operasyon." *Sabah* (22/4/ 2018). Available at: https://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2018/04/22/bekir-bozdag-deizm-iddialari-kirli-bir-operasyon

(footnote continued)

other, majoritarian grievances are underpinned by a feeling of having been abandoned by policy and politics overwhelmed with the consequences of the insufficiently regulated migration and the inadequate (too lenient) integration policies that often result in the apparent 'surrender' of the authorities to minorities' sense of entitlement (Lepianka et al., 2019, p. 20). One of such consequences is the alleged minoritization of national values, culture and language by 'foreigners' in schools. In Austria, concerns are raised about Austrians who are becoming de facto 'outsiders' in 'foreign classes', that is school classes dominated by foreigners. This concern is well captured in readers' comments: "Alright, so now half of the students [in classrooms overall] are not Austrians! That means that in a couple of years, the real Austrians will be a minority!"[32] or "It won't take very much longer and we will be foreigners in our home country."[33]

In a similar vein, in the Netherlands, some media attention was offered to the case of Mees – a 13-year-old Dutch boy discriminated against by his classmates as "the only boy with blond hair and blue eyes" in a 'black' school.[34] Added to this are the claimed grievances of misrecognition experienced through 'misplaced' and thus unjustified, in the eyes of the racial majority, accusations of racism:

> *The allochthon never goes further than always pointing the finger at the native Dutch and crying out [about] discrimination and racism in relation to circumstances they themselves have created in the past 50 years*[35]

A different type of recognitive grievance, yet in a twisted way related to the processes of 'minoritization', is related to the rejection of the secular values, and especially values of gender equality, in Turkey. Discriminatory treatment of women in *Imam Hatip* schools, where mixed sex education has been abolished, separate corridors have been created to isolate male and female students, and instances of sexual harassment against girls are ignored, pushes secular social groups, women in particular, into the margins of social life and deprives them of the status they acquired in the times of the secular republic. The worsening position of women is a part of the broader process of the minoritization of secular segments of the population via depriving them of educational opportunities that would match their values, norms and the way of life.

Representation

Within the realm of education, claims to representative justice are not particularly pronounced (Choules, 2007). Also in the media debates on selected educational issues analysed for this study, representative claims to justice seem to be voiced rather sparingly and often indirectly. Interesting here are the debates in Portugal, where the

---

[32] A comment by a reader to article "'Müssen die finden, die Gift in Schulen tragen'." *Kronen Zeitung* (12/9/2018). Available at: https://www.krone.at/1769553

[33] A comment by a reader to article "Deutsch nur bei Hälfte der Schüler Umgangssprache." *Kronen Zeitung* (13/09/2018). Available at: https://www.krone.at/1770642

[34] Duin, Roelf Jan (2016) "Mees (13) trekt het niet meer als enig wit kind in de klas." *AD (*18/10/2016). Online version of the article available at: https://www.ad.nl/nieuws/enige-kaaskop-in-de-klas~a8e0a98a/

[35] A comment by a reader to the blog post "'Slechte schoolprestaties allochtone leerlingen = Schuld van Ongelijkheid'." *Geenstijl.nl* (07/01/2018). Available at: https://www.geenstijl.nl/5140158/steenhuis-ga-weg-bij-dat-vod/

inequality in educational attainment and underrepresentation of students of colour in higher education settings is interpreted in the context of their (future) absence from decision-making bodies (Bicas et al., 2019).

Most often, however, representation related claims take the form of demands for incorporating parental voice in the matters of relevance for the education of their children and/or calls for diversity in school boards and the teachers' body. Especially in the Netherlands, the discussion of the underrepresentation of specific societal groups, usually ethnic, religious or cultural minorities, within the institutional structure of schools reflects concern with the unequal distribution of power.

For representation the issue of who is actually given the opportunity to participate in the (educational) debate, to determine its content and to exert influence (on par with others) on the solutions adopted is central. On the other hand, although being given voice constitutes a necessary condition for a meaningful participation, it does not necessarily imply equal participation in the process of deliberation. In Portugal, the non-recognition of minorities as population groups with own identities and needs, including educational needs, is given as a reason for their reluctance to participate in a national project that is of not-of-their-making.

Indeed, in most of the discourses analysed, it is not only the inclusion/exclusion of specific voices in the debate that is being problematized, but also the value – in terms of importance and legitimacy – of specific voices as well as the scope of their influence. In most countries under study, the issue of the incorporation of minority voices to co-determine the *content* of mainstream curriculum and/or its *moral foundation* is a serious bone of contention, mainly due to the alleged incompatibility of minority norms and values with the national 'core.'

The issue of legitimacy of the voices included became relevant in the UK case, where much of the Trojan Horse controversy revolved around the presence in the debate of biased and untrustworthy actors, whose distorted accounts made the task of establishing the "truth" that would permit a "just" resolution impossible (Divald 2019). The UK focus on the actual working of the national debate draws attention to the procedural aspects of deliberative justice: the importance of transparency, avoidance of procedural irregularities and errors. As stated by Divald (2019), "if procedural justice is breached, justice as representation is difficult to achieve" (p. 23). As discussed in one of the subsequent sections, the issue of just procedures and fair treatment in a communicative process is also strongly linked to epistemic justice.

With respect to representation, the UK case highlights, more than other country cases, the importance attached to state institutions as "legitimate representatives" that are "supposed to exercise their authority legitimately, impartially and competently for all segments of the population" (Divald, 2019, p. 23) and are guardians of justice procedures. The apparent failure of the UK authorities to respond fairly to the concerns of different groups seems to put into question their capacity to act as genuine representatives of the whole population. Also in other countries, the alleged failure of the authorities to perform according to what is considered 'the general will' (which *nota bene* differs per frame adopted) is seen as a breach of social contract and a failure of representation. While not always explicit, the grievances of non-representation by the authorities seem particularly strong in the media which stand in the ideological opposition to the authorities, current or past, whose decisions negatively affect(ed) the part of the society whose perspective the particular medium (or a self-proclaimed representative in case of audience members) claims to reflect. In Turkey, this is well illustrated in the content of pro-governmental *Sabah* which praises the current government for "listening to the demands of the citizens" and – via active facilitation of *Imam Hatip* schools, restores past injustices suffered by the religious part of the society, the students and graduates

of the *Imam Hatip* schools in particular. On the other hand, the oppositional *Cumhuiyet* accuses the government of ignoring the wishes of vast population who demands adequate access to secular 'scientific' schools and true freedom of choice in educational matters.

Other notions of justice present in the debates

As noted in previous ETHOS reports D2.3 (Knijn et al., 2018) and D7.1 (Knijn and Lepianka, 2018), Fraser's tripartite typology of justice is not necessarily exhaustive; alternative claims to justice and/or claims that run across the three ideal-typical facets of justice are also identifiable in the media debates analysed: claims based on civil right and liberties, claims to procedural justice, claims understood in the spirit of capabilities and functionings, claims to epistemic justice, historical justice and redress and understandings of justice as freedom from fear and (ontological) insecurity.

(Civil) rights and liberties

The notion of *freedom* is at the heart of education-related debates. This is hardly surprising considering that the right to education is in itself a freedom right, with a strong element of free choice and free exercise, and that it is strongly related to both freedom of religion and freedom of expression (cf. Salát, 2019). The language of freedom in the realm of education is particularly often used in the Netherlands, where freedom of education is frequently construed as a core democratic value, closely related to freedom of choice and general suffrage, and complying with the principles of the liberal rule of law. In Turkey, the proliferation of the religiously informed *Imam Hatip* schools, at the expense of secular schools, is claimed to have limited the right of parents to choose (secular) education for their children. The fact that the limitations of choice affect disproportionately financially disadvantaged families further adds to the injustice by conditioning the exercise of civil rights on financial resources. The violation of freedom of choice is intertwined in the Turkish debates with recognitive and redistributive claims to justice. Forcing children and their parents to make educational choices against their convictions is seen as a form of misrecognition; the de facto conditioning of freedom of choice upon parental resources constitutes a form of redistributive harm.

Interestingly, in Hungary the right to freedom of (educational) choice and exercise is presented by pro-government media as in opposition to the 'oppressive' human rights rhetoric that misrepresents the position and interests of minority groups, Roma in particular. While the government-critical media accuse the government of the unequal treatment of minority groups and the anti-democratic "limitation of minority rights", the pro-government media condemn human rights lawyers for being dogmatic and missing the problem of non-integration and general, also normative, incompatibility of the Roma population. Interesting in those debates is the implicit conflict around the autonomy of Roma population – while the more liberal, government-critical media through the use of human rights rhetoric subscribe to a vision of Roma, and other vulnerable groups, as an autonomous subject capable of using their rights and liberties, the pro-government media seem to adhere to the government's paternalistic vision of vulnerable groups as in need of corrective action (Kende, 2019; cf. Zemandl, 2018).

