



The form-school as a vehicle for the detotalization of refugee camps in Greece

Mickaël Idrac¹

Accepted: 11 June 2022

© The Author(s) under exclusive licence to UNESCO International Bureau of Education 2022

Abstract Refugee camps have been multiplying at the gates of the European Union since the escalation of the Libyan and Syrian conflicts in 2016, particularly in Greece and Italy. These countries, which act as the main gateways, are implementing a “hotspots” approach included in the European agenda on migration established for the period 2015–2020. At the same time, restrictive migration policies combined with structural difficulties within the formal education system are encouraging the emergence of educational complexes directly within the camps. The objective of this article, which focuses on the situation in Greece, is to demonstrate to what extent the development of these complexes is modifying the environment of the camps to the point of changing the very essence of their definition.

Keywords Education · Form-camp · Form-school · Greece · Hotspots

While encampments (Agier, 2014) are multiplying at the gateways of the European Union concomitantly with the worsening of the Libyan and Syrian conflicts, the topic of education in the camp context has barely been explored. Certain researchers regret the lack of data on the question (Cooper, 2005; Dryden-Peterson et al., 2015; Fresia, 2007; Lanoue, 2006) while others note that when they exist, they focus on didactic issues (Arvisais & Charland, 2015). Didactics is a science whose subject is methods of teaching and learning; consequently, it does not take enough interest in what occurs outside the classroom to understand the impact of educational dynamics on the refugee camp environment.

This article proposes going beyond the didactics framework to explore education in the camp context from the sociological viewpoint. Rather than taking an interest in the question of transmitting knowledge as has been proposed until now, it seems crucial to raise the following question as a prerequisite: What intention does or should a newly created school in a refugee camp pursue?

✉ Mickaël Idrac
mickael.idrac@umontreal.ca

¹ Université de Montréal, Montreal, Canada

To explore this question, I conducted an ethnographic survey for three years, between 2017 and 2019, throughout Greece. Following an exclusively qualitative methodology, I went to seven camps to collect data: Skaramangas, Eleonas, and Ritsona on the continent; and Vial, Kara Tepe, Moria, and Vathy on islands in the Aegean Sea. In these locations, I observed 17 classes and carried out 56 semi-directive interviews.

It immediately appeared that the educational complexes I planned to study went beyond both the spectrum of their traditional prerogatives on providing an education and that of their natural public: children. It then became necessary to differentiate the institutions that had a real impact on the children's daily lives from the many recreational structures that claimed to be schools but that only filled, at best, a gaping void left by the public education systems. If the term "educational complex" was chosen in my framework, the reason is that they quite often bring together the equivalents of preschool and elementary schools but also playgrounds and spaces for meetings, administration areas, and spaces dedicated to receiving adults.

Consequently, the major objective of this article became modeling the form-school concept that I use to describe the influence of these new types of educational complexes on the camps. First I will examine the context elements contributing both to the multiplication of camps and of the camps' schools. Next, I will describe the characteristics of the form-school that demonstrate to what point their activity radically changes the camps' environment. Finally, I will highlight the detotalization process of these camps to open up new reflection perspectives on the definition of the camp concept.

Contextualization elements on the proliferation of the camps

The Common European Asylum System comprises five texts that member countries were ordered to transpose to their national law before July 2015. Among these texts, the so-called "Dublin" regulations are a mainstay of the "hotspots" approach whose construction I will detail.

In parallel to the last transpositions of the Common European Asylum System into the national legal systems of EU member countries, on May 15, 2015, European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker presented an agenda on migrations for the 2015–2020 period (Commission to the European Parliament, 2015), stressing the necessity of having a "global approach" to migrations. The EU hotspots approach states that the European Commission incorporated considerations of "excessive migratory pressures" into the agenda. In practice, it concerns zones at the EU borders—in particular, Italy and Greece—which have geostrategic positions. On July 15, 2015, commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos presented the EU member states with a roadmap for its implementation (Avramopoulos, 2015). The hotspots approach was consequently supposed to involve the EU's dedicated agencies, in particular Frontex, which was mandated to monitor the external borders in order to assist so-called "frontline" countries (Rodier, 2017). In Italy, the European Commission established the hotspots around the ports of Pozzallo, Porto Empedocle, Trapani, and Lampedusa. In Greece, they were located on the islands of Lesbos, Samos, Chios, Leros, and Kos. The hotspots approach focuses on registering, identifying, fingerprinting, and collecting accounts of asylum-seekers as well as managing return operations.

Once they are identified as eligible for asylum, potential candidates must file a request for protection in Italy or Greece, according to the Dublin regulations, as it is on these territories that these migrants were identified.

Officially, the hotspots approach permits migrants to file an asylum request, request relocation, or facilitate a return to their country of origin. Unofficially, the procedures are so slow that this approach creates bottlenecks, contributing to a drastic increase in the number of camps. For example, the 350,000 arrivals by sea in 2016 in Greece and Italy were more numerous than the departures. Between March 2016 and December 2016, 748 migrants were sent back to Turkey out of 17,000 arrivals in the Greek island hotspots. In Italy, less than 20% of the decisions to return were executed (Wessberg & Szabolcs Fazakas, 2017).

