

Refugee children, trust and inclusive school cultures

Wayne Veck and Julie Wharton

wayne.veck@winchester.ac.uk
julie.wharton@winchester.ac.uk

Faculty of Education
University of Winchester,
UK

Abstract

Drawing on the thinking of Knud Ejler Løgstrup (1905-1981), this article examines the place of mistrust and trust in the exclusion of inclusion of young refugees. Mistrust directed towards refugees takes an entirely depersonalised form when it results from exclusionary processes that situate unique persons within generalised categories. Refugees themselves can come to hold all authority figures, including educators, in suspicion. If schools are to counter this type of mistrust, they will need to become places that are worthy of the trust of young refugees. Paramount here is the creation of inclusive and trusting school cultures where all children are listened to and welcomed as distinct contributors to the life of their schools.

Keywords: refugees; inclusive education; trust; school culture; ethics

Introduction

We open this article with two stories that speak of trust and its absence in the lives of young people. The first story springs forth from the imagination of the Jewish theologian and philosopher, Martin Buber. Buber (2006, 116) envisions a ‘child lying with half-closed eyes, waiting with tense soul for its mother to speak’. This child aches to experience ‘communion in the face of the lonely night, which spreads beyond the window and threatens to invade’ (Buber 2006, 116). Buber (2006, 116) goes on to speak of the ‘many children’ who ‘do not need to wait, for they know that they are unceasingly addressed in a dialogue which never breaks off’. These are the children that ‘lie preserved and guarded, invulnerable, clad in the silver mail of trust’ (Buber 2006, 116).

What, however, of the child into whose life the lonely night has invaded? What of the child, uprooted from the home that once was their own, who is left seeking a new place to belong within the world? Our second story speaks of one such child. It is contained within the recollections of Ron Baker, a Professor of Social Work, about his childhood experiences of taking flight from Nazi Germany and finding refuge in England. Baker recalls two images, indelibly impressed upon his memories of his childhood. The first is of five-year-old boy he once was, living in Berlin with his mother and brother, his father having been deported to Poland. In defiance of Nazi law, his father returned to the family home one Friday to share the Sabbath with his family. During the course of their evening meal, there was a knock on the door. The young Baker opened the door to perceive a ‘smiling Gestapo officer’, a man who, as Baker (1990, 66) later recalled,

quietly asked whether my father was at home. I was terrified, but said ‘no’. He then asked, again quietly almost gently when was the last time I had seen him and I said not for a long time. His smile remained constant.

The second of Baker’s images is of a crowded street in Liverpool, England, along which he walked among 300 other Jewish children, all of them refugees from Nazi Germany. Baker (1990, 66) recollects that a woman ran up to him from ‘out of the crowd,’ held him closely, as ‘tears were streaming down her face,’ and all the while, ‘she was warm and smiling through them’. And yet, the young Baker response to this act of kindness was to be ‘filled with confused feelings and intense anxiety’, since he had learned ‘not to trust smiling people’ (Baker 1990, 66).

What difference might a school make to the life of child for whom the smiling face of adult is a source of suspicion? What would it mean to bring such a child to the security that Buber (2006, 116) spoke of when he envisioned a child encased in the ‘silver mail of trust’? In this article, we argue that if a school is to hold out any legitimate hope of answering such mistrust and restoring security, it will need to become a place that is worthy of the trust of children seeking refuge. This, we contend, necessitates the creation of a culture where all students and educators are trusted to make unique and distinctive contributions to their schools.

Lyytinen (2017, 491) has noted, “In refugee studies, ‘trust’ has routinely been taken for granted”, before adding: ‘its theoretical use in refugee studies remains limited’. Equally, Keddie (2012, 1296) has called for ‘greater thinking and theorising in relation to marginalised students and, more specifically, refugee students’. In our attempt to breathe theoretical insights into the significance of trust in the education of children seeking refuge we draw, in the first section of this article, on the thinking of Knud Ejler Løgstrup (1905-1981), the Danish philosopher and theologian. Here we follow Løgstrup (1997; 2007) in arguing that, in the teeth of the suspicion that can arise within refugees (like the young Baker), and the indiscriminate mistrust that can confront them, trust remains nevertheless fundamental in the human condition and thus a central concern in the inclusion and education of refugee children. In advancing this view we in no way seek to diminish the reality of mistrust in the lives of refugees. Indeed, we examine how people forced to migrate from the country of their birth can experience layers of mistrust that arises out brutality in their homeland, unfair bureaucratic systems governing the asylum systems, and hostile environments in countries where sanctuary is sought. In relation to the mistrust that is directed towards refugees, we

identify the ways exclusionary processes act to situate distinct and unique persons within depersonalised categories. We go on to consider how children seeking refuge may, in turn, view their educators, along with other professionals, as representatives of a faceless, hostile authority.

Where the first section of the article attempts to illuminate the significance of personal trust in human lives and what is lost when human relations are harden by mistrust, the second section examines what it would mean to include young refugees into schools where they feel themselves to be trusted as distinct individuals and where they, in turn, can trust their educators and other professionals. The task of including these children in schools, we argue, has to extend beyond compensating for the difficulties they have experienced and continue to encounter in their lives and learning. Instead, we connect the task of including refugee students in education to the creation of trusting school cultures, where all children are included for the contribution they might make towards the betterment of their schools.