It is worth noting, however, that in education research freedom of parental choice is closely related to representative justice. As noted by Power, "the language of choice (…) appeals to a form of justice based on participation", having a voice and influence, which is at the core the Fraser's understanding of justice as

representation (Power, 2012, p. 485). Within ETHOS the entwinement of the representative justice in the language of rights and civil liberties has been also noted, for example in D4.2 (Lepianka, 2018).

Procedural justice & double standards

As already alluded to, breaches in procedural justice, understood as administration of justice, underpin many other grievances of injustice. For example, who is given voice and how much this voice counts (representative justice) might be a question of *just* or *fair* procedures. Similarly, as shown by the UK case, procedural irregularities in the investigation of school (mal)practices might affect the legitimacy of conclusions formed and – in case of unjustified accusations – contribute to misrecognition of those wrongly accused. In the latter case, the injustice of misrecognition was further aggravated by procedural irregularities that prevented the unjustly accused from clearing their name.

In the Netherlands, grievances about procedural injustice range from criticism of biased admission procedures that allow schools to segregate between less and more desirable students and result in unequal access to (supposedly better) 'white' schools, to complains about the biased treatment of children from weaker milieus, visible in more strict evaluation of their test results, which – in combination with early tracking system – often limits their educational advancement and negatively affects their social mobility. In Turkey, complaints about the injustice of double standards in admission procedures are evoked when the pro-government media reflect on the injustice of a coefficient rule that until 2011 confined the *Imam Hatip* graduates to divinity faculties, thus effectively limiting their access to university education (Ruben and Hişil, 2019).

Strongest claims to procedural justice, however, seem to be made in Austrian debates around the current coalition's (ÖVP-FPÖ) proposals for clear, uniform standards, rules and procedures in evaluating individual educational achievements. This procedural strictness, which aims at securing 'just' outcomes on the basis of merit, is also criticized for its neglect of the needs of vulnerable groups, the implicit bias for the already privileged (autochthonous able-bodied Austrians) and the inequality of outcome it is likely to perpetuate. In its essence the Austrian debate seems to touch on the relationship between procedural and substantive justice and how this relationship is determined by a specific/preferred understanding of substantive justice.

In the material analysed, 'double standards' refer as well to the dubious, shifting standards applied by state institutions (e.g. the educational inspectorate Ofsted in the UK; see Divald, 2019, p. 22) and the 'unjust morals' of the actors involved. In Hungary especially, the various political sides of the debate – the human rights activists opposing educational segregation on behalf of Roma minority and the government officials promoting segregation, again, on behalf of Roma minority – mutually accuse each other of cynicism, hypocrisy and manipulative use of Roma issue to promote their own interests. While such forms of discrediting are sometimes experienced as misrecognition (e.g., by the proponents of religious education in the Netherlands) and/or epistemic injustice, in the Hungarian case they are also used to expose the double morals of actors who in real life fail to hold onto values officially preached (human rights activists) or frame themselves as defenders of vulnerable groups to promote their own elitist interests (governmental officials).

Interesting in this context is also the emphasis on establishing the "truth" as a precondition and at the same time an aspect of procedural justice and thus, at the end, also an aspect of substantive justice (recognitive, representative, redistributive, etc.). For example, in the UK Trojan Horse debate assessing "what really happened"

and whether the Trojan Horse document (recognised by all to be a fraud) and its allegations (more debated) were true or not is considered a condition sine qua non of deciding on what is the "right thing to do" and how to "judge" the various actors involved. At the same time, however, the irregularities in the procedure that impeded the assessing of the "truth" (and just confirm or refute allegations) were condemned for obstructing justice.

Capabilities & adaptive preferences

Understood as a person's capacity to pursue a life she has reason to value (Sen, 1999), capabilities seem to permeate all claims to justice. Yet, they seem particularly pronounced in views of education (system) as a missed chance, where social inequalities, instead of being reduced, tend to be *reproduced*, not only directly, through differential (implicitly: discriminatory) treatment of children from weaker social milieus, but also indirectly through tempering their ambitions. As testified by an Afro-descendant student in Portugal,

> *in the phase of character-building, the child feels that they [the teachers] do not believe [in] her, that they do not encourage her. Within a short time span she internalizes the idea that she does not deserve to be a good student, internalizes an image that [she] is not good[36]*

In line with Sen, the latter might be interpreted as a factor that contributes to the development of *adaptive preferences* that reflect not the talent and aspirations of the children, but their adaptation to restrictive social conditions. Such grievances seem particularly pronounced in Portugal, or in the Netherlands and Hungary in the context of ethnic and socio-economic segregation of schools. However, to certain extent they seem also relevant in Turkey, where the enrolment system and school quotas, forces large numbers of ambitious students into lower quality religiously-oriented schools (*Imam Hatip*) or vocational schools. A quote from a government-critical newspaper, *Cumhuriyet*, captures the sense of injustice well:

> *Thousands of children [with high grade averages of 90 and above] could not enter any [scientific] school … You have destroyed the hopes, dreams, beliefs of all these children… What [will] happen to [those] young people who are supposed to be our future?[37]*

Children are often framed as being 'robbed of [educational] chances', 'trapped' or 'confined' and deprived of possibility to flourish. Usually, such framing refers to children from vulnerable milieus, whose choice of adequate education is limited and/or whose ability to follow extra-curricular activities outside of school are limited due to the cultural and financial capital of their parents. However, just like in case of other claims to justice, grievances related to the limited capabilities are not necessarily restricted to minority members. In most countries, the 'majority' children's capability to develop their talents is believed to be diminished by poor quality of education, often attributed to the presence of minority. Strikingly, concern for the capabilities and functionings of the 'majority' (white, well-off) children often leads to recommendations of unbending meritocracy-based standards

---

[36] Câncio, Fernanda (2017) "É preciso descolonizar Portugal." *Diário de Notícias* (13/06/2017). Available at: https://www.dn.pt/portugal/interior/racismo-e-preciso-descolonizar-portugal-8558961.html

[37] Atalay, Figen and Ozan Çepni "İmam Hatip projesi çöktü: 200 bin öğrenci system dışında kaldı." *Cumhuriyet* (30/7/2018). Available at : http://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/egitim/1041471/imam_hatip_projesi_coktu__200_bin_ogrenci_sistem_disinda_kaldi.html

within the educational system (Austria) and/or segregation of students according to their (supposed) aptitude, thus disregarding the capability needs of (less well-off) minority pupils (in Hungary and the Netherlands).

Epistemic justice

Another conception of justice that runs across multiplicity of justice claims voiced in the educational debates is – the so far unexplored in ETHOS – epistemic justice. While epistemic injustice can take various forms, it is usually evoked when someone is wronged in their capacity as knower or epistemic subject (Fricker 2007; 2013; 2017). Fricker distinguishes between 'testimonial injustice,' which occurs when someone's knowledge and/or credibility is ignored, rejected as false, treated as less relevant, or deflated because that person is a member of a particular social group; and 'hermeneutical injustice', which occurs when someone's experience cannot be rendered intelligible (by them or by others) because of the unavailability of sufficiently shared concepts that could adequately identify or explain that experience or because of the style of communication. Kidd and colleagues (2017), in their *Introduction to the Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*, define epistemic injustice as "those forms of unfair treatment that relate to issues of knowledge, understanding and participation in communicative practices" (Kidd et al., 2017, p. 1). Regardless of the specific definition or form, epistemic injustice is believed to be generated by stereotypes and prejudices about marginalised groups and a derivate of unequal power relations. At the end, those who are considered highly credible as knowers are usually drawn from more privileged groups.

In the analysed media debates on education claims to epistemic justice are most clearly present in discussions about curriculum, and more specifically, omissions and silences about the (historical) harms inflicted by the dominant group (in most countries analysed: white majority) and experienced by (the ancestors of) specific categories, such as Afro-descendants (Portugal) or Roma (Portugal and Hungary). In the Portuguese debates, attention is drawn to the lack of rhetorical space and means by which minority groups could contribute to the Portuguese canonical historiography with stories of exploitation, plundering, prosecution and extermination (testimonial injustice).