This research takes an interest in the dynamics of encampment (Agier, 2014), which raises the question of the extraterritorialization of the sites whose boundaries are sometimes difficult to define and that appear as “off-sites” or “heterotopies” (Foucault, 1994). This heterotopic characteristic, combined with an exceptional system within the camps and an exclusion from social interactions around them, defines the “form-camp” (Agier, 2014). Yet the multiplication of camps on the Europe-wide scale questions the essence of this idea since it challenges traditional categorizations. Indeed, the dichotomies between open and closed camps (Intrand & Perrouy, 2005) or between formal and informal camps (Corbet, 2014) no longer correspond to reality since European camps often accumulate several dimensions. The risk incurred therefore becomes describing all confinement centers as camps, even though they could represent a bridge to the migrants’ durable integration into a society.

To study the phenomenon in Greece, I therefore chose to approach it through the sociology of total institutions (Goffman, 2013) in order to categorize the different camps I identified.

A total institution is “a place of residence and work in which a large number of individuals placed in the same situation, cut off from the outside world for a relatively long period, together lead a reclusive life whose modalities are explicitly regulated down to the slightest detail” (Goffman, 2013). This approach was seldom used in the framework of recent research on camp sociology. I only found two studies following an intellectual reasoning relatively similar to mine, one on the camps in the Sudanese northeast (Le Houérou, 2006) and the other on a reception center in Mineo in Italy (Bassi, 2015).

Le Houérou’s article is interesting in its theorization of the structural inferiority of those living in the camps, who are in a situation of “absolute dependence” faced with the administrators of the total institution—the camp—and the weakness of the counterpowers. Bassi’s contribution lies in categorizing an open reception center as a total institution by means of characteristics such as institutional status, reclusive life, or obstacles to social exchanges with the outside world. Nevertheless, the two researchers did not analyze the social relations between institutions, which this research proposes to do and which will, I hope, cast a new look at what happens behind the fence.

These theoretical choices led me to select and conduct a survey in seven camps in Greece that present the characteristics of “total” institutions. To establish the camps as total institutions or not, in addition to the three characteristics of Michel Agier’s form-camp, I have selected the following three dimensions: a warehousing function for the boarders; logistics dedicated to the gatekeeping of people; and a specialization in the totalitarian control of their lifestyle (Goffman, 2013).

Modeling of the form-school concept echoing the form-camp

This article will focus on describing the influence of educational complexes on the total dimension of the seven camps I selected in Greece. We should therefore attempt to understand why, parallel to the proliferation of the camps, we are also witnessing a proliferation

of educational complexes through a denial of inclusion (Idrac & Rachédi, 2017) used against the camp's children.

In Greece, primary schools are directly responsible for enrolling children in the formal education sector. The denial of inclusion, when played out on a local scale, seems at first sight the result of pressure exerted by the community and not really linked to political strategies. Distancing procedures are then put in place by management personnel, who thereby buy themselves a form of social peace. My surveys stemming from activist networks, collectives that defend migrants' rights, showed even primary school teachers brought up disinformation on, for example, the question of vaccination records that must be up-to-date when a child is enrolled. They present the absence of such records as an obstacle, whereas it is simple to be vaccinated free of charge; and, in addition, vaccination documents do not exist in certain countries. Principals also use the computer technology excuse when refusing to enroll Arabic-speaking children with the pretext that their software cannot write the Arabic alphabet.

Taking a step back, however, I was able to realize to what extent large-scale dynamics were orchestrated by the state. Through a procedure I will now present, it prevents all children living in the camps on the islands of the Aegean Sea from accessing formal school enrollment, dedicating a specific program to the children in camps.

The Reception Facilities for Refugee Education (DYEP in the Greek acronym, which is the most common) is pursuing a transitional objective between the emergency context and durable installation by permitting children in camps to attend a public school a few hours a day, after the Greek students have left. Greek students and those who live in the camps cross each other during certain time slots, engaging in recreation together and taking part in periodic activities. In the camps, the Refugee Education Coordinators (REC) employed by the Ministry of Education register the families' requests to enroll their children in the DYEP. On the continent, to validate my hypotheses, I queried the RECs of Skaramangas and Eleonas (Athens region) in 2017, 2018, and 2019, as well as Ritsona in 2019. On the islands, I met the REC of Vial on the island of Chios in 2018. On Lesbos, no one agreed to meet me, and in 2019, I met the REC of Vathy on the island of Samos. Since September 2017, the DYEP has coexisted with a Zones of Education of Priorities (ZEP) system, which has existed for many years and whose framework was adapted.

All the ZEP schools that admit between 9 and 20 displaced children can, resulting from the change in legislative framework, theoretically open a specific class with financing and tools dedicated to receiving migrants. The students are supposed to be permanently included in an ordinary class in these schools and benefit from specific support in small groups for Greek, English, math, and sciences.

The UNICEF coordinator present in Greece explained that this change occurred because the framework of the DYEP had become too rigid. It was exclusively dedicated to the children of the Reception and Accommodation Centers (RAC), the legal status of the camps on the continent, which de facto excluded the children from the Reception and Identification Centers (RIC), the legal status of the camps of the Aegean Sea. Nonetheless, the change in the framework of the ZEP has never represented a viable solution as this structure is only accessible to students living outside the camps, while migrants on the islands live only in camps. Consequently, they are offered no possibility to enroll their children in a formal education system, whether the DYEP or the ZEP. The permanent representative of the Greek Ministry of Education in the Education Sector Working Group (ESWG) reported that the denial of inclusion used against children living in the island camps is above all political: migrants are intentionally kept in the RIC, overpopulation is maintained, and the emergency situation is increasingly oppressive.

