Inclusion and migration: a critical engagement with the field

Oakleigh Welply

School of Education, Durham University, UK

Leazes Road, Durham DH1 1TA. Oakleigh.welply@durham.ac.uk

Summary

In a context of globalisation and increased mobility, migration has brought new societal challenges to nation states, raising questions about how countries can promote inclusion within contexts of increased diversity. Education occupies a central yet paradoxical place in this process. On the one hand, schools' failure to be fully inclusive of new forms of diversity is decried as a cause of violence and fragmentation in society. On the other hand, schools are invested with the role of including and socialising individuals from diverse backgrounds for future participation in society. There is little agreement on how this can best be achieved. Central to these questions are the ways in which educational systems can engage with increasing diversity, be it new movements of people, new forms of communication and networks or more complex forms of identity. These present new challenges in terms of educational policy and practice, locally, nationally and globally. Young migrants face multiple barriers to inclusion such as underachievement, discrimination and segregation. In order to fully engage with these challenges, global and national policies need to be considered alongside institutional structures, the role of key stakeholders (teachers, support staff, parents, local community members) and the experience of young immigrants.

Keywords

Migration, Inclusion, Language, Diversity, Mainstreaming, Discrimination, Segregation, Inequalities, Citizenship, Mobility

Introduction

In a context of globalisation and increased mobility, migration has brought new societal challenges to nation states, raising questions about how countries can promote inclusion within contexts of increased diversity (Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009). Global policy since the early 2000s, such as Education for All (EFA) (2000) and the Millenium Development Goals (2000-2015) stressed the importance of inclusion in contexts of increased migration, ensuring that all children receive education across the world and over a sustained period of time (Miles and Singal, 2010; Polat, 2011; Aikman and Dyer, 2012). The Sustainable Development Goals (2015-2030) reinforced this aim, putting inclusion at the centre stage, defined as quality of education for all and good relationships between students of different genders, religions, cultures and language (Fukuda-Parr, 2016). These global policies offer a strong frame for thinking about migration and inclusion. However, immigration and educational policy are strongly defined within national frameworks, which oftentimes stand in contrast to wider global ideals of inclusion. This is not devoid of tensions. Moreover, the field of immigration and migration studies is vast and the concept of inclusion itself remains contested. Within this, education occupies a central yet paradoxical place. On the one hand, schools' failure to be fully inclusive of new forms of diversity is decried as a cause of violence and fragmentation in society. On the other hand, schools are invested with the role of including and socialising individuals from diverse backgrounds for future participation in society. There is little agreement on how this can best be achieved. Central to these debates are the ways in which educational systems can engage with

increasing diversity, be it new movements of people, new forms of communication and networks or more complex forms of identity. These present new challenges in terms of educational policy and practice, locally, nationally and globally (Arnot, Schneider and Welply, 2016).

Studies have approached migration and inclusion from a range of perspectives, which contribute both theoretical and empirical insights into these issues. Some studies have focused on educational policies, approaches to inclusion, debates around mainstreaming or special education (Bourne, 2007; Tomlinson, 2009; Banks, 2002; Banks, Suárez-Orozco and Ben-Peretz, 2016; Taylor and Kaur Sidhu, 2012; Messiou and Azaola, 2018). Other research has looked at mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion at an institutional level and the roles institutions play in social reproduction, focusing on the role of discourse, stereotyping and symbolic domination of cultural values (Blackledge, 2001; Gillborn, 2015; Leonardo, 2002a, 2002b, 2004, 2009). Studies have also examined individual perceptions and beliefs, looking at different stakeholders (teachers, students, parents) in schools and investigating how categories of difference such as race, ethnicity, language or religion intersect in young people's experience (Youdell, 2012; Pal Sian, 2015; Welply, 2018). Finally, specific migration experiences have emerged as highly significant: how do we include the non-citizen child (Pinson, Arnot and Candappa, 2010; Miller, Ziaian and Esterman, 2018). How can migration as a way of life be included within education (Dyer, 2018)?

Defining terms: Migration and inclusion

In order to engage with issues related to migration and inclusion, it is necessary to look into these concepts and the different definitions and perspectives that surround them.

Migration commonly designates the movement of people across geographic locations to reside in a new place, in a different country or region (Arnot et al, p.1). It is a process rather than merely a geographical re-location (Crivello, 2011). For young people, migration most often entails multiple transitions, from one place to another and from an educational system to another, with new values and frames of reference (de Block and Buckingham, 2007; Adams and Kirova, 2007). Public discourse tends to represent migration as a phenomenon from the global South to the global North. However, many of the migration flows are also intra-national or between global South countries (Bartlett and Ghaffar-Kucher, 2013). Migration might be rural to urban, the result of displacement, diasporic, transnational, all of which will involve different networks and community ties that might encourage or hinder inclusion. Migration might include the whole family or be the migration of children alone (O'Ensor and Gozdiak, 2011). These different types of migration hold implications for thinking about inclusion and the educational networks and processes within which it is inscribed.

The temporality of migration is also of significance (Rao and Mushi, 2012; Arnot et al, 2016). Newcomers or newly arrived migrants will have different linguistic and cultural experiences and resources to established migrant families of first, second or third generation migrants. However, the use of such categories has been criticised for not accounting for the ways in which migrants with different temporalities might be made to feel, and the intersection of race, ethnicity, language and religion across generations of migrants. It also runs the risk of homogenising a group that is fundamentally diverse (Suárez-Orozco, Martin, Alexandersson, Dance, and Lunneblad, 2014). In many cases, established migrants might be treated as if they were 'newly arrived'. This is exemplified by attitudes towards Muslim youth in Western countries (Welply, 2018),

or in attitudes towards Hispanic populations in some of the US states (see for example Ayón, 2016). Trajectories of migration will also vary greatly, whether it is forced migration, choice migration, unaccompanied migration or study-abroad (Arnot et al., 2016). Closely linked to trajectories, the socio-economic status of migrants varies across contexts. In most cases, migration is seen as a way of moving out of poverty but, although desired, social mobility is not always an outcome of migration (Maddox, 2010; Crivello, 2011).

The complexity and variety in the experiences and temporalities of migration warn us against looking at migrant children as a homogenous category. They represent a very diverse social category (O'Ennor and Gozdiak, 2010), framed by legal rights, global and local economies, institutional constraints and expectations. The terms "migrant" or "immigrant" also hold different meanings in different national contexts (Collett and Pretrovic, 2014). In some countries, such as France and the US, an immigrant is someone who is newly-arrived from a different country (ibid). In the Netherlands or Germany, an immigrant might have been born of migrant parents, in the host country (ibid). In the UK, the focus tends to be on ethnic-minorities, although immigrant has been used to refer to more recent migration from Eastern European countries (Arnot, Schneider, Evans, Liu and Welply, 2014). It is not uncommon, however, for the terms 'migrant' and 'immigrant' to be used interchangeably in academic literature. Here, we will refer to 'immigrant' as second or third-generation and 'migrant' as children or young people who have experienced migration themselves.