Refugees and mistrust

The political theorist, Hannah Arendt, opened her intensely incisive 1943 essay on the experience of being forced to flee from Nazi Germany thus:

In the first place, we don't like to be called “refugees.” We ourselves call each other “newcomers” or “immigrants.” (2007, 264)

Arendt (2007, 264) goes on to observe:

A refugee used to be a person driven to seek refuge because of some act committed or some political opinion held. Well, it is true we have had to seek refuge; but we committed no acts and most of us never dreamt of having any radical political opinion.

In other words, refugees and seekers of refuge are not people that have grouped together in a collective effort to forge a shared identity borne out of a common set of interests or concerns. They are, rather, distinct individuals positioned together under the same artificial and imposed category by circumstances entirely beyond their control.

For the main part, the experience mistrust arises out of a painful interaction with another person who has – or, at least, is perceived to have – rejected, exploited, or simply been indifferent to, the trust one has placed in them. This type of mistrust, that sees a once trusted individual become the source of suspicion, is quite distinct from the mistrust that can be directed towards refugees. When a person seeking refuge is mistrusted, not because of the deeds they have committed or words they have spoken, but simply because they have been uprooted from the place of their birth, then they are the object of generalised mistrust.

Simone Weil once observed that whenever we come to view a person, suffering some kind of affliction, “as a unit in a collection, or a specimen from the social category labelled ‘unfortunate’,” they are no longer held to be a person, ‘exactly like us’ (2003, 64). A person, mistrusted for no other reason than the fact that they were forced to leave their home has, in much the same way, already been cast aside, reduced to ‘a specimen’ from a ‘social category’, one more ‘unit’ of the ‘collection’ named “refugee.”

It is possible to reach a whole range of conclusions about the value of migration, to be, for example, for or against open borders, but where one stands on such questions is determined by the judgements one reaches. However, when a person mistrusts *all* refugees, they will necessarily greet with suspicion any *single* refugee they happen to encounter. For this person, “refugees” represent a group of people about whom they can, without any difficult appraisal and with no thought to reaching a measured judgement, deem unworthy of their trust. So, while mistrust of refugees as a group can, of course, be experienced in a way that is personally hurtful to individuals, this mistrust is directed towards neither the distinctive characteristics nor the personal actions of any single individual refugee. This is, in fact, an entirely depersonalised form of mistrust.

The experience of refugees often accords with the palpable and painful reality that when people are persistently mistrusted, they are themselves all too likely to mistrust, rather than trust, strangers (Ni’ Raghallaigh 2013; Bauman 2016). It is possible to identify three sources of this mistrust, each of which corresponds to a distinct stage in the experience of being uprooted and becoming displaced. First, before a person is forced to leave their home, before they have so much as given thought of seeking refuge in a new place or a foreign land, they are all too likely to have encountered enough of the world’s cruelty to leave them weary of trusting others (Hynes, T. 2003; Ni’ Raghallaigh 2013; Morina *et al.* 2016; Lyytinen 2017). Second, even if a person, uprooted from the place of their birth, succeeds in retaining some semblance of hope for and faith in the world, they will, as Hynes, P. (2009, 117) points out, ‘need to address the issue of trust during the asylum support system’. Offering them previous little in the way of ‘support’, refugees caught up in this system, can be left ‘stigmatized and

socially excluded,' and thus unable to access the kind of 'mainstream services' that might provide fertile for the 'creation of space for trust that is an essential component of wider policy agendas' (Hynes, P. 2009, 117). Strang and Ager (2010) also identify, within the mechanisms of asylum seeking itself, a process that can divest individuals uprooted from their homes of their individual distinctiveness. It is a process that 'takes a more extreme form where people making claims for asylum are kept in detention whilst their cases are being heard', since this leaves them 'assumed to be untrustworthy until proven innocent' (Strang and Ager 2010, 593). Finally, having encountered mistrust in their homeland, in the transitional systems of asylum, refugees can find, in precisely the place where sanctuary is sought, a deluge of negative attitudes directed straight at them (Pinson and Arnot 2010; Pinson, Arnot and Candappa 2010; MacDonald 2017; Taylor and Ravinder 2012).

All this militates against refugees trusting anyone that is, or seems to be, an official (Kohli 2006; Mackenzie, McDowell and Pittaway 2007). In the same way that the suspicion directed towards refugees can be entirely depersonalised, so refugees can come to hold 'a generalized mistrust ... of officials such as agency workers, translators or local community representatives' (Mackenzie, McDowell and Pittaway 2007, 303). Individuals seeking refuge can, that is, look past the particular and distinct qualities of social workers and other professionals. For refugees, these individual people can be "identified with 'the authorities' and mistrusted" (Kohli 2006, 711).