The restrictive political choices among migratory policies are an initial explanation, but the denial of inclusion, which will bring about an exponential multiplication of the number of educational complexes in the camps, also contributes to the public education system's structural gaps.

When I conducted my first field survey, in 2017, while developing my network through the ESWG, the pedagogic director of the nongovernmental organization (NGO) Arsis located in Thessalonica, in northern Greece, was the first person to bring up the outdated labeling strategies. Indeed, for her as for the majority of actors I subsequently met, attempting to put children from the current migratory flows into preexisting "boxes" can only lead to failure. In Greece, the techniques used in enrolling these children in school borrow from those dedicated to nonnative-speaking students and children in travelers' families.

Yet these reception strategies overlook a major characteristic of the children in the camps: trauma. Freud (1993) initially described trauma as a wound inside the individual. The field of psychology then reconsidered it as "an event in the subject's life that is defined by its intensity, the incapacity of the subject to appropriately respond to it, the upheaval and the lasting pathogenic effects that it causes in the psychic organization" (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1967). Not until the 1980s and 1990s was the state of "post-traumatic stress" recognized internationally and the trauma that had become its synonym was defined as "an exceptional, violent event that threatens an individual's life or his physical or psychic integrity, such as aggression, accidents, disasters, or war, but also having experienced it on the trauma mode, in dread, horror, and the feeling of powerlessness and the absence of help" (Crocq, 1999). The trauma accumulated by the children during their migratory wanderings then imperils the cultural transmission dynamics permitted by education and undermines the reconstruction of an *intercultural ego* (Derivois et al., 2009, 2013).

In migration, cultural transmission is therefore confronted with children's trauma. An anecdote told to me by the REC of the Vial camp on the island of Chios, who is also a teacher within the structure, is an excellent example: "Two children were playing when a fighter plane flew by overhead. One of the two children, a Syrian, took my hand and shouted *kyria, kyria*, which means *madame, madame* with an expression that meant that I shouldn't worry. This plane breaking the sound barrier reminded him of bombings". The teacher then analyzed the scene as an exterior sign of trauma, considering that each detail could upend the children's emotional status. Sometimes, without the slightest warning, some children start to cry, calling for their parents, while others, traditionally "well-behaved", begin to disturb the class. This class disturbance often involves violence, when children "hit" their classmates. It could be a form of mimicry since the children, despite their young age, repeat the behaviors of adults they observe, those violent adults sometimes being their own parents. A project manager at the Greek Ministry of Education, in charge of installing preschools in the camps, considers that taking the children's trauma into account when the camp is being established is a key success factor in the framework of a transition to formal education.

With the same logic, the DYEP program, adapted based on recommendations from a consortium of researchers, imposes training programs in psychosocial support to the teachers who receive children from the camps. That is why, within the ESWG, several working meetings of which I attended, trauma is considered an invariant in the camp context, children are not exceptions to it, and their trauma must be remedied before they are able to join a formal school program.

The interviews I conducted helped me confirm to what point the principal objective of the camps' educational dynamics is the transition between the encampment situation and the children's capacity to join an outside formal school. The public education sector in

Greece does not seem in a position to treat the children's traumatic condition, due to lack of training and resources, which encourages the denial of inclusion. The children, whose behavior is entirely a function of emotional, potentially violent, aspects right from early childhood, cannot fit into the norm that the school represents, and the teachers are not in a position to take them in charge. Nonetheless, we cannot view the question of trauma in a vacuum. We must take a global approach in which, before considering "holding school", we consider "holding a class". The class, which includes a multitude of nationalities, should not be seen as cut off from the world with an omniscient teacher but as containing many aspects, played out within all sorts of interstices. The challenge for the camps' teachers is to undertake a multilingual approach that aims to produce a transculturality that will transform the representations of the interacting agents and "mobilize the collective above and beyond the individual" (Forestal, 2008).

Another consequence of the outdated labeling strategies that the children in the camps are subjected to involves the question of an "acculturation that aims at transforming the cultural systems confronting each other" (Abdallah-Preteille, 1996) rather than shifting to interculturalization. This interculturalization concept, which emerged in the 1990s, assumes a "reciprocal double transformation of the cultural systems confronting each other" (Clanet, 1993). Paradoxically, this interdependence seems better taken into account by nonformal education within the camps, which become innovative transitory laboratories for cultivating transculturality (Idrac, 2018).

This transculturality, which favors the reconstruction of the children's *intercultural ego*, provides the starting point of the spreading of well-being in the camp and can make the encamped school a positive step in the children's migratory itinerary. With the objective of "holding a class", language becomes a simple vehicle for learning connected to the child's needs.