Migration has impacted differently on educational institutions across the globe. In highly concentrated urban areas, it has led to contexts of "super-diversity" which

present new linguistic and cultural challenges for educational institutions traditionally embedded in unitary national values (Vertovec, 2017; Alba and Duyvendak, 2017). In other areas, migration has led to shifts in terms of majority/minority and led to new forms of social diversity, whilst in areas without migration the phenomenon is not experienced but imagined, leading nevertheless to different social perceptions and beliefs on inclusion. In all cases, migration has led to new engagements with the notion of inclusion itself, whether it is in terms of access to education, support in education, attainment, citizenship rights, welfare or future employability (Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014). This vast array of concepts related to inclusion points to the complexity of thinking about migration and inclusion and the challenges it brings to educational systems worldwide. It opens new theoretical and empirical challenge to academic work in this area.

Inclusion is generally understood as ensuring the full participation of *all* students in school, regardless of disability, gender, race, ethnicity, religion or language (Gosh, and Galczynski, 2014). However the concept of inclusion is not devoid of ambiguity and differences in interpretations as the "language of inclusion" can mean different ideas and practices and presents variations across national contexts (Slee, 2009, p.178). Education is often presented as the main vector of inclusion, which has strong implications for migration and education (van Zanten, 2000; Dyer, 2010, 2017; King and Mai, 2008; Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014).). This relates to the way in which educational systems and practices can encourage children and young people from a range of racial, cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious backgrounds to fully participate in school and society. Key to this idea is promoting school and classroom environments in which "difference" is not framed in a negative or deficit way but seen as fully part

of school cultures and pedagogical practices as a whole (Gosh and Galczynski, 2014). In this sense, inclusive education aims to respond to increased diversity by breaking down barriers and forms of exclusion, but also challenge unequal power hierarchies inscribed in colonial history and socio-economic inequalities (Lorcerie, 2013). The concepts of migration and inclusion in education are thus located within wider frames of reference: immigration policy, citizenship rights, social inclusion and integration as well as public discourse on the immigrant "Other." As such, questions around migration and inclusion are closely linked to issues of social stratification, poverty and forms of "othering". Whilst the "immigrant Other" in Western societies tended to be viewed through the lens of race or ethnicity, these old categories of difference now intersect with new categories of difference such as language or religion (Welply, 2017). These social categories play a role in the way in which inclusion is understood and approached in scholarly work and policy, which will put different emphasis on theoretical perspectives ranging from a more "structuralist" approach that looks at migration and inclusion in terms of socioeconomic hierarchy to a "culturalist" approach that focuses on language, ethnicity, religion or culture (Portes and Rivas, 2011).

When related to migration, inclusion is often closely linked to *integration*. This supports the idea of equipping young migrants with the necessary linguistic, social and cultural skills to fully participate in society, understood as successful employment and political participation (Collett et Petrovic, 2014). In this sense, successful inclusion tends to be measured in terms of immigrant children's educational attainment and employability (Alba and Holdaway, 2014; Ichou, 2014; Gomolla, 2006; Schnepf, 2006; Dronkers & Fleischmann, 2010; Dronkers and Heus, 2016). Whilst this offers a good overall indication of a central aspect of inclusion in an educational system, focusing

solely on statistics nevertheless overlooks other dimensions of inclusion/integration, in particular the way it is experienced by the young migrants, their families, teachers and other members of the community. “Marginal returns” of migration and education can also be an indicator of successful inclusion (Maddox, 2010) and need to be investigated beyond the dominant statistical narratives.

This article focuses mainly on migration and inclusion in the context of Western societies (USA, Canada, Australia, Western Europe), and will thus look predominantly at issues of inclusion associated to what is commonly referred to as global South/global North migration (Modood and Salt, 2010; Arnot et al. 2016). These forms of migration raise particular questions in terms of inclusion, in particular how can educational systems which remain strongly nationally embedded be inclusive of more diverse populations? How do historical, social, political and cultural legacies impact on the inclusion of migrant youth? What dynamics are at play between modernist states built on idea of national unity and common belonging and increased diversity in schools? How do political and media discourse frame these issues and impact on the experiences of inclusion of young migrants? How do global trends impact on inclusion at a national or local level? When addressing these questions in the Global North, these cannot be dissociated from power hierarchies inscribed in colonial history, global inequalities and poverty.

This article will first examine approaches to migration and inclusion at policy level, looking at the contested models of integration that frame policy and discourse around migration and education, approaches to linguistic diversity and educational inequalities. It will then turn to a discussion of inequalities, segregation and discrimination, focusing on the institutional level, looking at educational practices and the role of key

stakeholders (teachers, parents, students) to understand more closely the experience of inclusion of children and young people from immigrant backgrounds in school. Finally, it will examine other forms of migration and reflect on what these mean for thinking about inclusion.

Policies of inclusion

Educational policy on migration and inclusion has taken different forms at a global, national or local level. At a global level, migrant children's right to access education is inscribed within an international rights framework, such as the 1990 Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants and Members of Their Families, or the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (Nicolai, Wales and Aiazzi, 2016). However, there are wide national variations in the practical implementations of these rights, which tend to be more effective at primary education level than for secondary and tertiary education. In terms of international policy, the *Education for All* framework (EFA) (2000) and the *Millenium Development Goals* (MDG) (2000-2015) insisted on making education available to more children over a longer period of time (Aikman and Dyer, 2012). As part of this global policy, one of the priorities was to provide access to school for minoritised groups across the globe. Critiques of this approach have pointed to limitations of focusing on access only and the need to focus on the quality of education beyond access (Unterhalter, 2014). Scholars have critiqued the restrictive definition of "education" understood solely as formal education which overlooks a range of different educational needs from minority groups and does not respond to the diversity of experiences and lifestyles across the world (Dyer, 2010).

The implementation of these global goals of inclusion at a national level are not devoid of tension. National immigration policies impact on educational policy and practice, with strong implications for schools, educators and students. Legal frameworks developed through national immigration policies create different barriers and possibilities for migrant children in their access to education. These might vary widely across countries, with a direct impact on the education and inclusion of young migrants, who will have different access to educational opportunities depending on the host country and on their own legal status.