The grievances of epistemic injustice strongly resonate in complains about the inculcation of the dominant historical narrative in the minority groups. Important here are the processes of the relativization of the violence of colonialism and the trivialization and obliteration of racism. Such grievances are again well illustrated in the Portuguese debates, where attention is drawn to instances of visual misrepresentation of racism through "an image of a slave subtitles 'dancing on a festive day' that gives an idea that slavery was not so bad and that they were even entitled to a day off and could hold their festivities and preserve their cultures" or the way the myth of non-racism of the Portuguese is reinforced by the paradigm that associated racism with Holocaust or apartheid in South Africa, but not with colonialism (Bicas et al., 2018, pp 19-20). While such instilling is itself a form of epistemic violence, it also contributes to the hermeneutical injustice, as it deprives the racialized minorities of resources necessary to conceptualize, evaluate, or understand some of their experiences (cf. Fricker, 2007).

In the UK Trojan Horse debates, the grievances of epistemic nature seem echoed in the media clips that reflect on the position of Muslim communities as an epistemic actor and especially their perceived credibility, not only in the Trojan Horse controversy itself but in any (future) controversy. As observed by Miah in his piece in *Discover Society*:

> *It (the story) is seen to confirm existing pre-conceived ideas of Muslim communities undermining a secular liberal consensus in Britain… The fact that an unauthenticated document has had such a huge impact on*

public discourse sets worrying precedents for the future, as it potentially frames future allegations of Muslims setting up Trojan Horses to infiltrate politics, local authorities and even the NHS.[38]

Arguably, it was the perceived lack of credibility of the Muslim community that allowed the untrue allegations to take "on a life on their own"[39] and made it possible to exclude Muslim voices from the public debate, at least at its outset. It was also the lack of credibility of the Muslim community as a whole that made possible the introduction of far-going security measures targeted exclusively at Muslims, which again is likely to further undermine their credibility:

Firstly, it seems that the indiscriminate use of Prevent measures is used to frame young Muslims, some of them as young as 4 years, through the lenses of counter-terrorism. Secondly, one of the most significant moments in a child's memory of attending nursery starts with, as far as Ofsted[40] *is concerned, with a deficit, or a label, which implies they are potential 'terrorists'.*[41]

On an individual level, telling as well is a testimony of a former high school student in Portugal, who having scored a 10 in a history test had to wait for the grade until the next test:

That is, she [the teacher] wanted to see if the 10 was actually mine. Since I was a black, she needed to check. Obviously, we are much more analysed, evaluated and scrutinized. There is a question about our abilities and potentialities since kindergarten.[42]

The above example clearly shows how the credibility of a minority member, including the child (!), tends to be evaluated through the lens of their social location and the generalisation of negative stereotypes about the group they putatively belong to (cf. McConkey, 2004).

Strikingly, in the educational debates analysed for the current study, epistemic harm is evoked in the grievances of both the vulnerable and the (relatively) powerful groups. For example, in the Netherlands, where the (supposedly white Dutch) audience of right-wing media feel harmed by the leftist elites that "reject logical explanations, refute existing evidence" thus ignoring the (or their: white majority's) 'truth' about the threat ethnic minorities and their institutions pose to the Dutch society.

Central to those grievances is the issue of trust/distrust and trustworthiness/untrustworthiness of the testimonies circulating in the public sphere. In the Trojan Horse controversy (the UK), the authenticity of the Trojan Horse document were often rejected as a "hoax", "forgery", "fake", "fraud", not "genuine", "unauthenticated",

---

[38] Miah, Shamim (2014) "Trojan Horse, Ofsted and the 'Prevent'Ing of Education." *Discover Society* (1/07/2014). Available at: https://discoversociety.org/2014/07/01/trojan-horse-ofsted-and-the-preventing-of-education/

[39] Shackle, Samira (2017) "Trojan Horse: The Real Story behind the Fake 'Islamic Plot' to Take over Schools." *The Guardian* (1/09/2017). Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/sep/01/trojan-horse-the-real-story-behind-the-fake-islamic-plot-to-take-over-schools

[40] Ofsted stands for Office for Standards in Education. It is a state agency with a mandate to inspect primary and secondary schools in England.

[41] Miah, Shamim (2014) "Trojan Horse, Ofsted and the 'Prevent'Ing of Education." *Discover Society* (1/07/2014). Available at: https://discoversociety.org/2014/07/01/trojan-horse-ofsted-and-the-preventing-of-education/

[42] Henriques, Joana Gorjão (2017) "Dos afrodescendentes espera-se que não passem da 'escolaridade obrigatória'." *Jornal Público* (09/09/2017). Available at: https://www.publico.pt/2017/09/09/sociedade/noticia/dos-afrodescendentes-esperase-que-nao-passem-da-escolaridade-obrigatoria-1784725

"unverified" and "debunked" (Divald, 2019, p. 9). Also in other national contexts, various actors search for 'authenticity' of information circulated and accuse some other participants of the debate of lies, 'false news', 'propaganda' and/or manipulative use of 'evidence' or data, such as statistics (e.g. in the Netherlands, but also Turkey and Hungary).

Often, such accusations are in themselves a form of epistemic harm, though. After all, as emphasized by Fricker (2007), perceived epistemic credibility of an actor relates to both: their perceived competence as knower and their perceived sincerity (discussed in Hawley, 2017, p. 70). Attempts to undermine the credibility of the opponent by the pro-government media in Hungary constitute a very good example of epistemic injustice. The intentions of activists who oppose educational segregation of Roma children as a violation of human rights is questioned by pro-government media through presenting them as elite members – "human rights lawyers from Rose Hill [= a posh district in Budapest inhabited by highly educated]" – who in real life rarely, if ever, get in contact with Roma, yet "give pep talk[s]" that disregard Roma interests. At the same time, mutual accusations of manipulation and lies, and battles over credibility, seem related to struggles over social power. As noted by Hawley (2017), "distrusting, or withholding trust is … an exercise of social power: you may deny other people important opportunities when you fail to trust them, both through the practical consequences of your distrust and through its symbolic power" (p.70).

Essential to some of the debates analysed is the status of 'truth' or 'establishing the truth' as a condition *sine qua non* of doing justice. For example, establishing the "truth" about the real victims and about what really happened in the Trojan Horse controversy is seen as necessary for the identification and resolution of other injustices (Divald, 2019, 12), including misrecognition and/or redistribution. At the same time, 'establishing the truth' necessitates 'epistemic justice', understood as an equal ability of all the participants of the debate to exert epistemic influence, that is to share their knowledge as credible partners of a conversation that have the capacity to actually convince the other to one's point of view. Fricker refers to such a situation as "the cooperative ethos of mutual epistemic recognition" (Fricker, 2018, p. 4). Understood in such terms, epistemic justice seems to require proper, on par, inclusion in a conversation, or what Fraser has called "participatory parity" and/or Benhabib, following Habermas, discussed under "discourse ethics."[43]

---

[43] Various authors made connection between epistemic justice and recognition (McConkey, 2004; Congdon, 2017; Fricker, 2018; Giladi ,2018); whereas others have stressed the distributive dimension of epistemic justice, understood as receiving less than fair share of an epistemic good, such as education or access to expert knowledge, information or advice (e.g. Coady, 2017). Fricker also explores the connections between epistemic justice and representation (2013).

(footnote continued)

Justice as redress

The understanding of justice as a form of redress for harm suffered, albeit present, in not always very pronounced in the analysed material. Also, the understanding of redress and its functions seems to differ between countries analysed. In Portugal attention is drawn to the uncovering the "truth" of the violence of colonialism as a necessary condition of reconciliation and the granting to minority groups a position they deserve. Redress is linked here to processes of social reconciliation and restorative justice.

In Turkey, the reconciliatory element is absent. In conservative, pro-government media, the proliferation of the religious *Imam Hatip* schools is often presented as a reaction to harms experienced by the schools in the times of secular republic: "The harm done [to *Imam Hatip* schools] between 1997 and 2002 has hardly been repaired until 2010. We thank the politicians and state officials for repairing the damage."[44] The privileges the schools currently enjoy are framed as a form of redress for past discrimination; the (alleged) harm this inflicts on other, secular, schools and their students is silenced although not necessarily explicitly denied (nota bene just as the 'reparative' function of current favouritism towards *Imam Hatip* schools is silenced by the proponents of the secular values). At the same time, the repeated framing of the facilitation offered to the *Imam Hatip* schools as a form of compensation for past suffering ("the shackles are broken") seems to serve the purpose of explaining, if not legitimizing, policies that to some might appear unjust. The insistence on the temporal lens and historical perspective offers a possibility to diminish the relevance of their grievances.