Formal schools have a shortage of skills in transcultural dynamics and multilingualism on the classroom scale, a second dimension that encourages the denial of inclusion and therefore the proliferation of educational complexes within the camps. By intentionally distancing migrants, the public education system in Greece encourages the "outsider" condition (Becker, 1985) of the children in the camps. We will establish how education in the camp context can abolish this outsider status stuck on the children and how it can, through a ricochet effect, reach parents and inspire them to open up the camp. The gaps in the Greek public system regarding trauma and interculturality are strengths in the camp context, in which the actors work exclusively with children barely afloat in full trauma, in a deeply transcultural context, while being trained depending on needs. Subsequently, to adapt the transition objective, the form-school that I model is based on two pillars: taking trauma in charge and building transculturality.

Constructing the pillars of the form-school through the curriculum

Instituting the form-school as an object serving the transition to the norm by taking in charge trauma and constructing transculturality is a long-term process requiring a curriculum adapted to this objective. I will begin by discussing the form-schools' centering of learning on the children's identity. This centering ensures that curriculum content is only a response to the transition objective, and that the immediate potential application of the knowledge provided can then arouse the curiosity of the parents, who may also benefit from it.

In Greece, the educational response to the migratory crisis is the responsibility of the ESWG and is coordinated by UNICEF. In the camps, this UN agency's various objectives rely on three principal partners: the NGOs Elix, Metadrasi, and Solidarity Now. Adhering to the transition objective that will lead to inclusion within the DYEP, UNICEF suggests that the curriculum adapted in the camps be close to that of formal education: Greek, English, math, sciences, history, sports, and cultural activities, while keeping a link with the students' mother tongues.

This led UNICEF to recommend entering lessons through language, considering it a simple vehicle that allows work on all other skills, including cognitive, critical, and creative skills. All subjects are to be thought of and taught through the language objective, including math. Students' math representations, in formal school lessons, are European-centered; however, Arabic speakers count and write from right to left, unlike the operation techniques in most European countries. Thus UNICEF, while leaving its partners some latitude, recommends the presence of several adults, interpreters, and/or mediators in the classroom, in particular to keep a link with the mother tongue. The children's oral skills then represent a foundation that teachers can use as a support. Many children are successful in this dimension after a migratory itinerary during which they can have acquired solid bases in several languages. According to UNICEF, the public education system in Greece does not specifically or adequately work on the development of students' oral skills. Having the ambition to take in charge the trauma of children lacking oral skills that would make it possible to remedy their trauma becomes as utopian as wanting to include in an ordinary class children barely afloat in full trauma even if they do have language skills.

I met all the coordinators of the UNICEF partner NGOs as well as teachers working within the camps. They believed students must also be actors of the concept of learning, otherwise they will show an obvious disinterest in what they learn from teachers whose interest they do not perceive.

This then leads to the proposal of learning subjects that are immediately mobilizable in daily life while compatible with a formal education program. My interviewees noted that while students were often little interested in formal sessions of theoretical knowledge, they became much more involved when the education met requests the students had made themselves. This attention to students' desires makes it possible to work on language while taking the opposite stance of the acculturation in the public education system. The transcultural dimension of lessons with a focus on the children's identity, culture, and above all their expectations becomes the determining factor in creating the curriculum of the form-schools. Several studies, in particular those by researchers in Quebec working with educational or social personnel, note the importance of starting with the family history of the migrant or refugee populations in question (Rachédi et al., 2011; Montgomery et al., 2012; Vatz Laaroussi et al., 2013). Nevertheless, these data are often initially inaccessible due to the children's mutism, a manifestation of trauma. Yet, when a form-school designs learning based on the students' identity (Cummins, 2009), it makes it possible to collect biographical stories that will in turn contribute to the construction and transculturality objective. In the camp context, more than in an ordinary class, it becomes impossible to obtain an efficacious "given education" without relying on a "received education" (de Saint Martin & Gheorgiu, 2010) from before the families' migratory project. This received education is a dimension teachers can explore through techniques such as drawing and other artistic activities. It can equally include the study of multilingual texts, the use of social networks, or videoconferences such as those used in the preschool of the Ritsona camp and the city of Chalkida.

In a camp, as the NGO Eix particularly clearly envisaged in our interviews, the treatment of trauma and transculturality are defined as processes that are never definitively acquired. We should even ask ourselves if the *intercultural ego* might be so moving that it should be the subject of particular attention on the scale of daily life.

Feedback from dialogue with the children made it possible for the actors in nonformal education to analyze what they themselves needed. Subsequently, a curriculum based on questions of daily life emerged, permitting immediate use within the camp and in its environment. From the continent to the Greek islands, the structures I described as form-schools arrived at the same conclusions before proposing sessions that were incorporated into gradual thematic sequences: going from place to place, reading a map, buying food, talking to the police, taking public transportation.

The partnership between teacher and students in the program's construction—the adult remaining an initiator of proposals, as in Vial or Kara Tepe where moving from one place to another was worked on—also helps create a climate of trust and the feeling of belonging to a group. The teacher, listening and considering the child's needs, then becomes a fully fledged member of the transcultural collective. With a curriculum dedicated to survival, enabling children to take back some control over their daily lives lets them take a first step toward shedding their outsider condition.