Increase in immigration brings higher enrolment rates of migrant populations in schools and increased diversity in the classroom (Contreras, 2002; Borjas, 2000). This has an impact in terms of attainment, social integration and language development for migrant children (Arnot et al, 2014). It raises new issues such as student welfare and tackling new forms of discrimination, which will need to be addressed by schools (Androff et al, 2011). Immigration and educational policies (funding allocation, teacher training and professional development, language instruction policies) will also have an impact on the experience of immigrant youth in schools and that of educators (Gándara and Rumberger, 2009; Ybarra, Sanchez and Sanchez, 2016).

There is no consensus in the ways in in which to approach these challenges. Educational systems remain strongly embedded within national values and ideas of common belonging that might be at odds with the realities of migration. National approaches to inclusion carry values and beliefs about the place of difference in society, translated into practices in school (Raveaud, 2006). In Western democracies, approaches to the inclusion of migrant populations have been framed through discussions of "national models of integration" (Bertossi, 2011). These models of integration can be positioned

on a continuum, with a multicultural approach to inclusion on one end, and an assimilationist and 'colour blind' approach on the other (ibid, 2011). The predominant model in English speaking Western societies has been a multicultural approach, which is put forward as a response to the negative impact of assimilation models (Kymlicka, 2012; Modood and Meer, 2013). These policy views have strongly shaped approaches to inclusion of immigrant youth in education, often framed by multiculturalism in education or critical multicultural pedagogies (Banks, et al, 2016; May and Sleeter, 2010).

Multicultural models, such as those developed in English speaking countries (Canada, the US, the UK or Australia) in the 1960s and 1970s, insist on the recognition of minority particularities in educational policy and practice. These models define inclusion as the recognition and celebration of ethnic, religious and linguistic differences in mainstream schools (Taylor, 1992; Kymlicka, 1995; Modood and Meer, 2013, Meer, 2014; Banks et al, 2016; Gosh and Galczynski, 2014; Adams and Bell, 2016). However, the concept of 'multiculturalism' is versatile and ambivalent, and its definition and meaning are widely debated (Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009; Kymlicka, 2012; Joppke, 2017). Multicultural approaches to education have been criticised from two sides. On one side, in a context of 'multicultural backlash' in Europe and other Western democracies multicultural models have been criticised in public discourse for their failure to integrate ethnic and religious minorities (Bertossi, 2011, Vertovec & Wessenhorf, 2009; Triandafyllidou, Modood & Meer, 2011). These critiques point to new lines of tension, in particular issues concerning religion and the integration of Muslim communities (Abbas, 2012; Jackson, 2016; Collet, 2018). Multiculturalism as a practice has been critiqued for allowing communitarianism and

fragmentation in society, and at its worse is accused of fostering extremism and terrorism (Joppke, 2017). On the other side, scholarly critiques of multicultural education have stressed the vagueness of the term and the risk of it falling into mere 'political correctness', underpinned by neo-liberal language and ideology (Warmington, Gillborn, Rollock and Demak, 2018 ; Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Lentin and Titley, 2011). The liberal version of multiculturalism has been criticised as tokenistic, maintaining Western/White privileges and masking a more assimilationist approach (Gillborn, 2008). This has been accompanied by a critique of neoliberal discourse in education which has shifted from an inclusive approach in which the government and institutions played an active role in reducing inequalities faced by minority or migrant populations, to an individualised approach in which ethnic minority groups carry the blame for low achievement, which is explained in terms of culture or family background (Rampton, 2006; Tomlinson, 2009; Archer & Francis, 2007; Warmington et al, 2018).

At the other end of the continuum, an assimilationist approach, such as the Republican model promoted in France, aims to abstract pupils from their cultural, religious and linguistic particularities to integrate them within a unified Republican whole (Meer et al., 2009:213). This approach promotes the ideal of a shared homogenous language and culture for all pupils, rejecting multiculturalism and differentiation in favour of 'indifference to differences' in the public sphere of school (van Zanten 1997; Raveaud, 2008). Such assimilationist models have come under sharp critique, as shown in the case of France. The idea of a 'crisis' of the Republican model has been widely debated and scholars have questioned the suitability of this model for dealing with the new ethnic and religious diversity of the country's population (Lorcerie, 2017).

A climate of fear

These contrasting policy approaches to inclusion are situated within wider discourses around immigration. Between the early 2000s and 2018, a "moral panic" has arisen in the Western world around migration and education, which has impacted on public views of migration and inclusion (Welply 2018; Collet 2018). This moral panic has taken the form of a fear of the immigrant Other, considered as threat from within, which jeopardises social cohesion, presents a danger to "native" population and alters the national character of schools and society.

This moral panic is closely linked to the development of a securitisation discourse across Western democracies since the early 2000s, which insists on the threat of terrorism and the need for more surveillance measures towards Muslim populations (ibid, 2018). This discourse has emerged as a response to terrorist attacks (9/11 in September 2001 in the US, bombings in London in July 2005, terrorist attacks in France, Belgium, Germany, Sweden and the UK between 2015 and 2017) and resulted in more stringent immigration enforcement in many Western countries and an increase in State security responses in schools (Collett, 2018; Ybarra, Sanchez and Sanchez, 2016; Richardson and Bolloten, 2015). This securitisation discourse is framed by categories of belonging: the "good citizen" versus the "threatening Other" (Collett, 2018; Welply, 2018; Fargues, 2017). Muslim populations have been particularly targeted in a climate of increasing islamophobia (Jackson, 2016). As a result, religion, and in particular Islam has emerged as a central focus in relation to migration and inclusion (Youdell, 2012; Housee, 2012). Educational policy and discourse

internationally has been underpinned by expressions of mistrust towards Muslim youth and a need to increase surveillance and securitization in schools (Abbas, 2012; Lynch, 2013; Davies, 2014; Pal Sian, 2015). One prime example of this is the Birmingham "Trojan Horse" controversy in the UK which emerged in March 2014. Schools in Birmingham were investigated under the suspicion of a plot to promote the islamisation of secular schools. Although the suspicion of a plot was unfounded, this prompted debates around the risk of religious extremism in school which were followed by concrete policy responses: the introduction of a counter-terrorist Prevent Duty in schools in 2015, "to prevent people being drawn into terrorism" (DfE 2015) and the introduction of "Fundamental British Values" in the British curriculum in 2014, which have been criticised for promoting the assimilation of the Muslim Other into national values (Richardson and Bolloten 2015).