In the face of both the mistrust that arises within refugees and the mistrust that is directed towards them, Løgstrup's (1997) insistence that trust has primary place in human life might appear more than just a little dubious. Interestingly, Bauman, who is otherwise inspired by

much of Løgstrup's thought, has felt compelled to question whether young people today might not 'find Løgstrup's sunny and buoyant image of a trusting and trustworthy world rather far-fetched', since they 'learn daily ... that strangers are not to be trusted' (original emphasis, 2008, 56). Responding directly to Bauman's criticism of Løgstrup, Fink (2007, 14) notes: 'It is precisely when trust is lacking that we can come to realise what a basic and pervasive role it has in life'. In other words, the fact that it is difficult for both young and old alike to persist with the belief that trust is primary in human relations, provides us with evidence, not of whimsical and distorted nature of this belief, but rather of just how alienated lives can become from those forms of community in which individuals flourish as they partake in trusting relations. Bauman (2004, 92) has observed that in societies where consumption and the pursuit of individual interest abound, 'Trust is replaced by universal suspicion'. The ordering of the words here is telling: it is suspicion that supplants trust; it is trust that is fundamental. The ordering of words is equally telling in Daniel and Knudsen (1995, 1-2) observation that 'in the life of the refugee, trust is overwhelmed by mistrust, besieged by suspicion, and relentlessly undermined by caprice'. What Løgstrup (1997) insists comes naturally to us, to trust the stranger, has been 'overwhelmed', 'besieged' and 'undermined' by what is unnatural, alien.

To hold firm to the belief that trust is primary in human lives is not, of course, to deny that many young refugees trust in adults only for to find this trust met with indifference or hostility (Daniel and Knudsen 1995; Hynes, T. 2003; Ni' Raghallaigh 2013; Morina *et al.* 2016; Lyytinen 2017). However, this reality, far from undermining the indelible place of trust in our lives, and especially in the lives of children, actually confirms the depth of the human need to trust and to be trusted. Indeed, the dependency of mistrust on the prior existence of

trust serves to reveal what is so elevating about the place of trust in the human condition. Here it is useful to consider Løgstrup's (1997, 15) claim that when a child distrusts they do so not because they have 'learned consciously and deliberately' that there are people to be wary of and around. When a child withholds trust it is, rather, 'a matter of psychic automatism' (Løgstrup 1997, 15). In other words, mistrust arises automatically in the child, in the same way that one outstretches one's hands when falling to the ground, and not because the child has actively determined that the world, or even some small part of it, is not worthy of their trust. This is what is so cruel in the adult's indifference or hostility in the face of the child's openness to them: even in a world where evidence mounts in favour of the conclusion that withdrawing into suspicion would be their wiser course, even when they are met with indifference or cruelty, the child nevertheless persists in seeking to trust and to be trusted.

Løgstrup (2007, 2) usefully clarifies his position on the primacy of trust thus: 'When I ... say that trust is primary, I mean that distrust is the negation of trust, and is, as such, founded in trust'. Stern (2017, 291) adds further elucidation by way of remarking that Løgstrup does not intend to advance the case that trust is chronologically prior to distrust, but rather 'that trust is a necessary condition to the proper functioning of human life on which distrust is parasitic'. What is true of distrust is true, also, of the propagators of distrust. The politician, who speaks of a 'swarm' of refugees (BBC News 2015), the newspaper columnist, who evokes the image of a 'cockroach' to describe human beings fleeing for their lives from places that were once their homes (Hopkins 2015), both feed on our fears, certainly, but more insidiously and more accurately, they are parasitic on our trust. If we were not poised to trust the newcomer, the message that the stranger is to be feared would hardly resonate with us. The message would merely confirm our already existing relation to the unknown person. What arouses our fear,

what stirs us to anxiously cast the other person aside, is the fact that this person has - through precisely the kind of processes detailed above - come to be inescapably associated with the kind of qualities that disturb our natural, trusting relation to the stranger.

For Løgstrup (1997), the primacy of trust extends beyond the desire to be trustworthy.

Others trust us, not because we have deliberately cultivated the kinds of characteristics and qualities that are likely to inspire confidence in our trustworthiness. Rather, trust originates in, what Løgstrup (1997) names, ‘the ethical demand’. Løgstrup (1997, 18) writes of how this demand shapes our relationships with others in the following way:

We help to shape his or her world not by theories and views but by our very attitude towards him or her. Herein lies the unarticulated and one might say anonymous demand that we take care of the life which trust has placed in our hands.

In other words, even before we prove ourselves trustworthy, we are entrusted by the other person; we are depended upon by the other, before we establish that we are dependable. Life asks us to be responsible for the other person, because they are - without their ever needing to express this to us directly – reliant upon us to be responsive to them. In particular, the other person depends on us to take them, their words and deeds, seriously and, more generally and more crucially, on our willingness to respond to them with generosity, and not cold indifference, if ever they should come to harm in our presence. Hence Faulkner’s (2014, 341) suggests that ‘what Løgstrup calls the radical ethical demand’ could also ‘be called the demand that X be trustworthy’.

Buber (2006, 126) advances an account of a boy, seemingly disaffected by the learning process, whose ‘resistance against being educated gives way to a singular happening’, that is, to the recognition that this educator is ‘taking part in his life, accepting him before desiring to influence him’, and so the boy stands assured that that ‘he may trust’ this person. The same transformative potential might be realised whenever an educator greets a child displaced from their home with what Løgstrup (1997) characterises as an ‘attitude’ of trust. It is might then be possible for this child to conclude of their educator, in words that echo Løgstrup (1997), Here is a person that is responsive to, and responsible for, me; for so long as I am with this person, I trust they will take care of my life - the life my trust has placed in their hands. This transformation in the relation between the educator and the child occurs at the moment attention is given, the moment at which generalised conclusions are supplanted by acceptance of the distinctiveness of the child.