Subsequently, the form-school will arouse the interest of their parents and other adults in the camp. This will make it possible to counteract an invariant in the families' migratory itinerary: the inversion of the generations (Moro, 1998) ending in the parentification of the children (Boszormenyi-Nagy, 1965). This inversion is built on the parents' gaps in language and comprehension of the outside world, while the children better apprehend these dimensions (Moro, 1998), which are integrated through educational institutions. Paradoxically, the children's attendance at a form-school therefore seems to initially strengthen the parentification of the children. Boszormenyi-Nagy's definition of parentification has been updated several times and is now considered as follows: "An internal relational process in family life that leads a child or an adolescent to take on greater responsibilities than his age and maturity would warrant in a precise sociocultural and historical context and that leads him to become a parent for his parent(s)" (Le Goff, 1999). The parentification phenomenon is greatly magnified in the camps and becomes concrete through a genuine inversion of parentality going beyond that of the generations.

Parentality is an idea that appeared in the 1990s whose definition has only reached consensus more recently:

Parentality designates all the ways of being and experiencing the fact of being a parent. It is a process that combines the different dimensions of the parental, material, psychological, moral, cultural, and social function. It describes the link between an adult and a child, whatever the family structure of which it is a part, with the aim of ensuring the child's care, development, and education. This adult/child relationship assumes a group of functions, rights, and obligations (moral, material, legal, educational, cultural) exercised in the higher interest of the child by virtue of a link stipulated by the law (parental authority). It is part of the social and educational environment in which the family and the child live. (Conseil National de la parentalité, 2011)

In the camp context, parents experiencing a high level of trauma while being totally engulfed by administrative demands linked to their migratory itineraries will abandon their role within the family to the point where the children become the masters of the household and take care of the supply of foodstuffs, representing material dimensions of parentality. Children also play the role of interface with the reception society in the social dimension

of parentality since they have more expert language capacities, corresponding to a cultural dimension of parentality. It is not infrequent that the oldest children take care of the youngest to the point of becoming their moral authority or look after the health of their own parent to the point of becoming a psychological support. The history of the form-school of the Skaramangas camp, in the Athens suburbs, which was narrated to me by a coordinator of the NGO Elix, exemplifies how the parentality inversion process can be shifted. This camp's school complex, when it first started its activity, was regularly vandalized and had objects stolen, computer equipment in particular. It also faced disdain from camp administrators, to the extent that its containers were sometimes moved by cranes outside of school hours without the teachers being informed. It was only after the complex was appropriated by the children, who defended it to the point of denouncing the thieves, that the spread of well-being could be set in motion, with the support of a new level of prescribers—that of the parents. The families were inspired to spend an increasing amount of time in the form-school, going as far as defending, protecting, and recommending it.

The parents' curiosity about and then appropriation of the form-school, aroused after the children had become its prescribers, was not obvious. As mentioned, the first step is proposing a curriculum connected to questions of everyday life, with immediate potential for applicable knowledge, which arouses the parents' interest. Next, the parents' appropriating the form-school occurs through a parentalization of the activities carried out. For the NGO Metadrasi, this desire for parentalization is characterized by the expression of "having the parents sit down": rather than talking to parents on the doorstep of the classroom or in the recreational areas, the educational complex's workers insist on receiving them seated, in a closed space, for a brief discussion. For the coordinator of the Vial camp's site, giving parents this attention maintains their curiosity about and interest in the form-school. Educational personnel or management often followed these discussions with a festive moment, such as snacks and informal exchanges. Within the form-school of the Kara Tepe camp, on the island of Lesbos, the Metadrasi coordinators even installed a room dedicated to receiving the parents, with games, interpreters, and social workers who can talk with them while the children are in class. Often, during these moments, fears dwindle and the parents take pleasure in the get-together, including Greek parents when they are invited. On the islands of Lesbos and Chios, the camps are close to cities or villages, which has created a certain amount of tension. In response, the NGO Metadrasi asked the local parents' associations to organize meetings in the camp on the form-school's premises. Subsequently, certain members of these associations became supports, even allies, in the political combat faced with conservative municipalities.

The Metadrasi workers have developed an argument to attract potentially resistant Greek parents: they point out the reality of the Greek diaspora or that many Greeks have lived for years outside their country. Parentality has become a priority of the NGO because it permits immediate feedback on the children's condition. The children are happy to see their parents spend a pleasant moment with the parents of their Greek classmates in support groups or festive activities. The well-being that subsequently develops inside the form-school can open doors.

Conclusion and reflections on the camp concept

The first three parts of this article have defined the form-school based on its objective of a transition to the norm represented by the formal education sector. Its pillars are the taking in charge of children's trauma and the construction of transcultural dynamics. In this

conclusion I will envisage the consequences of such an institution's activities within a refugee camp and how they can create a snowball effect starting from the moment they arouse the parents' curiosity. When the form-school succeeds in counteracting the inversion of parentality between adults and children, it will succeed in shifting the total characteristics of the camp and reducing the oppressive structure. I noticed that when the form-school radically changed the entire camp, it was because it was the only institution to interact with all the others in direct or indirect actions within the camp.

Direct interactions correspond to situations in which a given institution cannot fulfill its mission without being in contact with the form-school. For example, a representative of the Ministry of Education in a camp will need lists of the children enrolled in the form-school to orient them to the DYEP. Indirect actions correspond to situations in which two institutions are not in a position to communicate with an intermediary agent—the form-school. For example, when the Red Cross does not succeed in treating migrants because health is a subject that frightens people, the form-school acts as a mediator, inviting the migrants and caregivers and connecting the populations to dedramatize the treatment. Moreover, the form-schools are the only institutions to interact with the world outside the camp in events such as school outings, even bringing the outside world in for artistic performances. Finally, they are the only ones that permit interactions between several camps, since the families often go through several Greek camps during their migratory itinerary. This process, in which the form-school takes the central place of the interactional interplay within the camp, can abolish the three characteristics of the total institution: a warehousing function, logistics dedicated to the gatekeeping of people, and a specialization in the totalitarian control of their lifestyle.