These representations of the undesirable immigrant Other are located at the intersection of language, religion and race (Youdell, 2012). Children who do not speak the dominant language of school have been depicted as 'swamping' schools, straining schools for resources, and changing the national character of schools, which is seen as damaging for "national" pupils, both in terms of learning and identity (Welply, 2017). Linguistic diversity has been accused of being a source of fragmentation in society, with a fear of other languages "taking over" the dominant language. In the US, the fear of Spanish taking over American English has been an on-going debate (Gándara and Aldana, 2015). In European countries, resistance to children speaking languages other than the dominant language in schools is often associated to fear of religious extremism developing in schools. Examples of this are debates around the introduction of Arabic lessons in primary schools in France in 2016, which was met with strong resistance

based on claims that this would lead to communitarianism and threatened social cohesion and national unity (Genevard, 2016). In England the same year, the former Prime Minister David Cameron declared that not mastering English presented a risk of extremism (Mason and Sherwood, 2016). These examples show that Islam is at the centre of these debates (Jackson, 2016; Collet 2018), highlighting the intersection between language and religion as a new line of difference in societies (Welply, 2018).

Language: mainstreaming and inclusion

These debates draw attention to the problematic place of language in relation to the inclusion of young migrants and immigrants. Many students have specific linguistic needs in the first few years of arrival or the first few years of school if they speak another language at home. Despite the wider discourse of fear around linguistic diversity in schools, it is widely agreed in academic research that supporting the linguistic skills of young immigrants is central to positive educational outcomes, engaging with the curriculum, developing literacy and numeracy and managing assessment tasks (Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014; Liu, Fisher, Forbes and Evans, 2014; Welply, 2017). However, there is little agreement in terms of educational policy, which is often caught in a tension between 'mainstreaming' and providing specialised support for multilingual children. The concept of mainstreaming originated in relation to inclusion in terms of gender or disability, but it has become central to debates around linguistic diversity. "Mainstreaming approaches for inclusion" can take different forms across countries (Collet and Petrovic, 2014). In many cases, educational policies have emphasised mainstreaming whilst providing targeted support for children with other linguistic backgrounds. In Denmark and Germany, language testing has been developed

to identify children who need targeted language support (ibid). In the UK, mainstreaming has implied that all mainstream schools and teachers are responsible for meeting the linguistic needs of English as an Additional Language (EAL) pupils, through bilingual support, rather than pupils being taught in separate classes or by specialist teachers (Bourne, 2007). This involves the presence of EAL coordinators or support teachers/assistants. However, the lack of clear governmental policy around language, and cuts in ring-fenced funding have put pressure on mainstreaming practices in the UK (Arnot et al, 2014). In the US, in the absence of any centralised educational policy, provision for English Language Learners (ELLs) varies across States and school districts, with "as many models of bilingual and second language programmes as there are school districts" (Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014, p7). Provision for ELLs varies between pull-out programmes, second language support and dual-language programmes (ibid). The effectiveness and consistency of these programmes are variable, as many suffer from a lack of sufficient resources and some policy initiatives have been strongly criticised for creating further segregation (Combs, da Silva Iddings, Moll, 2014).

Alternative models to mainstreaming in relation to language, such as those developed in France or introduced in some states in the US, have encouraged linguistic support in separate classes or separate schools (Johnson and Johnson, 2015; Delamotte, Penloup and Reuter, 2016). In France, newly-arrived non-French speaking pupils are either placed in a separate 'remedial class' or follow separate French language classes once a week during their first year of schooling before re-joining the mainstream (Delamotte et al, 2016). Similar practices can be found in Belgium, where newly arrived children spend 16 out of 28 hours of schooling in separate language classes (European Commission Report, 2013). In Arizona, and California children who are not first

language speakers of English are separated into immersion classrooms for a number of hours a week, a policy which has been critiqued by some scholars as a "21st century linguistic apartheid" (Combs et al, 2014).

Separate linguistic instruction has been criticised for hindering social integration as well as not providing children with appropriate academic English that would allow higher academic achievement (Gándara and Rumberger, 2009). The choice of language of instruction and assessment for young migrants has also been questioned, and suggestions for developing bilingual instruction and forms of assessment in children's home language have been put forward as a more inclusive alternative (Liu, Fisher, Forbes and Evans, 2017). This is closely related to the question of language rights for migrant children, namely, to what extent are minoritized populations given the right to learn their home language as well as the dominant language of the country, and whether they are given access to the best quality education, regardless of their home language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008; May 2014). Scholars have insisted on the need to recognise migrant children's biliteracy and their different levels of oracy and written proficiency in each language, in the classroom and outside school (Brinton et al, 2017). In order to achieve this, teachers need further training and professional development as well as support from specialist bilingual teaching assistants (Liu et al, 2017).

These approaches to language support for immigrant children reflect the tensions between the inclusion values of the multicultural model with an emphasis on 'differentiation' and assimilation values that emphasise 'normalisation'. Across these different approaches to linguistic diversity in schools, a common critique in academic literature is their tendency to view linguistic minorities in school along a deficit model. This view considers that speaking another language than the dominant one in school

might limit children's literacy skills and hinder their cognitive development (Agacinksi et al. 2015; Michael-Luna, 2013). Lower attainment has been explained as a result of "delays in language acquisition" (Cusset et al, 2015). Critiques have pointed to the fact that this view overlooks many of the benefits of multilingualism (Liu and Evans, 2016), reduces linguistic diversity to homogenous categories and ignores the multiple forms of negotiation of linguistic diversity by children in school (Welply, 2010; 2017). However, this deficit view remains strongly embedded within discourses on migration and inclusion in school.

Inequalities, segregation and discrimination

This deficit model is closely linked to debates around inequalities in achievement for migrant or immigrant children. Issues related to underachievement, inequality and discrimination against children from immigrant backgrounds have raised important questions about migration and inclusion (Banks et al, 2014; Alba and Holloway, 2014). Large-scale statistical studies have shown that certain ethnic-minority/immigrant groups reach lower achievement levels than the national average in Western countries (Europe and the US) (Dronkers and Heus, 2016; Feliciano and Lanuza, 2017) as well as many countries from lower or middle-income countries in the Global South, where access to school tends to be lower for immigrant groups. This is the case for example in Côte d'Ivoire, Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic, although there are exceptions, such as Burkina Faso (OECD, 2017). Achievement levels of migrant groups can also vary between countries. For example, immigrant children from Arabic-speaking countries from the same socio-economic background have been shown to perform better in the Netherlands than in Qatar (Nicolai et al, 2016). One challenge is

that countries across the world experience different migratory flows and offer different educational provisions which makes it quasi impossible to produce international comparable data, in particular in low and middle-income countries (Nicolai et al, 2016). Where data is available, it appears that immigrant children have more difficulties than other groups in accessing education and tend to have lower levels of attainment (OECD, 2015).