A reversed framing is used in Hungary, where right-wing pro-government media portray the international (especially EU) involvement in the issues of Roma education in Hungary as 'revenge' for the uncompromising stance of Hungary in the face of the 'refugee crisis' in 2015. Since Hungary (or pro-government media on behalf of Hungary) does not feel guilty of inflicting harm, the 'revenge' of the European institutions is clearly seen as unjust injury; an act of misplaced punishment designed to make the alleged culprit suffer. Although no reference is made to retribution as such, the language of vengeance indicates some relevance of retributive interpretations of justice, if only to explain the action of others.

Justice as protection (& freedom from ontological fear)

Protection, or – to refer to a concept tentatively applied in ETHOS reports D4.2 (Lepianka, 2018) and D7.1 (Knijn and Lepianka, 2018) – 'ontological security,' is yet another facet of justice whose relevance emerged in several of our country studies. Used in particular by conservative and/or right-wing media and their on-line active audiences in Austria, the Netherlands and the UK, the right to protection of one's surroundings and way of life (or freedom from ontological fear) is claimed by, or on behalf of, those who feel that 'the continuity of [their] self-identity and in the constancy of the surrounding social and material environments' (Giddens, 1991, p. 91) is threatened by Islamic fundamentalism: non-Muslim white majority, Christians, women, homosexuals. Occasionally, the right to 'protection' is extended to Muslim-children seen as in danger of indoctrination and eventually radicalisation by

---

[44] Haberleri, Gündem (2018) "28 Şubat sürecinde 2 kez görevden alınan İmam Hatip Lisesi Müdürü o günleri anlattı" *Sabah* (28/02/2018). Available at: https://www.sabah.com.tr/gundem/2018/02/28/28-subat-surecinde-2-kez-gorevden-alinan-imam-hatip-lisesi-muduru-o-gunleri-anlatti.

extremists, although it is not really clear if the 'protection' is going to secure, or to violate, the 'ontological security' of the children.

In contrast, in Turkey, it is both the religious segments of the society that are in need of protection against the rather vague "enemies of the people," implicitly identified as the establishment and supporters of the secular republic, and the secular segments of the population whose norms and values are being violated by Islamist order. In both cases, it is the experienced (now or in the past) inability to secure the continuity of the preferred social and moral order and the craving for such continuity that drive demands for justice.

Strikingly, calls for justice as protection, or freedom from ontological fear, are often veiled in the language of war, invasion and/or military operation.

Tensions identified

The various justice claims are commonly seen as entwined. For example, in the UK, the Netherlands and Austria, the more liberal, usually left-wing, media and their audiences plea for the recognition of minority (also Muslim) identity and community, also as a way to support the educational attainment of minority children. The recognitive claims of various minority groups often go hand in hand with demands for more just distribution of resources (for example between schools serving different groups of students) and minority voice and representation within school settings. Moreover, as illustrated in the Turkish debates about *Imam Hatip* schools, redistributive injustice suffered by non-religious schools in terms of resource allocation, which affects the schools' capacity to admit all the students who would like to enrol, is seen by its critics not only as a cause of the unequal distribution of educational opportunities for a large number of youth (redistributive justice) and a factor that negatively affects their ability to flourish and lead the life which have reasons to value (capabilities), but linked as well to the violation of students' norms and values by forcing them into religious practices.

On the other hand, as expected, our analysis reveals numerous, frequently interwoven, tensions between various types of claims, the procedural principles that govern different spheres and domains of justice, the moral grounds on which claims are made and, last but not least, between justice claims of various groups.

Tensions between facets of justice

As discussed by Fraser, realisation of recognitive claims to justice is often in conflict with the realisation of justice understood as fair distribution of resources. And vice versa. The latter tension is acknowledged in Portuguese debates, where the (policy) focus of poverty and class structure as the main factor explaining educational inequalities, pushes the injustice of colour blindness and the role of racism in the perpetuation of structural inequalities out of public debate and consciousness (Bicas et al., 2019, p. 27).

In other countries, the tensions between recognition and redistribution are more clearly interwoven with tensions between justice claims of various groups, which also appeal to different justice principles that govern redistribution of resources. In Austria and the Netherlands, more conservative media and their audiences often draw attention to how recognition of minority cultures and needs allegedly violates the principles of just distribution, for example via preferential treatment (larger investment!) of minority pupils and schools that accommodate them. It is also asserted, although often indirectly, that the recognition of the special educational needs of minority children negatively affects the majority's children educational development and their capabilities.

Comparable concerns, although reversed with respect to the identification of (potential) victims and beneficiaries of the existing educational policies, are expressed by more liberal, usually left-wing media and their audiences, which criticize the privileged position of denominational schools and/or policies that prioritize(d) freedom of educational choice over equal opportunities. The tension between the freedom of choice and the distributive ideals of equal opportunity seems particularly hotly debated the Netherlands and Hungary, where the parental prerogative to choose the most suitable education for their children is juxtaposed against its adverse consequence: white/intelligentsia/middle class 'flight' that contributes to educational segregation and, in consequence, the inequality of educational attainment, opportunity and social mobility. On the one hand, in the more conservative media, segregation is presented as an unavoidable side effect of the much celebrated freedom of education, an aftermath of a natural parental drive to advance their children by boosting their well-being and future prospects and a corollary to the basic human need to associate with those whom we find similar. On the other hand, in the more liberal (Hungary) or left-wing media (the Netherlands), it is sometimes suggested that freedom of educational choice is not identical for *all* parents, but conditioned on parental resources in the form of economic, social and cultural capital.

Moreover, in the Netherlands, Hungary and Turkey attention is drawn to redistributive injustices generated and/or reinforced by the prioritization of the freedom offered to religious schools in shaping their admission policies (the Netherlands, Hungary) and/or by the preferences they enjoy in the allocation of state resources (Hungary, Turkey). The (renewed) recognition of the traditionally dominant and/or historically embedded religious identities is framed by the more liberal, left-wing media, as a cause, even if indirect, of a skewed distribution of educational attainment, life chances and capabilities that puts some children, especially children from more vulnerable socio-economic milieus, in a disadvantage.

In addition, support of religiously informed education in the name of the recognition of religious identities and values endorsed by parents, is sometimes framed as disadvantageous for the capability development of the children who attend religiously-informed schools. Since the schools are believed to foster intolerance for difference and to narrow down the horizons of their students, children attending them are less likely to "flourish in a modern multicultural society." While this type of fear is more often expressed in relation to the disabling capacities of Muslim schools, e.g., in the UK, similar concerns are also voiced in relation to Christian schools, for example in Hungary or the Netherlands.

On a different note, recognition of (religious/cultural) difference is often perceived to be at odds with a broader sense of justice linked to the well-being and safety of the society. For example, recognition of (even some elements of) Muslim culture is construed, especially by the more conservative media and their audiences, as a threat to the ('ontological') security of the majority, predominantly white, population. Thus, the freedom enjoyed by Muslim parents to pass onto their children their values and ways of life raises concerns and demands that the passing of "extremist values," values deemed "separatist" or "extremised" should not be recognized by the state.

All in all, the privileged position of denominational schools, while justifiable on the grounds of recognition of difference and/or civil liberties, freedom of religion and freedom of choice, is often framed in the analyzed media as at odds with the demands of redistributive justice and the well-being of society a whole. Attention is drawn to the harmful effects of religious indoctrination and the threat it poses to emancipation, tolerance, progress and science; and – last but not least – the adverse effects of (religion based) segregation on social integration and cohesion.

Tensions related to the principles of justice & the moral grounds for justice

Tensions between the various principles of (redistributive) justice – merit, equality and need – seem particularly pronounced in the Austrian debates on the proposed reforms in the education system and their normative foundations. The debates revolve around the fairness of the whole educational system and whether or not (or to what extent) it should aim at increasing educational attainment through uniform ('equalizing') standards and procedures that reward hard work, discipline and achievement (meritocracy) or, alternatively, through addressing individual needs and securing equality of opportunity through systemic redistribution.

Similar controversy, although less central in the debate, is present in the Netherlands, where the freedom of (white, middle class, Dutch) parents to choose schools for their children is defended also on the grounds of the educational abilities, achievements and aspirations of the (white, middle class, Dutch) children which are likely to sink in mixed schools that focus on addressing the needs of the often mediocre and unruly pupils form weaker milieus. In those debates the tensions between different principles that should govern the distribution of (quality) education frequently coincide with tensions between the claims of different groups.