Subsequently, the effects on the camps most often mentioned in the first three parts of the article—Skaramangas, Eleonas, and Ritsona on the continent as well as Vial and Kara Tepe on the islands of the Aegean Sea—should be described.

The Skaramangas form-school's detotalization began with the parentalization of the activities of Elix, the administrator of the educational complex. The strategies aimed at attracting the parents impacted all the adults. Within the form-school, the camp's users acquired skills enabling them to leave the camp, making the camp no longer a perimeter exclusively dedicated to waiting and warehousing the boarders. The migrants take control of their lifestyle, creating new solidarity networks and durably modifying individual behaviors. The gatekeeping logistics in the Reception and Accommodation Centers in continental Greece still exist but are considerably "softer" than in the Reception and Identification Centers of the Aegean Sea islands. The migrants live in containers that have hot water and electricity and in camps that are only rarely overpopulated. Nevertheless, the form-school influences this gatekeeping dimension to the extent that it gives the migrants communication capacities that permit them to negotiate their encampment conditions, call for improvements, or ask for repairs on their accommodations. They are no longer dependent on the camp's institutions for their daily activities; they are treated as equals vis-à-vis the camp's authorities and thereby shed their outsider label.

In Eleonas, Elix attempted to arouse the parents' curiosity through creating a curriculum that could become attractive to adults. The adults, even those without children, then began to attend the form-school. As the inversion of parentality diminished, and the adults gradually shed their passiveness to once again become actors in the camp's life, the camp was transformed, no longer exclusively dedicated to waiting. Even if the Eleonas camp had always been open and connected to the city through public transportation, gatekeeping logistics go hand-in-hand with the camp's temporary reception objective for migrants to stay dependent on administrative decisions. Although these reception conditions

are relatively good compared to other camps, attendance at a form-school has given the migrants language and relational capacities that allow them to negotiate with the camp's authorities in order to improve their daily lives, in particular on the material dimension. They became able to enact repairs of their shared spaces or the renovation of playgrounds.

As intra-camp interactions drastically changed individual behaviors, the capacities the migrants acquired then drastically changed the institutional landscape. Having to treat the camp's residents as equals, the camp's institutions had no choice but to modify their behavior for fear of no longer being in a position to carry out their mission.

Warehousing has been reinforced in Ritsona through its distancing from the closest city. Waiting then takes precedence over any other potential activity. In this camp, where the preschool is managed by a principal of one of the public preschools of the city of Chalkida, extra-camp interactions were easier than elsewhere to implement. The inversion of parentality was initially very strong there but was rapidly counteracted when strategies to attract the parents gave them language and relational skills. They shook off their passive wait-and-see attitude and transformed the camp into a more active space. Ritsona was useful in demonstrating that a small camp and one whose health and hygiene conditions are acceptable is not incompatible with gatekeeping logistics. In this specific landscape, the form-school enjoys absolute trust on the part of the camp's users. Administrators used this trust to attract the parents into the bosom of the form-school and to give them the skills needed to take back control of their lifestyle, negotiate with the administration, or go outside the camp even if it remains complicated to get to the city. It seems that in this camp, the form-school's extra-camp interactions are the starting point of the detotalization process. They modified the camp's temporality by taking the migrants out of their state of passiveness, even if, in Ritsona, totalitarian control of the lifestyle is more a consequence of the camp's structures and objectives than the desire of the camp's institutions.

In Vial, the symbolic positioning of the form-school, just outside the camp, helped give the impression that entering the premises of the Metadrasi educational complex made it possible to "leave" the camp. This was the starting point of the form-camp's detotalization dynamic, since according to Metadrasi, this sense of freedom can reduce trauma. Consequently, they attempt to encourage more extra-camp interactions, such as correspondences with formal schools in foreign countries. The positive messages spread in the camp by children who attended the form-school aroused the interest of the parents, who visited the complex in increasing numbers.

They were led to spend time there until they became, in their turn, the intended public in the activities, for working or discussion groups. The migrants gradually succeeded in freeing themselves from their condition, shifting the inversion of parentality. In the Reception and Identification Centers, whose objective is to implement the hotspots approach, the warehousing-of-people logistics reaches its paroxysm. The camp's objective remains the same: registering, identifying, fingerprinting, and collecting accounts. Nevertheless, its execution modalities will be eased, and without those, the institutions will no longer succeed in carrying out their mission. If these modalities are eased under the form-school's influence, it is because the migrants have acquired the necessary skills to take back control of their lifestyle. They become actors of the camps, get out of a situation exclusively dedicated to waiting, and grow truly aware of their environment. Faced with this modification of individual behaviors induced by the form-school, the camp's institutions must adapt to a public that is taking back control of its identity.