Immigrant youth are seen to suffer more from poor educational outcomes and social mobility if they are located at the intersection of positions of disadvantage: poverty, linguistic barriers, newcomer status, racial discrimination or non-citizen status (illegal, undocumented migrant) (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2014; Youdell, 2012; Shain, 2012). Explanations for these inequalities are multiple, and academic research on these issues tends itself to remain strongly influenced by national values and engagement with diversity. Culturalist approaches tend to look at cultural gaps and the need for schools to adapt to plurality and provide all children with the tools for success in school (Portes and Rivas, 2011, Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014; Gillborn 2015). Structuralist approaches tend to focus mainly on socio-economic factors, which are seen as the main explanation for the underachievement of certain immigrant background groups (Alba and Holloway, 2014; Ichou, 2014). Studies have revealed inequalities that range from urban segregation (Tomlinson, 2009; Logan and Burdick, 2016), ethnocentric curricula and identities (Gorski, 2008; Gillborn, 2017), lack of teacher training and preparation (Gosh and Galzcinki, 2014; Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014; Arnot et al, 2014) and deficit models for linguistic or religious minorities (Housee, 2012; Agacinksi et al. 2015; Michael-Luna, 2013). Educational systems have been criticised for being monocultural and

monolingual and not meeting the linguistic, religious or cultural needs of minority pupils (Welply, 2017; Vang and Chang, 2018, Miller et al, 2018).

Segregation, whether it is ethnic, religious, economic or urban has been put forward as a source of academic inequality for migrant and immigrant youth. The introduction of faith schools in the UK or the develop of Charter schools in the US have come under critique for being divisive and working against the idea of unity through diversity. Critiques of faith schools have viewed these as a threat to social cohesion, which stands against successful inclusion (Collett, 2018; Halstead and McLaughlin, 2005) whilst defenders advocate the recognition of diversity and the right to practice the religion of choice (Short, 2002; Pecenka and Anthias, 2015). Charter schools have also been under strong criticism for promoting segregation and reinforcing inequalities under the guise of "free choice" (Fabricant and Fine, 2012; Buras, 2015; Logan and Burdick-Will, 2016). Urban inequalities, or the creation of "ghettos" of urban deprivation have also been strongly criticised in academic literature (See for example, Tomlinson, 2009; Khosrokhavar, 2018; Nogera, 2017). The "reactivity" of educational systems (Alba and Holloway, 2014, p. 258) means that privileged groups are able to maintain their privileges despite reforms aimed at promoting better inclusion and reducing inequalities for migrants. Very often privileges are maintained through the residential segregation of schooling (Tomlinson, 2009; Shankar-Brown, 2015; Alberio, 2012, Lipman, 2011; Ho, 2015) which can be found, albeit in different forms, across Western democracies leading most often to inequalities amongst schools, with middle-class "native" white children attending schools of comparative better quality than immigrant background children (Alba and Holloway, 2013; Nogera, 2017). These forms of urban segregation and school inequalities vary across national contexts, and are dependent

on a range of factors: urban planning, level of centralisation of the educational system and of educational funding, teacher quality and class size (Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014). They are the result of neoliberal policies in education, forms of assessment and the intersectionality of positions of disadvantage (race, poverty, language, legal status) (Logan and Burdick-Will, 2016; Apple, 2018). This redeployment of privileged groups' advantage in education, which functions at the disadvantage of minorized groups, highlights the superficiality of the "integrationist movement" in education (Merry, 2016). Not all scholars agree that separate schooling has negative effects on minoritized communities. For example, Merry responds to the inefficiency of integrationist policies through the suggestion that "voluntary separation" can have an empowering effect on minoritized communities. For Merry, segregated schooling can help counter the inequality that results from increased parental choice in education, in a context of marketisation of education and neoliberal policies. Whilst controversial in its approach to cultural identification, and possibly more ideational than embedded in real-term contexts, this view offers a critical alternative to the idea of mainstreaming as the only way of tackling inequalities in education (Jackson, 2014).

Discrimination is put forward as another contributing factor to inequalities for young migrants. Young people and children from migrant/immigrant backgrounds have been shown to experience multiple levels of discrimination and stereotyping based on perceived differences (e.g. Crozier and Davies, 2008; Youdell, 2012; Hawkins 2014). Discrimination ranges from racist insults and violence from peers (Shain, 2012) to non-verbal discrimination (Youdell, 2012) and normalised discourses of racism, embedded in institutional structures or peer group mechanisms (Miller 2015). Whilst earlier studies on discrimination tended to focus more on race and ethnicity, recent studies tend

to approach these through an intersectional lens (Gillborn, 2015). Stereotyping has been shown to be one of the greatest barriers to successful inclusion of children and young people from immigrant backgrounds. A range of literature argues that immigrant or ethnic minority children's identities in school are constructed in response to feelings of unfairness, discrimination and stereotyping. Stereotypes vary across local contexts and according to ethnic-groups, often intersecting with other identity categories such as gender or religion. Research in the US has shown how Latino and Hispanic children are viewed along a deficit model which builds on cultural and linguistic stereotypes. Racial hierarchies and ethnocentric bias in the classroom participate in microaggressions that position minority students along a deficit model which they come to internalize (Kholi and Solorzano, 2015; Alba and Holloway, 2013; Atwood and Lopez, 2014). More recently, islamophobia in public and policy discourse has strongly impacted on the experience of Muslim children in school, whilst teachers are not always equipped with the skills to adequately challenge stereotypes or provide spaces for discussion (Shain, 2012; Jackson, 2016). British research has highlighted ways in which African-Caribbean pupils feel rejected as 'undesirable learners' creating 'identity traps" which exclude them from pro-school identities (Youdell, 2006), while Chinese and South Asian pupils feel misunderstood or even invisible and experience a mismatch between family and school expectations (Archer & Francis 2007). In France, Belgium and Spain, studies have highlighted teacher stereotypes in relation to boys from North-African backgrounds, who feel discriminated on the basis of body presentation and ways of speaking (Felouzis, 2005; Gibson et al, 2013; Van Praag et al, 2015).