Trust, mistrust, students seeking refuge and inclusive school cultures

What would it mean to describe, not a single individual, but an entire school, as trustworthy? The question is crucial if the inclusion of children is not to be rest entirely upon the responsiveness and responsibility of one or two educators. Stepping into an inclusive school, a child uprooted from the place that was once their home, might encounter something more than an attitude of trust in the presence of certain attentive educators, they might, instead, enter into an atmosphere of trust. Once in this atmosphere, children encounter throughout their schools a living answer to the demand that schools should be trustworthy places, places where children are greeted with acceptance and not hostility, with recognition of the unique persons they are becoming, and not with generalisations and stereotypes. The primary task of

including children uprooted from their homes in schools might then, be less about changing these children so they might somehow learn to trust, and more about learning to create schools that are responsive to their lives and thus, to the ethical demand that schools are worthy of trust.

‘We inhabit a climate of trust as we inhabit an atmosphere and notice it as we notice air,’ Baier (1986, 234) observes, before adding: ‘only when it becomes scarce or polluted’. Trust, in other words, is appreciated only in its absence. Hence Løgstrup’s (2016, 127) reflection that, despite its primacy in our lives, when it comes to trust: ‘We do not discover it until it is gone’. So, how are we to create an atmosphere of trust in a school, when such an atmosphere is likely to be valued only once it has become contaminated by mistrust? Corbett (2001, 40) says of ‘school culture’ that it ‘can be felt in the general atmosphere of the building’. A school’s culture, like trust, can then become a kind of atmosphere and, like an atmosphere, it can all too easily be taken for granted. In other words, as trust is noticed only once it thins out, so inclusive, pluralistic, perpetually becoming school cultures might be appreciated only once they sour into exclusionary, monolithic and fixed school cultures. In what follows we advance the argument that if we are to take the inclusion of children seeking refuge alongside their peers seriously, then school culture, and its pivotal its role in securing an atmosphere of trust, needs to be examined seriously.

However, what we mean by school culture is complex (Deal and Peterson 2016), since school culture perpetually changes (Miravet and García 2013; Nind et al. 2004), and is or should be distinctive to each individual school (Hargreaves 1999). Given that “there is no singly agreed meaning of ‘school culture’” (Prosser 1999, 9), that ‘school culture is a multifaceted concept’

(Engels et al. 2008, 160), what would it mean to include children seeking refuge into schools where there are inclusive and trusting cultures? Slee (2011, 110) has argued: ‘Inclusive school cultures require fundamental changes in educational thinking about children, curriculum, pedagogy and school organization’. As we address these necessary ‘fundamental changes’, we begin by outlining what inclusive school cultures emphatically are not, before moving on, more positively, to examine the difference these cultures might make to the lives of refugee students.

A culture of remediating difference

Allan (2006, 126) has written of ‘the repetition of exclusion’ within and beyond schooling, and it is certainly possible to witness, in educational practices aimed at children seeking refuge, the repetition of categorising processes that, in special education, succeed in ‘reducing the person to the textbook accounts of defectiveness’ (Slee 2001, 117). Booth (2005, 153) has written of children with impairments that they ‘are whole people and like other children’, and so to act ‘as if their participation depends on overcoming only the disabling features of a school, diminishes them as people, since it ignores other aspects of their identities’. Equally, to reduce the question of inclusion for uprooted children to the single fact of their forced migration is to overlook the depths and complexities of these distinct and unique persons. Nevertheless, a focus on trauma, restricted literacy and interrupted or diminished experiences of schooling can dominate studies of young refugees and seekers of refuge (see, for example: Bajaj and Suresh, 2018; Block *et al.* 2014; Due, Riggs and Augoustinos, 2016; Gormez et al. 2017; and, Rumsey et al. 2018). This ‘tendency to medicalise the refugee subject’ (Taylor and Sidhu 2012, 44), or to gaze upon them through

one lens of deficiency or another, ignores the rather obvious fact that leaving - and enduring the leaving of - one's home might signal not vulnerability but rather resilience and adaptability (Ferfolja and Vickers 2010; Matthews 2008).

Migliarini, Stinson and D'Alessio (2019, 755) identify, within both the United States and Italy, 'the overrepresentation of migrant and minority students in the category of Special Educational Needs' and characterise the reductive processes that inform these outcomes as the "'SENitizing' migrant children." This reduction of a complex person to their label, to 'the refugee child' or to 'migrant student', itself echoes those social processes that result in refugees being mistrusted, not as a consequence of something they have stood for, done or said, but because of the fact that have been forced to leave their homes. When uprooted children that are - from the very first day of their placement in a new school - subjected to specialist interventions and educational practices, we should hardly be surprised if they struggle to trust that this school can provide any kind of sanctuary from the stereotypes, generalisations and suspicion that may have already endured.