Tensions arise as well respect to (past) suffering as a moral ground for affirmation, for example, in the form of preferential treatment. While redress and compensation of past harms do not seem controversial in themselves, tensions arise if compensation or redress implicates new suffering (arguably by a different social actor, often the alleged culprit of the past harm). While this trade-off is not necessarily verbalized in the debates analysed, it does seem to underpin controversies around the preferential treatment of religious schools in Turkey. Interesting in those debates is the assumed virtue, or blamelessness, of the (alleged) victims and the silencing of the harm they might have inflicted (in the past) or are inflicting (now) on some others, who also claim victimhood. This is very well illustrated in Turkey, where the affirmation of the historical victims (traditional, religious sections of the society) is framed as a moral triumph, with no attempt to acknowledge the harm, or sense of injustice, it might bring to other groups. On the other hand, the claims of injustice currently suffered by the secular sections of the population are devoid of reference to the harms the early republic might have inflicted on the religiously-minded groups. In both cases, the potential victimhood of the other is silenced. Discursively this is linked to the praxis of de-personalization of the other, who being framed as 'them' or 'the enemy' or 'the threat', seems to lose his/her moral claim to victimhood (and justice?).

Somehow related to the question of victimhood as a moral ground for justice, is the question of 'truth.' While 'truth' is often framed as a condition for enacting justice, tensions arise around who has the right, authority and means (tools) to establish the truth. As already noted, the importance of truth – understood through the lens of authenticity of claims and veracity of testimony – is particularly prominent in the Trojan Horse debates in the UK. Yet, the relevance of 'truth' as a means to and evocation of justice is also relevant for the debates in other countries. In the Netherlands, one of the frames identified in the media debates, unfolds mainly in reaction to the criticism that is experienced as ill-founded, based on 'fallacies', stereotypes, misconceptions, and erroneous information, and which in itself is experienced as a form of misrecognition.[45]

---

[45] Frame labelled in the Dutch country report as: "Freedom of Choice as a democratic value and right" (Lepianka et al., 2019).

The need for 'truth' as a condition for enacting justice is also reflected in the use of numbers, statistical data, reports and academic sources to establish the real scale and consequences of educational segregation in the Netherlands and the demands of real figures on the number of Roma and Afro-descendants residing in Portugal. In both those cases, the 'truth' of quantified data seems to offer a sort of a measuring rode that permits an evaluation of the scale of injustice and a solid basis for the development of policy that would tackle the various forms of exclusion and discrimination. In some media clips, the rightfulness and/or legitimacy of certain claims to justice seems to be evaluated on the basis of their 'accuracy' and/or measurable 'objectivity.'

Tensions between groups

Particularly pronounced in more conservative media are tensions between the claims of different social groups. Most important here are the disagreements as to whose well-being is threatened, who is the actual ('true') victim of injustice and who is the potential agent of the injustice inflicted.

Suffering victim vs. source of threat

Interesting in the material analysed is the relativity of the status of victim – often reversed depending on the ideological stance of the media. In Turkey, where the polarisation seems to be strongest, the sufferer-threat dichotomies run along the lines of secular/religious us vs. them, where the specific characteristic of 'us' and 'them' differ by context.

In Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands and the UK, in the more conservative, right-wing media, it is usually the white majority that is construed as a victim of (ethic, racial, religious) minority groups, the state and its (unjust) policies that favour minorities, or both. In Austria, the presence of children who deviate from the majority children in terms of culture (religious affiliation), language acquisition, but also discipline and morality, is believed to negatively influence the school system – both in terms of knowledge transmission (quality of education) and safety (problems with drugs and violence). The hard-working (implicitly white Austrian) students are portrayed as cheated of their educational opportunities through ever-sinking standards, outputs and quality of education; and a victim of "the experiments of the leftist educational planners."[46] Often the threat posed by minorities is framed as extending far beyond the educational settings. The alleged domination of Turks in Austrian public life, coupled with their alleged disregard for majoritarian values, are seen as a threat to the cultural continuity of the society as a whole.

If a minority group is construed as a victim by the conservative, right-wing media, they are the victim of self-exclusion and – in the case of Muslims – Islamic fundamentalism and extremism. In the UK, in the context of the Trojan Horse controversy, Muslim children in particular are construed as victims of their own communities that prevent them from flourishing and by cutting them off from the wider society make them "vulnerable to segregation and emotional dislocation."[47] Yet, also in the Netherlands, the right-wing audiences make reference to Muslim parents blaming them for the educational lack of success of their children. The consequences of such a

---

[46] *Unzensuriert.at* (2017) "Neue Regierung auf Leistungskurs im Bildungswesen". *Unzensuriert.at* (18/12/2017). Available at: https://unzensuriert.de/content/0025783-Neue-Regierung-auf-Leistungskurs-im-Bildungswesen

[47] Murray, Douglas (2014). "Save Our Children from the Islamists." *The Spectator* (4/06/2014). Available at: https://www.spectator.co.uk/2014/06/save-our-children-from-the-islamists/

rhetoric might be far-reaching. A belief that somebody suffers harm or inequality as a result of their voluntary decisions and is thus responsible for their disadvantageous position may go hand in hand with a denial or relativization of injustice they might be suffering.

Exceptional in this context are the right-wing, pro-government Hungarian media, which construe the Roma minority as a victim of human right lawyers who, aligned with EU in attacks against Hungarian educational policy of "loving segregation", act against the actual interests of the Roma children.

In the left-wing media, minority members are usually portrayed as a victim of (structural) neglect and institutional discrimination that prevents them from developing their talents and capabilities. In Hungary, they are presented as a victim of governmental policy that serves the isolation aspirations of the majority, and in particular the interests of religiously-minded elites. In Portugal, minorities are seen as victims of historically embedded institutional racism. In the UK, particular attention is drawn to the misrecognition of the Muslim community in the form of false accusations and stigmatization through associations with terrorism, extremism; Muslim communities are also recognized as an object of witch-hunt by government officials, demonized and scapegoated.

In general, minority groups are thus presented as either a suffering victim or a threat to the majority (children). For example, in Hungary media critical of the government accuse the authorities of manipulating Roma parents into support for school segregation against the interest of Roma children. On the other hand, the educational integration of 'uncultivated' and 'morally deprived' Roma children in mixed schools is presented by the pro-governmental Hungarian media as a threat to non-Roma. Such as duality is observable also in other countries.

Beyond the us-them rhetoric?

While the juxtaposition of the majority and minorities permeates the analysed material, in all countries there are frames that seek to move beyond the us-them rhetoric, with or without the actual embracing of diversity. In the Netherlands, for example, two frames that plea for freedom of parental choice in educational matters, justifying it on the grounds of historical tradition, constitutional rights and civil liberties, refrain from privileging (the grievances of) any specific socio-economic or ethnic group. While disregarding the issue of the potentially negative side-effect such freedom may bring to less privileged social groups, the two frames seem to view educational segregation as natural, or even beneficial to all groups of children who can develop in a familiar environment, surrounded by students of the same kind. Similar voices are raised in pro-governmental, right-wing, Hungarian media, which refer to "spontaneous segregation"[48], thus absolving political actors from responsibility for segregation of education along ethnic lines, and which describe the governmental policy of "loving segregation" as equally beneficial for

---

[48] Hanthy, Kinga (2016) "Kecskekő - Gyöngyöspata – az igazi problémát a politika szülte." *Magyaridok* (5/10/2016). Available at: https://www.magyaridok.hu/lugas/kecskeko-1066615/. The concept of "spontaneous segregation", fiercely contested in academic literature, relates educational segregation to residential segregation.

(footnote continued)

both: Roma children (attending secular schools) and Hungarian children (and especially those attending religious schools).[49] Characteristic of this rhetoric is avoidance of explicitly negative valuation of minority groups and evasion of juxtaposing the (white, national) majority against the (racialized) minority. Rather, the implicitly negative stereotypes of Roma are clothed in paternalistic care that defends segregation on the grounds of "special pedagogical methods" necessary to address the "cultural otherness" of Roma children. Moreover,

> *[Roma] families are happy that their children can learn in small [segregated] classes: they are in a safe place all day long, get a meal several times a day, surrounded by attention and love; they can learn music and participate in extracurricular programmes.*[50]

Such a rhetoric is rejected by the left-wing media, which protest against the framing of Roma children as requiring special care.