Forms of inclusion are also dependent on peer group relations in school. Studies have shown how peer-group relations and youth sub-cultures can play a central role in young immigrants' attitudes to school and thus impact on their inclusion and social integration (Arnot et al, 2014; Shain, 2012). In many cases, ethnic, religious or linguistic identification exist in peer-group relations, with a tendency for young people from the same religious, ethnic or linguistic background to group together. However, these processes are only one element of a complex process articulated around perceived notions of ethnicity and attempts to negotiate the tension between 'identification' and 'exclusion'. Whilst some peer-groups might tend to organise themselves around a strong sense of ethnic, religious or linguistic belonging, other groups transcend these boundaries (Van Praag, 2015; Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014). Perceived and projected 'identity markers' play a role in the experience of discrimination or identification with a peer-group (Blommaert, 2005). Ethnicity, race, religion and language can also be a basis for exclusion amongst peers, whether it is in the form of open violence, tacit rejection through silence or racist insults. This has been found to be the case in many Western democracies (for a comparative view see Walsh et al, 2016; for Ireland see Devine and Kelly, 2009; UK, Youdell, 2006; for France see Felouzis, 2005, for the US see Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014, Brown, 2015, for Australia see Priest et al, 2016) and in developing countries in the Global South (for Columbia and the Ecuador, see Barlett et al, 2015; for Kenya, see Mendenhall, 2015; for Egypt see Grabska, 2006). Religious discrimination, in particular against young Muslims has increased since the early 2000s. Discrimination ranges from open hostility (name-calling, physical attacks) to more tacit forms such as stereotyping or 'cutural pathologising' (Shain 2011). Unspoken misunderstandings by peers, negative media discourses on Muslims as terrorists and the absence of discussions about these in schools also cause discomfort and insecurity

for young Muslims in school (Shain, 2011;75; Pal Sian, 2015, Jackson, 2016). Language also plays a role in the construction of identities of ethnic minority/immigrant pupils outside the classroom. Rampton's study of young teenagers in a multi-ethnic school in Britain showed that young immigrants transcend assumed ethnic or linguistic boundaries in the process of negotiating identity through the ritualised use of 'language crossing' with their peers (1995).

Alba and Holloway refer to the "balance of responsibility among schools, communities and families" (2014:16), in which parents play a key role for children's successful inclusion by navigating school expectations, the curriculum, supporting children with school work, meeting with teachers and making informed educational choices. Immigrant families often do not possess the cultural capital that enables them to easily navigate new educational systems: they lack familiarity with the school system of the new country, or might not have the linguistic skills to support their children with school work, or understand important school communications and curriculum choices (Gibson et al, 2013). Community engagement and support has been shown to make a difference in immigrant children's educational outcomes for some ethnic groups (Safi, 2011). Programmes to further include parents of immigrant families into school life have been advocated as a solution to promote inclusion (Ryan et al, 2010; Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014). This includes linguistic support, guidance on school choice, and getting parents to participate in activities within schools (Arnot et al. 2014)

Redefining migration and inclusion

Many of the dominant paradigms around migration and inclusion are based on traditional forms of mobility and education. However, other forms of migration, such

as the experience of refugees and asylum-seekers raises new questions about the inclusion of young migrants in schools. Immigration policies and public discourse around refugees and asylum seekers have an impact on educational provision in terms of policy, schools, educators and children's experiences (Devere, McDermott, and Verbitsky, 2006). There is an inherent tension between a human rights framework, definitions of citizenship, globalization trends, neoliberal agendas and national frameworks which govern education and forms of belonging (Dryden-Peterson, 2016a). Scholarship points to the challenges for the inclusion of the non-citizen child, such as the limitations of a rights frameworks (citizenship rights and human rights) in providing successful inclusion in society (economic, social, political) and their weak impact on educational provision for children of asylum seekers and refugees (Taylor and Kaur Sidhu, 2012; Suárez-Orozco et al, 2014). Neoliberal policies in many of the receiving countries (US, Europe, Australia, New Zealand) have weakened the welfare state, which leads to resettlement policies and practices that are often misaligned with the ideals promoted by the human rights conventions of which these countries are signatories (Taylor and Kaur Siduh, 2012). The fundamental right to education for all children, as framed by *Education for All* (EFA) is often at odds with children's undocumented status. Access to mainstream education is not always available, and in some countries, children are educated in separate educational centres. This is the case, for example, in Turkey, where despite a commitment to provide education for all children, a portion of Syrian refugee children attend Temporary Education Centres in refugee camps (İçduygu, A., & Şimşek, D, 2016). A similar situation can be found in Kenya, where although a majority of refugees attend state funding school, there are significant variations according to geographical location and gender (Mendenhall et al, 2015). In Malaysia, irregular migrants are not legally allowed to attend government

schools (Nicolai et al, 2017). Quality of education is a central issue for refugee children. Even in countries where refugee children have access to mainstream education, the focus tends to be on language and wellbeing rather than educational content and quality. Indeed, quality has been a "neglected priority" in global conversations about migration and inclusion (Schweisfurth, 2015:259; Mendenhall et al, 2015; Unterhalter, 2014). Another challenge to inclusion arises from refugee's absence of legal access. Even when granted access to mainstream education, a majority of refugee children in "host neighbouring countries" will not be granted citizenship in host countries, thus limiting their possibilities of employment and participation in society (Dryden-Peterson, 2016b). In recent years, the only exception to this is the naturalisation of long-term Burundian refugees in Tanzania in 2014 (Hovil, 2016). Most often, within a context of neoliberal educational policies which emphasise goal driven education, standardised testing, performativity and comparisons, refugee children are positioned as the periphery of mainstream schooling and presented as "problematic" (Ferfolja and Vickers, 2010).

Not all countries have the same demographics of immigration and the capacity for educational systems and institutions to accommodate new migrants will vary greatly between high-income and low or middle-income countries. Responses will also differ between different local contexts and emergency conditions (Nicolai et al, 2017). For example, the large number of Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan led to a rapid increase in school population which could only be absorbed by double school shifts, with detrimental consequences for students and teachers (Dryden-Peterson and Aldeman, 2016). In contrast, high immigration influx has been shown to increase student performance in depopulated schools in London (Burgess, 2014). This points to

the contrasting effects of migration and schools' capacity for inclusion, which is often dependent on demographic trends, governmental or local funding, language support and teacher training. The lack of adequate teacher training and resources are noted as a challenge to providing quality education to refugee children, in the Global South (Mendenhall et al, 2015) and the Global North (Taylor and Kaur Siduh, 2012, van der Linden et al, 2013).

Beyond a sole focus on the challenges for refugee and migrant children in schools, some ideas from academic literature offer new perspectives on inclusion and migration. The work of Pinson, Arnot and Candappa on refugee and asylum-seeker children in the UK showed how teachers often had to negotiate between official directives and professional judgement, to provide inclusive education for children, which drew on implicit aspects of their professional practice such as compassion (2011). These non-official dimensions of practice, at the intersection of rational decisions and affect, allowed educators and schools to mobilise resources to help include refugee or asylum-seeking children in ways that were not guided by official educational policy. Fruja Amthor and Roxas (2016) advocate the recognition of the specific needs of refugee students and newcomer youth through a pedagogical shift from traditional multicultural pedagogies to ones that recognise cross-cultural relationships and cultural agency. However, scholars warn against singling out educators as solely responsible for the successful inclusion of refugee children in school, insisting on the role of global and national contexts as well as support from the local community. The role of families is strongly emphasised, with the need to develop reciprocal relationships with parents that move beyond a deficit model and a singular conception of what good education represents (Roy and Roxas, 2011). This raises questions about the choice of curriculum for refugee children. In situations of emergency, with fragmented access to education, the solutions vary

greatly. Some schools in Tanzania and Djibouti have offered education that follows refugee children's home country curriculum, in an attempt to address issues of accreditation transfer and allow young refugees to continue their education (Nicolai et al, 2017). The overarching choice, however, tends to be instruction following the host country's curriculum, to encourage linguistic and social integration.