It is possible to acknowledge the full extent of the difficulties that may have been experienced by these students and, at the same time, to refuse to delimit the inclusion these students to the task of remediation. To do so means confronting what Arnot and Pinson (2005, 60) identify as one 'of the major tensions found at all levels of the educational system that is associated with this particular group of vulnerable pupils'. This tension concerns 'whether to make the presence and needs of asylum-seeker and refugee pupils visible or whether to treat all pupils as equal without any special targeted policy and provision' (Arnot and Pinson 2005, 60). Daniel and Knudsen (1995, 1) observe that the 'crisis that precipitates

the refugee status is at once personal and social'. The same entanglement of impersonal and personal factors can permeate the experiences of uprooted children as they attempt to gain access to and progress through schooling. The complex dimensions of their experiences illustrate precisely why educators should attend to what is happening to and within these young people. This, in turn, entails educators navigating, what Pinson and Arnot (2010, 262) call, a 'child-centred holistic approach'.

In a discussion that illuminates tensions between a whole-school or child-centred approach, Maxine Greene (1995) turns to the novel, *Confessions of Felix Krull*, by Thomas Mann. Greene (1995, 10) addresses a struggle experienced within the novel's central character, Felix, between 'whether it is better to see the world small or to see it big'. To see the world small is to gaze upon it from a distance, where it is possible to witness a multitude of social, economic and political forces at play. To observe the world big is to see the world up-close, from where it is possible to study each individual person in their distinctiveness, to witness them in the midst of their particular struggles and attempts at advancement. Addressing these competing ways of attending to the world, Greene (1995, 11) writes:

The challenge may be to learn how to move back and forth, to comprehend the domains of policy and long-term planning while also attending to particular children, situation-specific undertakings, the unmeasurable, and the unique.

Greene's challenge necessitates rejecting a school culture of remediation, since only in this way might educators respond to the distinctiveness of the children they educate while, at the same time, extending critical attention to the wider exclusionary pressures and inclusive

possibilities that exist within their schools and communities (Due, Riggs and Augoustinos 2016). Greene's challenge has particular resonance for educators of uprooted children. A resonance that is nicely captured in Catarci (2016) stipulation that any innovation aimed at including a single young person seeking refuge should, at the same time, promote a shared understanding of the issues surrounding forced migration within their entire school and its wider community. Where there is a school culture that values the distinctiveness of individuals, children are not diminished to their perceived deficiencies and educational practices are expansive and not reductive.

A culture of listening

Carrington (1999, 259) writes: 'Inclusive education will require a school culture that emphasizes the notion of diversity'. The inclusion of young refugees in schools, in particular, requires a school culture where that accepts and values all educators and students as persons with distinct contributions. Inclusive schools are thus both trustworthy and trusting places, places that can might simultaneously mitigate the kind of generalised mistrust that excludes uprooted children and promote the participation and inclusion of these students. This means that, in these schools, educators are 'really listening' to children and, in this way, 'giving validity to what is being heard' (Corbett 1999, 56). Communicating this validity to young people further involves, as Florian and Beaton (2018, 883) note, conveying 'a genuinely held belief in their competence ... both in word and deed,' so they might 'trust that teachers are listening'. Feeling themselves listened to as distinct individuals, these children may 'choose to engage and participate in activities that are genuine and meaningful to them as learners, thereby giving true meaning to the concept of inclusion' (Florian and Beaton 2018, 883). In

other words, actualising inclusion in schooling means that children are not *passively* fixed within a static school, but are rather guided to become active *contributors* to their school and its perpetually becoming culture.

However, where difference is ordered into hierarchies in ways that see some differences promoted and celebrated (for example, children categorised as ‘being gifted and talented’), while others are adjudged to require specialist interventions and remediation (for example, children classified as ‘having special educational needs’), certain students will always ‘considered to be additional students’ (original emphasis, Slee 2019, 6). Caught within these hierarchies and their accompanying, ‘marginalizing discourses of normality and exceptionality’ (Slee 1998, 444), a refugee student – again, much like young persons with impairments - can find themselves gazed upon as a sympathetic other, a subject of their spectator’s pity. Hence Rutter’s (2006, 9) observation:

Pity ... compounds the idea that refugees are different from us. They are different from us because they are traumatised and dysfunctional.

How different this reductive, pitying gaze, which equates difference with deficiency, is from the kind of attentive and listening compassion that extends to the distinctiveness of the other person. Indeed, Arnot, Pinson and Candappa (2009, 262) hold that creating ‘the conditions for compassion to flourish within the school,’ is to provide uprooted children, ‘the chance by their actions to gain confidence, self-esteem and a sense of agency in taking control of their future world’. Thus Corbett (1999, 58) writes of how ‘creating an institutional culture which welcomes, supports and nurtures diverse needs’ involves “accepting people as they are not

expecting them to struggle to be ‘normal’.” It is on these grounds, also, that Booth and Ainscow (2002, 52) observe that where there are ‘inclusive school cultures’, educators, along with other professionals and young people respond to ‘one another as human beings as well as occupants of a ‘role’.” Inclusive school cultures may, in short, inspire educators to place their trust in the possibilities latent within, and in the possibilities that await, the distinct young people they educate. While children, feeling themselves trusted by a compassionate and responsive educator, might be offered a source of security in an uncertain world.