The public of the Kara Tepe camp is singular in that it is mostly composed of families who have already passed through the Moria camp, a Reception and Identification Center dedicated to implementing the hotspots approach. The form-camp is similar in many

respects to that of Eleonas in that it provides shelter close to the city and public transportation. Nevertheless, warehousing remains a reality in this space.

At Kara Tepe, the starting point of detotalization is the installation of a space dedicated to para-educational activities that aroused the curiosity of the adults to the point that they became not only actors in it but also the intended public for the many activities. The form-school directly influences individual behaviors, and the migrants emerge from their passiveness, create new solidarity networks, and appropriate the interior as well as the exterior space. Having acquired relational and language skills, they are capable of negotiating to improve their daily life and interacting with the world outside the camp.

The abolition of the totalitarian control of the migrants' lifestyle is linked to both the acquisition of skills and the durable modification of the institutions' behavior. The interactions maintained by the Kara Tepe form-school inspired the other institutions to the point that they wanted to establish themselves nearby. The camp has never been overpopulated and the management has only rarely used force. Nevertheless, violence is surreptitious and connected to the arbitrariness and sometimes the elimination of certain services, as well as the radical change in reference points by impromptu moving or travel.

Among the camp's total characteristics that are counteracted by a form-school's activity, totalitarian control is really the one that opens up new reflections on what comes next. It could challenge the very definition of the form-camp: an extraterritorialization that transforms the camp into a heterotopy, an exclusion from the surrounding social interchange, and an exceptional system inside the camp. Forced to treat the camp's residents as equals in a space that has become no longer strictly dedicated to waiting—these residents having appropriated the camp as well as extra-camp interactions, which they conduct with genuine strategic vision—camps have no choice but to modify their behavior. Otherwise they would no longer be in a position to carry out their mission, faced with users who are no longer outsiders. It is this institutional adaptation that can pacify camps and ring the death knell of the totalitarian control of lifestyles. We should therefore question, in the framework of new investigations, to what degree ending totalitarian control of the lifestyle of those in the camps also changes the characteristics of form-camps, turning them into new places with new ways of living.

References

- Abdallah-Preteuille, M. (1996). *Vers une pédagogie interculturelle* [Towards an intercultural pedagogy]. Anthropos.
- Agier, M. (2014). *Un monde de camps* [A world of camps]. La Découverte.
- Arvisais, O., & Charland, P. (2015). Enjeux éducationnels, curriculum et langue d'enseignement dans les camps de réfugiés. État des connaissances et perspectives de recherche [Educational issues, curriculum, and language of instruction in refugee camps: State of knowledge and research perspectives]. *Revue Canadienne des Jeunes Chercheurs et Chercheurs en Éducation*, 6(2), 87–93.
- Avramopoulos, D. (2015). Pub. L. No. 10963/15 JAI567 ASIM58 FRONT148 RELEX615.
- Bassi, M. (2015). Politiques de contrôle et réalités locales: Le cas du centre d'accueil (pour demandeurs d'asile) de Mineo en Sicile [Control policies and local realities: The case of the Mineo reception center (for asylum seekers) in Sicily]. *L'Espace Politique. Revue en Ligne de Géographie Politique et de Géopolitique*, 25(1).
- Becker, H. S. (1985). *Outsiders: Études de sociologie de la déviance* [Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance]. Métailié.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I. (1965). Une théorie des relations : Expérience et transactions [A theory of relationships: Experience and transactions]. In *Les psychotérapies familiales* (1980 ed.). Presses Universitaires de France.