The embracing of diversity that is paired with the recognition of the inherent agency of all actors, without pushing any of them in the role of a victim, is rather infrequent. In one of the frames identified in Austria, the 'otherness' of members of minority groups (religious, ethnic, sexual), although acknowledged and recognized as a cause of disadvantage in many social settings, is simultaneously presented as a source of pride and a strength. Rather than dwelling on the suffering of the minority groups, emphasis is placed on how their 'ascribed' difference constitutes an asset and a benefit. For example, multilingualism is not necessarily foregrounded as an object of neglect and disregard in the system of education, but rather as a gift and a special privilege of some minority groups.[51] Still, the 'agency' of the minority groups is not explicitly discussed in the context of them taking the responsivity for their (future) position in the society. Rather tellingly, the frame is exclusive to on-line platforms addressed at minority audiences.

<div align="center">

Tensions related to the scope of responsibility

</div>

In all the debates analysed, responsibility for the education process and outcomes is placed on a multiplicity of actors: parents, teachers and school boards, local and national authorities. However, the weight, range and content

---

[49] It is worth noting that most non-Roma children attending religious schools in Hungary are non-religious and their (or their parents') choice of religious schools is driven by the schools' elitist status.

[50] Anita, Élő (2015) "Szeretetteljes felzárkóztatás – A Kúria döntött, a baloldal elszörnyedt." *Valasz.hu* (23/04/2015). Available at: http://valasz.hu/publi/szeretetteljes-felzarkoztatas-a-kuria-dontott-a-baloldal-elszornyedt-111937?utm_source=mandiner&utm_medium=link&utm_campaign=mandiner_201811

[51] Indeed, as observed by one of the Austrian readers, "It's … sad that this immense potential of linguistic competency is constantly portrayed as something negative in the media. All languages are valuable." Source: Bag, Abdullah (2017) "Deutsch als Fremdsprache: Muss das etwas Negatives sein?" *Das Biber* (1/3/2017). Available at: https://www.dasbiber.at/blog/deutsch-als-fremdsprache-muss-das-etwas-negatives-sein

(footnote continued)

of this responsibility differs per frame used within and across countries. In more conservative discourses, emphasis is placed on parental responsibility for the outcome of the educational process. Equipped with the freedom to choose the education that is best suited for their children, exempt from the blame for "white" or "middle class" flight, (majority white) parents are viewed as the ultimate agents of the educational success of their children. In a similar vein, educational failure of, for example, minority children is attributed to the short-sightedness and lack of proper care on the part of their parents or their insufficient integration in the (host) society. For example, in Hungary, the pro-governmental media accuse Roma parents of "holding their children back"[52] despite all the governmental investment in remedial education (Kende, 2019, p. 19).

At the same time, there seems to be less consensus as to the scope and nature of responsibility that rests on the authorities, especially with respect to remedies. For example, in the Dutch discourses that defend the freedom of educational choice and construction of segregation as a natural process with no serious consequences for social relations, the role of the authorities is envisaged as clearly facilitative. Moreover, responsibility for any policy-related developments is delegated to the local level – the municipal authorities, school boards, civil society – thus exempting the national-level actors from structural reforms. Yet, in the discourses that frame the majority as a victim of multiculturalism and the politics of identity, decisive action on the part of national government is also demanded. In the Netherlands and Austria, where national authorities are blamed for the drama of multiculturalism, unfettered migration and failed integration of newcomers, the responsibility of the authorities lies in reversing the negative trends and – above all – in securing the continuity of the nation and national values through curbing the unwanted 'foreign' influences and demands. To what extent that means (forced) assimilation or deportation remains unclear.

On the other end of the ideological spectrum, causal responsibility for injustices within educational system and/or responsibility for the reparation of past harms and prevention of new grievances is clearly attributed to the politicians and authorities, coupled, occasionally, with a praise of minority parents' involvement in the educational advancement of their children. For example, the *Teaching Times*, in the UK, contrasted the attitudes of Muslim parents to those of the white working class in Birmingham:

> *It's also true that the Muslim population has led to a revival in the performance of the city's inner-city schools because of their commitment to education. Many of them are faring much better now than the white working-class schools in the outlying council estates – what are euphemistically called the 'White Highlands'. In educational terms, they are really the 'White Lowlands'. Muslim parents, especially the leaders in their community, are much more involved in education than their white counterparts and see it as critical to the*

---

[52] Velkei, Tamás (2015) "Agyi szegregáció." *Mandiner* (24/04/2015). Available at:
https://mandiner.hu/cikk/20150424_velkei_tamas_agyi_szegregacio.

(footnote continued)

health of their community. If such were the case in other schools in the city, teachers would be gleeful about more committed parental involvement.[53]

Remedies advocated to address redistributive injustices range from – a rather fundamental – abolition of the freedom of educational choice (for example, in the Netherlands), to far-reaching structural changes in the system of early tracking and/or limiting school autonomy in shaping their own admission criteria. With respect to the latter, in Hungary, Portugal and the Netherlands, calls for de-segregating educational settings and integration of minority children in mixed schools and classes are common. On the local level, discussed predominantly in the Netherlands and Hungary, preference is given to improvements in the quality of education, investments in attractive school infrastructure and amendments in teachers' education to increase their sensitivity towards minority children and prepare them "for inclusive pedagogy" [54] and/or accessible forms of supplementary tuition for socially disadvantaged pupils. Calls for well-integrated anti-poverty and housing policies are also present, especially in Portugal, where the problem of school segregation is construed as linked to territorial segregation. Politicians and (national) authorities are also held responsible for addressing recognitive injustices, suffered in particular by minority groups. In Portugal, authorities are hold responsible for de-colonizing and de-racializing of the curriculum and for altering the racialized structure of schools (composition of student and teacher body, management and school boards) that reinforces the reproduction of the colonial power- and class-relations and tolerance for racially motivated micro-aggression.

Tensions & visions of good life and common good

All those tensions seem very much rooted in the differing, sometimes incompatible, visions of good life and common good. Such a conflict is most acute in Turkey, where the controversy around the *Iman Hatip* schools is rooted in a fierce struggle between two irreconcilable value systems and visions of morality: the religious values of the current regime and the secular-modernist values (of the early republic). The conflict is most apparent with respect to ideal of gender relations and the position of women.

In other countries, tensions arise around the relative importance of freedom of choice of education and the right of parents and communities to nourish and transmit their (cultural and religious) values. Interestingly, those tensions may cut across the traditional opposition between liberal and communitarian visions of social life, where the former emphasize the autonomy of the individual and importance of individual liberty, and the latter accentuate the social nature of the self and the normative value of community. The freedom of educational choice is believed to reinforce the transmission of significant communal values, some of which – such as those religiously informed – might be far from promoting individual liberty or autonomy. This is well illustrated in the Netherlands, where freedom of choice of education is defended as a liberal right and a part of Dutch political history and national identity, deeply embedded in the Dutch *poldermodel or pillarization* and the culture of consensus; and where it is

---

[53] *Teaching Times*. n.d. 'Is There an Islamic Conspiracy in Birmingham Schools?' *Teaching Times.* Available at: https://www.teachingtimes.com/articles/is-there-an-islamic-conspiracy-in-birmingham-schools

[54] Újlaky, András (2016) "Kelletlenül. A kormány és az unió vitája a szegregált oktatás miatt." *Magyar Narancs* (03/11/2016). Available at: https://magyarnarancs.hu/publicisztika/kelletlenul-101452

being criticized for its negative effects on social segregation, social integration and social cohesion (Lepianka et al., 2019).

Interesting in this context is the tension, noted in the UK report, between *respect for diversity* and *the promotion of diversity*, "where the latter necessitates some form of separation between groups to enable the community to pass on its own values" (Divald, 2019, p.15). The general view of a society that seems to be cherished here is that of separation between groups leading parallel lives; a vision of society in which different social groups have the freedom and possibility to pursue their goals and thus also to choose the type of education that best suits their norms and values and benefits their children most. Implicitly, such a vision underscores the value attached to the recognition of difference and the equality among the relatively independent social groups**,** present, for example, in the Dutch tradition of pillarization, but reflected as well in the Hungarian metaphor of "loving segregation." In the UK, and to certain extent also in the Netherlands and Austria, such *promotion of diversity* is problematized due to its consequences for Muslim children, who are not allowed to 'flourish,' but also to the broader society, due the threat of Muslim radicalization and security threats. Fear of "parallel social worlds" and societies split into enclaves or island of (normatively) unconnected "tribes" urges the more conservative media, and especially their audiences, to demand a nearly total assimilation (or expulsion) of minority groups (or those members of the groups who do not conform to the norms and values of the majority). Crucial here is the issue of the perceived loyalty of the minority members to the state. Interestingly, however, 'loyalty' is not necessarily a value in itself: while minority members are expected to show loyalty to their host society, their loyalty to their own community is not judged by the same standards. Indeed 'moderate' Muslims in the UK, who remained silent after the Trojan Horse controversy broke, were accused by the rightist media of not speaking against Islamic fundamentalism; their loyalty and belonging questioned (Divald, 2019, pp. 20-21).