Buber (2006) encapsulates the centrality of attentive, listening relations in schooling when he describes the nervous self-concern of an adult as they step into a classroom for the first time. As this educator looks to the children before them they attend to a multitude of young faces and, in this elevating moment, the educator is able to overcome their self-preoccupation. In this moment of selfless attention, ‘the glance of the educator accepts and receives them all’ (Buber 2006, 120). So, even as they respond to the same ‘ethical demand’ expressed in the various faces of the children that look upon them in trust (Løgstrup 1997), educators do so knowing that they have to answer this demand in as many different ways as there are individual children before them. Educators, capable of glancing upon, and listening to, children in this way are trustworthy precisely because they have responded to what is distinct and unique in the children they educate.

This kind of compassionate listening conveys trust, because we cannot listen to others unless we have from the start assumed that their words are honest and worthy of attention.

Listening, in this way, responds to the vulnerability of anyone who, simply by venturing to speak, runs ‘the risk of one person daring to lay him or herself open to the other in the hope

of a response' (Løgstrup 1997, 17). Indeed, Løgstrup (1997, 17) identifies this risk as 'the essence of communication and ... the fundamental phenomenon of ethical life'. Listening to children as contributors to the life and culture of their institutions thus illuminates the primacy of the ethical and trusting relation in the formation and endurance of inclusive schooling.

Conclusion

We opened this article with two stories: one advanced by Buber (2006) about a child encased in trust, and the other, recalled by Baker (1990), of a child unable to trust in a smiling adult extending to them a small act of kindness. In this article we have attempted to argue that of these two depictions of childhood, it is Buber's child that represents, not simply an aspiration for, but an accurate characterisation of, what is most fundamental in childhood and, indeed, the human condition. In arguing this, we have not at any point denied the fact that to be uprooted from the land of one's birth, to be displaced and stateless, is to risk experiencing at each and every turn, not simply the absence of trust, but the more bitter reality of a generalised, entirely depersonalised mistrust.

Following Løgstrup (1997), we have argued that both the mistrust that can be directed towards, and the mistrust that can arise within, refugees are parasitic encroachments upon a demand to be trustworthy that is fundamental and universal. Two characteristics of inclusive school culture have emerged as being particularly pertinent to the task of actualising this trust, and thus security and a firm sense of belonging, within children uprooted from their homes. First, in schools where there are inclusive school cultures, differences are valued in

such a way that that each child is included, not for what they have been defined as being by others, but for who they are in all their distinctiveness. Second, in these schools, children are included for what they might actively contribute to the unfolding character of the school's culture. In articulating the need for, and the characteristics of, inclusive school cultures, we have attempted to answer Lyttinen (2017) call for insights into the place and role of trust in refugee studies along with Keddie's (2012) appeal for rigorous theorising on the lives and education of young refugees.

In particular, we have contended that the repetition of mistrust through the various stages of becoming and being a displaced person can be a generalised and depersonalised type of mistrust. This type of mistrust might be countered, we have maintained, only where schools refuse to reduce educators to mere specialists and students to passive recipients of interventions. More positively, answering this mistrust means recognising educators as contributors to the culture of their schools and not as mere deliverers of learning. Refusing the reduction of schooling to economic utilitarianism, D'Olimpio (2018, 196-97) contends: "I trust a teacher in a different or 'deeper' way than I trust or rely upon a salesperson who sells me a car or a checkout clerk from whom I purchase groceries." Webster (2018, 161) is equally adamant that trust in education cannot be reduced to the technical task of securing professional competence, since 'educators need to be trustworthy' and 'this involves more than the demonstrated evidence of appropriate qualifications and compliance to professional standards and codes of conduct'.

However, the very fact that educators can be positioned as mere technicians, and teaching itself to a kind of technology (Greene, 1978), is evidence that they and the schools they

inhabit, are too often mistrusted. Goepel (2012, 500), for example, identifies the inspection regimes, along with managerialism and the standardisation of teaching practices that produces the “danger of promoting ‘tick-box’ professionalism where teachers demonstrate the expected behaviours but out of compliance and in an environment of distrust rather than through the expression of their intrinsic professional characteristics or qualities.” Writing over twenty years ago, Corbett (1999, 60) described a ‘market culture’, along with ‘a cult of individual interests or entitlements’ that were ‘dominant in British education’. Twenty years on, this culture and cult persist in Britain, as they do elsewhere. Hence Allan and Persson (2018, 9) connect the ‘the high levels of teacher stress and dissatisfaction’ with the fact that they work ‘in a low trust environment’. This, in turn, creates ‘even greater risks to students ... in schools that are devoid of trust’ (Allan and Persson 2018, 9). Allan and Persson (2018, 10) conclude: ‘Inclusive education has a more important role than ever before in mitigating these risks through the cultivation of trust and confidence’. Ball (2018, 235) gives voice to the wider challenges confronting inclusive education generally, and the inclusion of refugee students in particular, when he identifies ‘rebuilding trust in teachers and schools’ as an essential aspect of the ‘political process of rethinking education for the 21st century’.

We thus acknowledge the significant difficulties inherent in a profession, which might itself be mistrusted, attempting to silence hostile voices that speak at and about young refugees. However, educators, who contribute to, and are sustained by, inclusive school cultures, can counter the mistrust and exclusion of young refugees simply by keeping alive the possibility that these children, who have experienced the worse of the world, will be listened to as persons with distinct voices. In this way, educators, working in and for inclusive schools, might respond to the demand that when children speak of the persons they are becoming they

should be heard and their words welcomed as announcements of the distinct contribution they each have to make to the life of their schools.