- Clanet, C. (1993). *L'Interculturel : Introduction aux approches interculturelles en Éducation et en Sciences Humaines* [The intercultural: An introduction to intercultural approaches in education and the humanities] (2nd ed.). Presses Universitaires du Mirail.
- Conseil national de la parentalité (2011). *Avis relatif à la définition de la parentalité et du soutien à la parentalité issu du comité national du 10 novembre 2011* [Opinion on the definition of parenthood and parenting support from the national committee of November 10, 2011]. http://www.mediation-familiale.org/images/pdf/soutiens-parentalite/definition_parentalite_2011.pdf
- Cooper, E. (2005). What do we know about out-of-school youths? How participatory action research can work for young refugees in camps. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 35(4), 463–477.
- Corbet, A. (2014). Dynamiques d'encampement: Comparaison entre un camp formel et un camp informel en Haïti [Dynamics of encampment: A comparison between a formal and an informal camp in Haiti]. *Cultures & Conflits*, 93, 87–108.
- Crocq, L. (1999). *Les traumatismes psychiques de guerre* [Psychological trauma of war]. Odile Jacob.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Transformative multiliteracies pedagogy: School-based strategies for closing the achievement gap. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, 11(2), 38–56.
- Derivois, D., Jaumard, N., Karray-Khemiri, A., & Kim, M.-S. (2013). La traversée traumatique d'un enfant migrant à l'école [The traumatic crossing of a migrant child at school]. *L'encéphale*, 39(1), 51–58.
- Derivois, D., Kim, M.-S., & Issartel, L. (2009). Vers un Moi interculturel : Trajectoires du Moi en situation migratoire et interculturelle [Towards an intercultural self: Trajectories of the self in migratory and intercultural situations]. In G. Berkman & C. Jacotgrapa (Eds.), *Archéologie du moi. Actes de Colloques* (pp. 153–161). Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Dryden-Peterson, S., Bellino, M. J., & Chopra, V. (2015). Conflict: Education and youth. In *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (pp. 632–638). Elsevier.
- European Commission (2015). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions, Pub. L. No. COM(2015) 240 final, 22. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52015AE4319>
- Forestal, C. (2008). Vers une approche transculturelle en didactique des langues-cultures [Towards a transcultural approach in language and culture teaching]. *Klincksieck*, 152(4), 393–410.
- Foucault, M. (1994). Des espaces autres (Conférence de 1967) [Other spaces (1967 conference)]. In *Dits et écrits 1954–1988: Vol. 4 (1980–1988)* (pp. 752–762). Gallimard.
- Fresia, M. (2007). Les réfugiés comme objet d'étude pour l'anthropologie: Enjeux et perspectives [Refugees as an object of study for anthropology: Issues and perspectives]. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 26(3), 100–118.
- Freud, S. (1993). *L'homme Moïse et la religion monothéiste: Trois essais* [The man Moses and the monotheistic religion: Three essays]. Gallimard.
- Goffman, E. (2013). *Asiles: Études sur la condition sociale des malades mentaux et autres reclus* [Asylums: Studies on the social condition of the mentally ill and other recluses] (first edition 1968). Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Idrac, M. (2018). De l'éducation d'urgence à l'intervention scolaire en contexte de camp [From emergency education to school-based intervention in camp settings]. *Cirhilla*, 44, 37–50.
- Idrac, M., & Rachédi, L. (2017). Mobilités et intervention scolaire: Cas des enfants déplacés de l'école laïque du Chemin des Dunes secular school [Mobility and school intervention: The case of displaced children from the Chemin des Dunes secular school]. In C. Montgomery & C. Bourassa-Dansereau (Eds.), *Mobilités internationales et intervention interculturelle: Théories, expériences et pratiques* (pp. 219–237). Presses de l'Université du Québec.
- Intrand, C., & Perrouty, P.-A. (2005). La diversité des camps d'étrangers en Europe: Présentation de la carte des camps de Migreurop [The diversity of foreigners' camps in Europe: Presentation of the Migreurop camp map]. *Cultures & Conflits*, 57, 71–90.
- Lanoue, E. (2006). *Éducation, violences et conflits armés en Afrique subsaharienne: Bilan critique de nos connaissances et perspectives de recherches* [Education, violence and armed conflict in sub-Saharan Africa: A critical review of our knowledge and research perspectives]. Éducation, Violences, Conflits et Perspectives de Paix en Afrique, Yaoundé, Cameroon.
- Laplanche, J., & Pontalis, J.-B. (1967). *Vocabulaire de la psychanalyse* [Vocabulary of psychoanalysis]. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Le Goff, J.-F. (1999). *L'enfant parent de ses parents* [The child as parent of his parents]. L'Harmattan.
- Le Houérou, F. (2006). Les territoires usurpés des ex-réfugiés érythréens dans le nord-est soudanais [Usurped territories of Eritrean ex-refugees in north-eastern Sudan]. *Bulletin De L'association De Géographes Français*, 83(1), 62–75.

- Montgomery, C., & Lamothe-Lachaine, A. (2012). *Histoires de migration et récits biographiques: Guide de pratique pour travailler avec des familles immigrantes* [Migration stories and biographical narratives: A guide to for working with immigrant families] Équipe METISS (Migration et ethnicité dans les interventions en santé et en services sociaux). Montréal : CSSS de la Montagne.
- Moro, M.-R. (1998). *Aspects psychiatriques transculturels chez l'enfant* [Transcultural psychiatric aspects in children]. Elsevier.
- Rachédi, L., Guesdon, N., & Breau, V. (2011). *Ateliers récits identitaires, promotion des histoires familiales de jeunes immigrants en maison de jeunes. Guide de formation* [Identity storytelling workshops, promotion of family stories of immigrant youth in youth centers. Training guide]. Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM).
- Rodier, C. (2017). Le faux semblant des hotspots [The false pretense of hotspots]. *La Revue des droits de l'homme. Revue du Centre de recherches et d'études sur les droits fondamentaux*, (13).
- de Saint Martin, M., & Gheorghiu, M. D. (2010). *Éducation et frontières sociales: Un grand bricolage* [Education and social boundaries: A great tinkering]. Michalon.
- Vatz Laaroussi, M., Tadlaoui, J.-E., & Gélinas, C. (2013). Médiations interculturelles: Défis et enjeux pour un meilleur vivre ensemble [Intercultural mediations: Challenges and issues for a better living together]. *Capsules du Centre d'études ethniques des universités montréalaises (CEETUM)*, 5.
- Wessberg, H. G., & Szabolcs Fazakas, I. (2017). *Réponse de l'UE à la crise des réfugiés: L'approche dite des "points d'accès", Présenté en vertu de l'article 287, paragraphe 4, deuxième alinéa, du TFUE* [EU response to the refugee crisis: The "gateway" approach. Submitted under Article 287(4), second subparagraph, TFEU]. European Court of Auditors (Chamber III).

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Mickaël Idrac is a postdoctoral researcher at the Université de Montréal, Quebec. He is a member of the research team on refugee families and asylum-seekers in Montréal; an associate researcher at the CEPED in Paris; and a research fellow at the Institut Convergences Migrations in Paris.