At the other end of the ideological spectrum, the more liberal and/or leftist media call for the embracing of minority groups as beneficial and enriching to the (host) society. Problematizing the apparent disregard for unequal power relations and the interdependence of different social groups, they plea for offering to minority groups a space to flourish and grow into the tissue of their (host) societies as their respected on par members. Securing real equality of opportunity via redistributive policies and promotion of mixed, in some context also secular schools, engaged in developing civic skills, is seen as a condition sine qua non of social cohesion, presumed to rest on the grounds of common (civic!) identity and respect for difference.

Discussion and Conclusions

The primary goal of this study is to uncover how justice, as an abstract and complex concept and phenomenon, is evoked in the (social) media in the context of educational debates and to map tensions inherent in the various notions of justice and visions of good life and common good. The role of media in informing and influencing public discourse, including education politics, is hard to overestimate. By creating, selecting, steering and shaping information for public consumption, media generate points of view, promote social agendas, frame problems and contribute to strengthening or undermining support for specific policies, practices and ideologies. Various stakeholders mobilize media for strategic advantage, for example, during a period of important social reforms.

Media also constitute an important outlet for popular discontent with existing policies and practices. The questions of what is just, to whom and on what moral grounds are usually crucial in those debates.

The role of education in the realization of (*social*) *justice* is ambiguous. On the one hand, education is considered crucial for the eradication of persistent inequalities and enhancement of social inclusion. On the other, due to its contribution to the (re)production of particular identities and social positioning, it is often seen as an important source of *in*justice. This tension, or contradiction, is hardly surprising considering a general lack of consensus on what kind of *justice ideals* education policies should pursue (redistribution vs. recognition), which allocative principles they should follow (need vs. desert vs. ability) and on what moral grounds, whose well-being they should prioritize (majority vs. minority), and who is ultimately responsible for the *just* 'outcomes' of the educational process (authorities vs. school vs. parents).

Focusing on the media debates on education allows us to tap those aspects of justice and justice-related tensions that have become most salient in various national context and most reflective of the current norms and ways (cf. Peeters and d'Haenens, 2005, p. 202). In this paper, we focus in particular on tensions that arise in debates on justice for minority groups, that is groups that are more likely to be classified as the 'other.'

As in other ETHOS reports, Nancy Fraser's tripartite framework of justice as recognition, re-distribution and representation constituted the starting point of our investigation. Our analysis shows that the way (social) media frame the various facets of justice in debates around educational issues overlaps with how the various elements of the Fraser's framework are conceptualised in educational research, thus confirming the usefulness of Fraser's analytical lens in disentangling the various forms of injustice that take place in the realm of education. At the same time, it shows how the various education-related grievances extend way beyond the school setting and question the entirety of social relations, their normative underpinnings and the power structure that legitimizes them.

In the material analyses, recognitive injustices are evoked particularly strongly in discussion about the assimilative agenda of schools that denies the various 'others' to co-author the curriculum and thus to nourish not only their own identity, but also the social respect for 'other-ness' and 'other-thinking' that characterises (or should characterise) a truly inclusive society. Practices of obliterating 'uncomfortable' historical figures, events and processes, discriminating between 'better' and 'lesser' languages and cultural backgrounds, refusal to *sympathize* with the other, where sympathy is understood as "sharing (or having the capacity to share) the feelings of another"[55] are thus interpreted through the lens of exclusion, but also self-exclusion - shutting oneself off the wider society, which disadvantage not only the individual or group in question, but the whole national community.

As expected, redistributive grievances permeate discussions about access to quality education, school admission policies, education tracking system, redistribution of public resources among various types of schools. Underpinning all those claims is a firm belief in the role of education in nourishing talent and ambition, on the one hand, and its significance for the alleviation of social inequalities, on the other. The debates revolve around the question of whether or not and 'how' the current educational system, succeeds in fulfilling its fundamental social mission; they

---

[55] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/empathy#note-1

expose tensions over the principles that govern the allocation of "justice", and – indirectly – groups whose well-being is, often implicitly, prioritized.

Strikingly, representation as a dimension of justice is less directly present in the media debates; most often they come to the surface in complains about insufficient inclusion of specific voices (parents, minorities) in the educational matters, issues of curriculum, educational core and admission policies and/or demands for a more diverse teacher's body. Particularly striking here is the absence of attention to the 'voice of the child' – in most of the analysed material children seem a mere object of reporting (and concern!) rather than an active subject and a partner in the debate that directly affects them and, moreover, has a pronounced influence on their future socio-economic status and position within the society.

The relative infrequency with which the issues of representation, children representation in particular, are discussed in the analysed media debates might stem from the sampling procedures applied in the current research. On the other hand, however, such absence, if confirmed in other research, is in itself telling. As noted by Choules: "Discourses about injustice often do not involve an analysis of power relationships. The absence of a power analysis benefits those groups who occupy positions of power" (2007, p. 461). In other words, not talking about power relations invariably contributes to their maintenance. This applies as well to the adult-child and parent-child relation.

When linked to mis-recognition of specific social groups, on the one hand, and the silences, omissions and half-truths they often complain about, on the other, representational injustice taps on epistemic injustice, understood as unfair treatment in issues of knowledge, understanding and participation in practices of communication and deliberation. Epistemic injustice has been identified in this report as one of the conception of justice that runs across multiplicity of justice claims voiced in the educational debates, alongside claims that appeal to civil right and liberties and/or human rights framework, claims to procedural justice, claims understood in the spirit of capabilities and functionings and understandings of justice as freedom from fear and (ontological) insecurity.

One of the goals of the current study was to map the justice-related tensions that are most salient in media discourse. The analysis allowed us to shed additional light on the tensions between various claims to justice, tensions between different understanding of justice claims and tensions between the principles that govern the realisation of justice. For example, it showed that the principles of merit, need or equality that seem to dominate in the distributive paradigm of justice, may be insufficient in explaining what is considered 'just' in allocation of 'education.' The demands of more or better, or rather different, education and/or special treatment of various groups may stem not from their perceived neediness or merit but rather their demands for redress (Turkey) and/or recognition of the unique contribution they make to the national community (Portugal).

Particularly relevant in this context is the media representation of tensions between justice claims by different groups, such as between the majority and a minority, secular and religious segments of the society, groups of different socio-economic status. Media are often claimed to subscribe to tacit cultural assumptions that may lead to the exclusion of the concerns of marginalized groups from the media content (Gerstl-Pepin, 2007, p. 4). Questions are then raised about the extent to which the oppressed groups are actually represented in and by the media, but also whether or not the position of the marginalised groups is devalued by their biased, usually negative, presentation. In much of the analysed media debates on education, one of the central, albeit often unspoken, questions, revolts around the issue of victimhood. The establishing who is the victim of policy (past or present),

institutional failures and in/action of some 'other' seems to constitute one of the necessary conditions to re-establish justice.

Given the immense moral power of victimhood and its appeal as a moral ground of justice, this is hardly surprising. Important here, however, is the implied blamelessness of the victim conveyed, for example in the opposition between a sufferer and a threat, uncovered also in our study, and the moral consequences of viewing the issue of victimhood through an 'either/or' lens. Diane Enns (2012) draws attention, among other things, to how absolving the victim from co-responsibility for shaping the socio-historical context in which injustice is taking place and/or searching for a better future, may ultimately deprive them of agency as moral actors. In addition, our analyses show how claiming victimhood, for example by a majority, may be paired with denying the victimhood of the other, in this case: minority, and turning them into the agents of majoritarian suffering; i.e. perpetrators of harm. In the Dutch and Austrian discourse, for example, this denial of the status of a victim to Muslim minority groups, takes the form of "blaming the victim" and equipping them with responsibility not only for their own position but also the position of the 'new' majoritarian victim. Here "blaming the victim" is combined with "shifting the blame."

Such shifts in the (media) discourse are hard to ignore, considering especially how media are shaped by the biases and agendas of the people and institutions involved, but also the ideologies, discourses, and narratives embedded in the broader culture (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1988). Moreover, since media have become a major site of political and ideological struggle among groups competing to frame reality in a way that emphasizes their definition of the 'problem,' those who have access to institutional power have here a huge advantage. This seems particularly true in countries in which media are deprived of much of their (political) independence, such as Hungary or Turkey, but visible as well in Austria and the Netherlands, the two countries, where right-wing populism is (close to) winning the hearts of the public.