This stresses the importance of moving away from a sole focus on the challenges children face in the host country school (language barriers, discrimination, stereotypes) to acknowledge young refugee's trajectories and pre-settlement educational experiences (Dryden-Peterson, 2016b; Uptin et al, 2016). Refugee children face multiple barriers to accessing quality education throughout their educational trajectory. Language barriers are one of the key difficulties encountered both during children's migration experience and once they have been re-settled. In their educational trajectories in multiple countries, children might encounter a range of different languages and be made to focus mainly on language acquisition at the detriment of other content-based education (Dryden-Peterson, 2016a; Wang et al, 2014). This might include a shift from one dominant language to another, but also a mix of dialects and different types of literacy, which offer lead to difficulties in accessing mainstream curriculum once resettled. Different forms of pedagogy will also be encountered by refugee children, with shifts from teacher-centred, lecture style pedagogies to more child-centred approaches, and little continuity between these different pedagogical approaches. Finally, discrimination will be experienced in multiple ways, from persecution in their home countries to stereotyping, prejudice and even violence in host countries (Dryden-Peterson, 2016b; Mendenhall et al, 2015).

Whilst approaches to the inclusion of asylum-seekers and refugees has often focused on trauma, many scholars agree that this lens can be restrictive or damaging. Instead, scholars insist on the importance of acknowledging children's resilience and provide resources to support it (Boyden, 2003; 2011). This framing moves beyond an understanding of young migrants as victims but recognises the agency of young refugees and migrants (Boyden, 2013). In other cases, the migration of young people (including refugees and economic migrants) can be aspirational, associated to school choice, global marketization but also inter-generational family relations, as shown in many migration movements (internal and international) in Peru, Ethiopia, India and Vietnam (Boyden, 2013). This helps redefine the very concept of inclusion, which is no longer understood as becoming integrated within existing institutions but seen as an opportunity to gain mobility, both social and geographical, which allows new educational choices and mitigates family poverty (Crivello, 2011). This perspective questions the accepted "terms of inclusion" promoted by traditional education and international educational policy (such as *Educational for All*) (Dyer, 2010), and redefines inclusion as multiple models of education that can be inclusive of many different forms of migration, communities and modes of communication. Dyer's research with pastoralists in Western India (Rabaris of Kuch) shows how the educational experiences of mobile pastoralists challenge the idea of sedentary forms of education and open up to new models of inclusion which involve non-traditional or formal schooling and mobile education (2016). Building on a livelihoods-oriented analysis (Scoones, 2009), Dyer presents models of education that would be inclusive of multiple forms of migration and different modes of inclusion. Similar approaches have been implemented in Gambia, Brazil and Columbia, allowing seasonal sensitive educational policies for mobile and pastoralist groups (Hadley, 2010; Nicolai, 2017).

These perspectives challenge traditional approaches to migration and inclusion, which tend to view young migrants in terms of vulnerability and deficit. They have in common a re-centering on young migrants' agency and the agency of various stakeholders involved in their education. Whilst policy, discourses and institutional structures constrain action, this does not mean that the experience of inclusion for migrants is one that is devoid of agency, whether it is the child, parents, communities or educators. Literature has shown how children's agency, their own imaginaries and forms of joint-cultural creation can transcend traditional divides in terms of home and host culture or school and family towards forms of intercultural inclusion (Welply, 2015; 2017; 2018). These cases point to the need to look at different forms of mobility, question traditional conceptions of education and the ideas of inclusion that they underpin whilst recognising young migrants' agency in the process.

These views contest a unitary, often Westernised notion of inclusive education, globally framed by international educational policy such as *Education for All* (EFA). EFA, in its original form (1990, 2000), represented a commitment to guaranteeing that every child and adult received basic and quality education, across the globe, inscribed within a human rights and social justice perspective (Miles and Singal, 2010). This was further supported by the *Millenium Development Goals* (MDGs) (2000-2015). With regard to migrant children and minoritized groups, EFA and the MDGs have had mixed success, with their treatment of inequality and the definition (or lack thereof) of marginalised groups seen as limited and at times problematic (Dyer, 2016; Barakat et al, 2016). The overwhelming focus on access to basic education in the MDGS has tended to overlook issues linked to quality and equity (Unterhalter, 2014). The *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) (2015-2030) have given more prominence to the notion of inequality,

but its definition remains unclear (Barakat et al, 2016). Whilst education for children in "vulnerable situations" (which includes migrant, refugee and displaced children) is positioned as central to meeting the SDGs in 2030 (Nicolai et al, 2017), with a stronger focus on living together in diverse societies and achieving intercultural understanding, the implementation and evaluation of quality education for migrant populations globally remains elusive in practice.

Conclusion and future research

The challenges linked to migration and inclusion are multiple, ranging from conceptual controversies to debates about policy and practice. They present local and national variations, which reflect wider perceptions of diversity in society, framed by discourses of rights, citizenship difference and belonging.

This multiplicity is reflected in the different perspectives discussed in this article. It is also apparent in the variety of methodological approaches towards the understanding of migration and inclusion. Whilst numerical approaches to migration and education can map out patterns of integration across countries and thus allow us to reflect on the inclusive nature of different educational systems, they do not allow a deeper examination of specific contextual or interactional factors that might shape the experience of inclusion for migrant youth. They also tend to overlook their agency in the process and the multiple forms of negotiation they bring to the situation. This has led to the development of more interpretive methodologies that engage with different groups and different generations, trying to understand the perspectives of young immigrants themselves, within different educational spaces. These methodological

approaches allow for an exploration of the diversity of experiences of migrant groups and help understand particular processes and mechanisms of inclusion. However, the specificity of these experiences and the multiplicity of methods and populations studied cannot identify patterns and wider societal mechanisms of inclusion/integration, and thus present challenges to developing wider theoretical or conceptual frameworks. The complementarity of different approaches thus needs to be highlighted, to gain a broad, systematic and rich understanding of the relationship between migration and inclusion and the implications this holds for educational systems across the world. There are many factors that influence inclusion in a context of migration and, as has been shown in this article, these vary across national or local contexts, and within different types of institutions. They are strongly inscribed within wider public discourse about migration and integration in society, as well as representations of the immigrant Other and ideas of national identity. From this multiplicity of contexts and perspectives, a few key points can nevertheless be identified with impact on the inclusion of migrant/immigrant youth in schools, and allow a multi-levelled understanding of the processes at play.