Notes on Contributors

Wayne Veck is currently a Reader in Education at Winchester University. Wayne started his teaching career as a teacher of English to students from Afghanistan and Iraq seeking refuge in the UK. He has published widely about disability, forced migration and inclusion and exclusion in education.

Julie Wharton is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Winchester and works within the Institute of Education and the Department of Education Studies. She has been a Special Educational Needs and Disability Inspector in a Local Authority and the Virtual Head teacher for Children who are Looked After, supporting unaccompanied asylum seeking children. Her research focuses on social justice and inclusion and she has published and disseminated research about disability, forced migration and inclusive schooling.

References

Allan, J. 2006. "The repetition of exclusion." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 10 (02-03): 121-133.

Allan, J. and E. Persson. 2018. "Social capital and trust for inclusion in school and society." *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1-11. doi.org/10.1177/1746197918801001

Arendt, H. 2007. "We Refugees." In: *The Jewish Writings*, edited by J. Kahn and R. H.

Feldman, 264-274. Schocken Books, New York

Arnot, M. and H. Pinson. 2005. *The education of asylum seeker and refugee children: a study of LEA and school values, policies and practices*. Cambridge, Cambridge University, Faculty of Education. <https://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/people/staff/arnot/AsylumReportFinal.pdf>

- Arnot, M., H. Pinson, and M. Candappa. 2009. 'Compassion, caring and justice: teachers' strategies to maintain moral integrity in the face of national hostility to the "non-citizen"'. *Educational Review* 61 (3): 249-264.
- Baker, R. 1990. "The Refugee Experience: Communication and Stress, Recollections of a Refugee Survivor." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 3 (1): 64-71.
- Bajaj, M. and S. Suresh. 2018. 'The "Warm Embrace" of a Newcomer School for Immigrant and Refugee Youth'. *Theory Into Practice* 57 (2), 91-98.
- Ball, S.J. 2018. "The tragedy of state education in England: Reluctance, compromise and muddle—a system in disarray." *Journal of the British Academy* 6: 207–238
- Baier, A. 1986. "Trust and Antitrust." *Ethics* 96 (2): 231-260.
- Bauman, Z. 2004. *Wasted lives: Modernity and its outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman, Z. 2008. *Does ethics stand a chance in a world of consumers?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bauman, Z. 2016. *Strangers at our door*. Cambridge: Polity.
- BBC News. 2015. *David Cameron criticised over migrant 'swarm' language*. London: BBC News Online. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-33716501>. Accessed 31 July 2016
- Block, K., S. Cross, E. Riggs, and L. Gibbs. 2014. "Supporting schools to create an inclusive environment for refugee students." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 18 (12): 1337-1355.
- Booth, T. and M. Ainscow. 2002. *Index for inclusion developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education
- Booth, T. 2005. "Keeping the Future Alive: putting inclusive values into action." *FORUM* 47 (2): 151-158.
- Buber, M. 2006. *Between man and man*. London: Routledge.

- Carrington, S. 1999. "Inclusion needs a different school culture." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 3 (3): 257-268.
- Catarci, M. 2016. "Challenging interculturalism: the inclusion of asylum seekers and refugees in Italy." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of European Studies* 8 (2): 21-33.
- Corbett, J 1999. "Inclusive education and school culture." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 3 (1): 53-61.
- Corbett, J. 2001. *Supporting Inclusive Education: A connective pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- Daniel, E. V. and J. Knudsen. 1995. "Introduction." In: *Mistrusting Refugees* edited by E. V. Daniel and J. Knudsen, 1-12. London: University of California Press.
- Deal, T.E. and, K.D. Peterson. 2016. *Shaping School Culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- D'Olimpio, L. 2018. "Trust as a virtue in education." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50 (2): 193-202.
- Due, C., D.W. Riggs, and M. Augoustinos. 2016. "Diversity in intensive English language centres in South Australia: sociocultural approaches to education for students with migrant or refugee backgrounds." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 20 (12): 1286-1296.
- Engels, N., G. Hotton, G. Devos, D. Bouckenooghe, and A. Aelterman. 2008. "Principals in schools with a positive school culture." *Educational Studies* 34 (3): 159-174.
- Faulkner, P. 2014. "The moral obligations of trust." *Philosophical Explorations* 17 (3): 332-345.

- Ferfolja, T. and M. Vickers. 2010. "Supporting refugee students in school education in Greater Western Sydney." *Critical Studies in Education* 51 (2): 149-162.
- Fink, H. 2007. "The concept of ethics and the ethical in K.E. Løgstrup's *The Ethical Demand*." In: *Concern for the other: Perspective on the ethics of K.E. Løgstrup*, edited by S. Andersen and K. Van Kooten Niekerk, 9-28. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Florian, L. and M. Beaton. 2018. "Inclusive pedagogy in action: getting it right for every child." *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22 (8): 870-884.
- Goepel, J. 2012. "Upholding public trust: an examination of teacher professionalism and the use of Teachers' Standards in England." *Teacher Development* 16 (4): 489-505.
- Gomez, V., H.N. Kılıç, A.C. Oregul, M.N. Demir, E.B. Mert, B. Makhouta, K. Kınık, and B. Semerci. 2017. "Evaluation of a school-based, teacher-delivered psychological intervention group program for trauma-affected Syrian refugee children in Istanbul, Turkey." *Psychiatry and Clinical Psychopharmacology* 27 (2): 125-131.
- Greene, M. 1978. "Teaching: The Question of Personal Reality." *Teachers College Record* 80 (1): 23-35.
- Greene, M. 1995. *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hargreaves, A. 1999. "Helping Practitioners Explore Their School's Culture." In *School Culture*, edited by J. Prosser, 48-65. London: Paul Chapman.
- Hopkins, K. 2015. *Rescue Boats? I'd use Gunships to Stop Migrants*. *The Sun*, April 17, National edition, p. 11.
- Hynes, P. 2009. "Contemporary compulsory dispersal and the absence of space for the restoration of trust." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 22 (1): 97-121.