Bibliography

Anderson, B., Hartman, C. and Knijn, T. (2017). Report on the Conceptualisation and Articulation of Justice: Justice in Social Theory. ETHOS Deliverable 5.1. Available at https://www.ethos-europe.eu/publications.

Anderson, Gary L. (2007) "Media's Impact on Educational Policies and Practices: Political Spectacle and Social Control" *Peabody Journal of Education* 82(1): 103-120.

Baroutsis, Aspa (2019) "Mapping the field of education research and media." In: Aspa Baroutsis, Steward Riddle and Pat Thomson (eds) *Education Research and the Media: Challenges and Possibilities.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Bicas, Mara, Meneses, Maria Paula and Brito, Laura (2019). *Mapping the Construction of Justice Claims in the Media. National Report D4.4. - Portugal*. Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 4.4.

Buğra, A. (2018). Report on a Theoretical Review of the Conceptualization and Articulation of Justice in Political Theory. ETHOS Deliverable 4.1. Available at https://www.ethos-europe.eu/publications.

Buğra, Ayse and Akkan, Basak (2019). Discourses on minorities (and vulnerable groups) access to education, inclusionary and exclusionary aspects. ETHOS Deliverable 4.3.

Choules, Kathryn (2007) "The Shifting Sands of Social Justice Discourse: From Situating the Problem with ''Them,'' to Situating it with ''Us''" *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 29:461–481.

Coady, David (2017) "Epistemic Injustice as Distributive Injustice." In: Ian James Kidd, José Medina, and Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*. New York: Routledge: 61-68.

Congdon, Matthew (2017). "What's Wrong with Epistemic Injustice? Harm, Vice, Objectification, Misrecognition." In: Ian James Kidd, José Medina, and Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*. New York: Routledge: 243–253.

Cribb, Alan and Sharon Gewirtz (2003) "Towards a sociology of just practices. An analysis of plural conceptions of justice." In: Vincent, Carol (ed) *Social Justice, Education and Identity.* London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 15-29.

Deutsch, M. (1975). "Equity, Equality, and Need: What Determines Which Value Will Be Used as the Basis of Distributive Justice." *Journal of Social Issues* 31(3): 137- 149.

De Vreese C (2005) News framing: Theory and typology. Information Design Journal 13(1): 51–62.

Divald, Susan (2019) *The Trojan Horse Controversy: Mapping the construction of justice in the UK media*. Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 4.4.

Entman R (1993) Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication 43(4): 51–58.

Fitzgerald, Richard and William Housley (2016) "Media, Policy and Interaction: Introduction." In: Fitzgerald, Richard and William Housley (eds) *Media, Policy and Interaction*. London: Routledge.

Fraser, Nancy (1989) Talking about Needs: Interpretive Contests as Political Conflicts in Welfare-State Societies. *Ethics* 99(2): 291-313.

Fricker, Miranda (2007) *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fricker, Miranda (2013) "Epistemic justice as a condition of political freedom?" *Synthese* 190: 1317–1332.

Fricker, Miranda (2017) "Evolving Concepts of Epistemic Justice." In: Ian James Kidd, José Medina, and Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*. New York: Routledge: 53–60.

Fricker, Miranda (2018) "Epistemic Injustice and Recognition Theory: A New Conversation – Afterword." *Feminist Philosophy Quarterly* 4(4), Article 8.

Gerstl-Pepin, Cynthia I. (2007) "Introduction to the Special Issue on the Media, Democracy, and the Politics of Education." *Peabody Journal of Education* 82(1): 1-9.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identify: Self and Society in Late Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giladi, Paul (2018) "Epistemic Injustice: A Role for Recognition?" *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 44 (2): 141–158.

Goffman E (1974) Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gosepath, Stefan (2011) "Equality", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/equality/

Hawley, K. (2017) "Trust, Distrust, and Epistemic Injustice." In: Ian James Kidd, José Medina, and Gaile Pohlhaus, Jr. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*. New York: Routledge: 69-78.

Inceoglu, Yasemin, Ceren Sozeri and Tirse Erbaysal Filibeli (2019). *Monitoring Media Pluralism in Europe: Application of the Media Pluralism Monitor 2017 in the European Union, FYROM, Serbia & Turkey Country Report: Turkey*. Florance: Centre for Media Pluralism and Freedom.

Keddie, Amanda (2012). "Schooling and social justice through the lenses of Nancy Fraser." *Critical Studies in Education* 53(3): 263-279.

Kende, Agnes (2019). *Mapping the construction of justice claims in media: Hungarian case*. Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 4.4.

King, Gary, Schneer, Benjamin, and White, Ariel (2017). "How the news media activate public expression and influence national agendas." Science 358, 776-780.

Knijn, Trudie, Theuns, Tom and Zala, Miklos (2018). *Multidisciplinary Perspective on Justice in Europe.* ETHOS Deliverable 2.3. Available at: https://www.ethos-europe.eu/publications.

Knijn, Trudie and Lepianka, Dorota (2018) Report containing a conceptual framework for integration of findings. ETHOS Deliverable 7.1. Available at: https://www.ethos-europe.eu/publications.

Komter, Aafke (2005) *Social Solidarity and the gift.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lepianka, Dorota (2018) Justice in European Political Discourse – comparative report of six country cases. ETHOS Deliverable 4.2. Available at: https://www.ethos-europe.eu/publications.

Lomborg, Stine (2017) "A state of flux: Histories of social media research." European Journal of Communication 2017, Vol. 32(1) 6–15.

McConkey, Jane (2004) "Knowledge and Acknowledgement: 'Epistemic Injustice' as a Problem of Recognition." *Politics* 24 (3): 198–205.

Miller, D. (1992). "Distributive Justice: What the People Think." *Ethics* 102(3): 555-593.

Miller, D. (1999). *Principles of Justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Pantea, Maria-Carmen. 2015. *Social Inclusion of Young People in Europe: Trends and Policy Measures Summary Report on the 2013/14 Social Inclusion Country Templates*. Partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of youth. Accessed on 24/6/2019 from: http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668217/Summary_Report_Social_Inclusion_2015.pdf/7d184d78-539b-4c49-8e40-089349dea2b8.

Peeters, A. L. and d'Haenens, L. (2005). Bridging or bonding? Relationship between integration and media use among ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. Communications 30(2): 201–31.

Power, Sally (2012) "From redistribution to recognition to representation: social injustice and the changing politics of education." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 10(4): 473-492.

Rippon, S., Theuns, T., de Maagt, S., Zala, M, and van den Brink, B. (2018). Report on the European Heritage of Philosophical Theorizing about Justice. ETHOS Deliverable 2.1. Available at https://www.ethoseurope.eu/publications.

Rossini, D.A. (2019) *Monitoring Media Pluralism in Europe: Application of the Media Pluralism Monitor 2017 in the European Union, FYROM, Serbia & Turkey Country Report: the Netherlands*. Florance: Centre for Media Pluralism and Freedom.

Ruben, Duybun and Oğuzhan Hışıl (2019). *Political Discourses on the Religious Education and Minorization of Secular Groups in Media.* Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 4.4.

Salát, O. (2019) "A comparative report on the right to education: An assessment of the legal framework of six countries from the perspective of recognitive and redistributive justice." ETHOS Deliverable 3.6. Available at: https://www.ethos-europe.eu/publications.

Schwinger, T. (1980). "Just Allocation of Goods: Decisions Among Three Principles." In: G. Mikula (eds.). *Justice and Social Interaction. Experimental and theoretical contributions from psychological research*. Bern [etc.], Hans Huber Publishers: 95-125.

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

Tiefenbacher, Wanda and Perschy, Livia (2019). *Mapping the construction of justice claims in traditional media and social media – Case Study Austria*. Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 4.4.

Valkenburg P, Semetko H and De Vreese C (1999) The effects of news frames on readers' thoughts and recall. Communication Research 26(5): 550–569.

Van Gorp B (2005) Where is the frame? Victims and intruders in the Belgian press coverage of the asylum issue. European Journal of Communication 20(4): 484–507.

Vincent, Carol (2003) "Introduction." In: In: Vincent, Carol (ed) *Social Justice, Education and Identity.* London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Zemandl, Eva (2018). *The Roma experience of political (in)justice: The case of school (de)segregation in Hungary.* Country Report prepared for ETHOS Deliverable 5.2.