- Hynes, T. 2003. *The Issue of 'Trust' and 'Mistrust' in Research with Refugees: Choices, Caveats and Considerations for Researchers. New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper No. 98.* Geneva: UNHCR.
- Keddie, A. 2012. "Pursuing justice for refugee students: addressing issues of cultural (mis)recognition." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 16 (12): 1295-1310.
- Kohli, R. K. S. 2006. "The Sound of Silence: Listening to What Unaccompanied Asylum-seeking Children Say and Do Not Say." *British Journal of Social Work* 36: 707–721
- Løgstrup, K.E. 1997. *The Ethical Demand*, Trans. T.I. Jensen. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Løgstrup, K.E. 2007. *Beyond the Ethical Demand*, Trans. S. Dew and H. Flegel, edited. by K. van K. Niekerk. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.
- Lyytinen, E. 2017. "Refugees' 'Journeys of Trust': Creating an Analytical Framework to Examine Refugees' Exilic Journeys with a Focus on Trust." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30 (4), 489-510.
- MacDonald, F. 2017. "Positioning young refugees in Australia: media discourse and social exclusion." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 21 (11): 1182-1195.
- Mackenzie, C., C. McDowell, and E. Pittaway. 2007. "Beyond 'Do No Harm': The Challenge of Constructing Ethical Relationships in Refugee Research." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20 (2): 299-319.
- Matthews, J. 2008. "Schooling and settlement: refugee education in Australia." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 18 (1): 31-45.
- Migliarini, V., C. Stinson, and S. D'Alessio. 2019. "'SENitizing' migrant children in inclusive settings: exploring the impact of the Salamanca Statement thinking in Italy and the United States." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 23 (7-8): 754-767.

- Miravet, L.M. and O.M. García. 2013. "The role of teachers' shared values and objectives in promoting intercultural and inclusive school cultures: a case study." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26 (10): 1373-1386.
- Morina, N., U. Schnyder, M. Schick, A. Nickerson, and R.A. Bryant. 2016. "Attachment style and interpersonal trauma in refugees." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 50 (12): 1161–1168.
- Ni' Raghallaigh, M. 2013. "The Causes of Mistrust amongst Asylum Seekers and Refugees: Insights from Research with Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Minors Living in the Republic of Ireland." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 27 (1): 82-100.
- Nind, M., S. Benjamin, K. Sheehy, J. Collins, and K. Hall. 2004. "Methodological challenges in researching inclusive school cultures." *Educational Review* 56 (3): 259-270.
- Pinson, H and M. Arnot. 2007. "Sociology of Education and the Wasteland of Refugee Education Research." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 28 (3): 399-407.
- Pinson, H. and M. Arnot. 2010. "Local conceptualisations of the education of asylum-seeking and refugee students: from hostile to holistic models." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 14 (3): 247-267.
- Pinson, H., M. Arnot, and M. Candappa. 2010. *Education, asylum and the 'non-citizen' child*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prosser, J. 1999. "The evolution of school culture research." In *School Culture*, edited by J. Prosser, 1-14. London: Paul Chapman.
- Rumsey, A.D., N. Golubovic, N. Elston, C.Y. Chang, A. Dixon, and K. Guvensel. 2018. "Addressing the Social and Emotional Needs of Refugee Adolescents in Schools: Learning from the experiences of School Counselors." *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling*, 4(1): 81-100.

- Rutter, J. 2006. *Refugee children in the UK*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Slee, R. 1998. "Inclusive education? This must signify 'new times' in educational research." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 46 (4): 440-454.
- Slee, R. 2001. "'Inclusion in Practice': does practice make perfect?" *Educational Review* 53 (2): 113-123.
- Slee, R. 2011. *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. London: Routledge
- Slee, R. 2019. "Belonging in an age of exclusion." *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1602366.
- Stern, R. 2017. "'Trust is Basic': Løgstrup on the Priority of Trust." In *The Philosophy of Trust*, edited by P. Faulkner and T. Simpson, 272-294. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strang, A. and A. Ager. 2010. "Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23 (4): 589-607.
- Taylor, S. and K.S. Ravinder. 2012. "Supporting refugee students in schools: what constitutes inclusive education?" *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 16 (1): 39-56.
- Taylor, S. and R.K. Sidhu. 2012. "Supporting refugee students in schools: what constitutes inclusive education?" *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 16 (1): 39-56.
- Webster, R. S. 2018. "Being trustworthy: going beyond evidence to desiring." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50 (2): 152-162.