Educational policy is determinant in the success of inclusion initiatives. However, it is necessary to look beyond stated principles to examine the actual practices of inclusion. Curriculum, school structures, teacher recruitment and training, school choice and provision, national assessments, funding and support all shape inclusion for migrant/immigrant youth. Funding is of course central, and will impact directly on the resources available to support young migrants, whether it is in terms of language support, parental guidance and involvement, additional staff or smaller classes. The level of centralisation of a country in terms of educational policy will also have different effects. In decentralised states such as the USA or Germany, there is little cohesion in

terms of approach to linguistic minorities and wide gaps in terms of practice and levels of support. In highly centralised states such as France, there is more coherence across the country but this can lead to a monolithic approach to inclusion that might not benefit all migrant groups or individuals. The 'national" values around inclusion and the conceptual construction of difference and equality (equality of treatment *versus* equality of opportunity) will also impact on the way in which inclusion is put into practice in schools. In many cases, monolingual and monocultural school systems tend to function in assimilationist ways, even when the professed ethos or guiding policy tends to be more inclusive and multicultural. Beliefs about language and multilingualism, fears about Islam all participate in micro-practices that can act in inclusionary or exclusionary ways.

As a result of this multiplicity of challenges, there are no simple answers to the question of how to promote successful inclusion of migrants in schools. However, some key principles can be put forward. Firstly, there is a need to re-focus research on migration and inclusion and make it central to policy. Secondly, sufficient funding is needed to develop adequate support structures for young migrants in school, the training of teachers and guidance for families. Thirdly, more attention needs to be given to language issues and the way these intersect with identity, social integration and achievement in schools. Fourthly, it is important to recognise the multiple trajectories, forms of mobility and educational experiences of young migrants/immigrants, as well as their agency in these processes. Finally, the role of structural constraints and discrimination needs to be acknowledged to overcome daily discrimination and inequalities faced by young migrants in school, to promote the inclusion of *all* young people within educational systems.

Bibliographical references

Abbas, T. (2012). 'Radical Politics, Violent Extremism and the Impact of UK Counter-Terrorism Strategy on Muslim Diaspora Communities: The "Securitisation of Integration"'. In S. Akbarzadeh (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Political Islam*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Adams, L., & Kirova, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Global Migration and Education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Adams, M., & Bell, L. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*. New York: Routledge.

Agacinski, D., Bolsson-Cohen, M., Deprez-Boudier, V., Garner, H., Harfi, M., Frederic, L., & Maigne, G. (2015). Favouring the Economic Integration of Young People with Immigrant Backgrounds. Paris: France Stratégie.

Aikman, S., & Dyer, C. (2012). Education and Inclusion: Re-Examining the Narratives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 42*(2), 177-185.

Alamartine, F. (2003). Des faits? Quels faits? A propos de 'manifestations ethniques' dans un LP Parisien. In F. Lorcerie (Ed.), *L'école et le défi ethnique*. Paris: ESF-éditeur & INRP.

Alba, R., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2017). What About the Mainstream? Assimilation in Super-Diverse Times. *Ethnic and Racial Studies. Published online 11th December 2017. Retrieved 20th June 2018. URL:https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406127*.

Alberio, M. (2012). Education and Social Inequalities in the Urban Space: A French Example. *Papers in Political Economy,* -(45), *Published online 1st May 2012. Retrieved 20th June 2018.* URL : http://journals.openedition.org/interventionseconomiques/1547.

Androff, D. K., Ayon, C., Becerra, D., & Gurrola, M. (2011). US immigration policy and immigrant children's well-being: The impact of policy shifts. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare,* 38 (1) 77-98.

Archer, L., & Francis, B. (2007). *Understanding Minority Ethnic Achievement: Race, Gender, Class and 'Success'*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Arnot, M., Schneider, C., Evans, M., Liu, Y., Welply, O., & Davies-Tutt, D. (2014). *School approaches to the education of EAL students. Language development, social integration and achievement*. Cambridge: The Bell Educational Trust Ltd.

Atwood, E., & López, G. R. (2014). Let's Be Critically Honest: Towards a Messier Counterstory in Critical Race Theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(9), 1134-1154.

Banks, J. (2002). Race, Knowledge Construction, and Education in the USA: Lessons from History. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 7-27.

Banks, J., & McGee, C. (Eds.). (2009). *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Banks, J., Suárez-Orozco, M., & Ben-Peretz, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Global Migration, Diversity, and Civic Education: Improving Policy and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Barakat, B., Bengtsson, S., Muttarak, R., & Kebede, E. (2016). *Modelling SDG scenarios for Educational Attainment and Development*. CESDEG: Education for all Global Monitoring Report (EFA-GMR).

Bartlett, L., & Ghaffar-Kucher, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Refugees, Immigrants, and Education in the Global South: Lives in Motion*. London: Routledge.

Bartlett, L., Rodriguez, D. and Oliveira, G. (2015) *Migration and education: socio-cultural perspectives*. *Educação e Pesquisa*. 41 (1) http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1517-9702201508144891.

Basternier, A. (2015). L'école en France devant la société ethnique. *Le Débat, 4*(186), 168-185.

Beaud, S. (2018). *La France des Belhoumi*. Paris: La Découverte.

Bertossi, C. (2011). National Models of Integration in Europe : A Comparative and Critical Analysis. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(12), 1561-1580.

Bishop, R. (2011). *Freeing Ourselves.* . Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Blackledge, A. (2001). Literacy, Schooling and Ideology in a Multilingual State. *Curriculum Journal, 12*(3), 291-312.

Borjas, G. J. (2011). *Heaven's door: Immigration policy and the American economy*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Bourne, J. (2007). Focus on Literacy: ELT and Educational Attainment in England. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *The International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Norwell: Springer-Verlag.

Brinton, D. M., Kagan, O., & Bauckus, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Heritage language education: A new field emerging*. New York: Routledge.

Buras, K. (2015). *Charter Schools, Race, and Urban Space: Where the Market Meets Grassroots Resistance*. New York: Routledge.

Burgess, S. (2014) *Understanding the success of London's schools.* Centre for Market and Public Organisation Working

Collet, B. (2018). *Migration, Religion, and Schooling in Liberal Democratic States*. New York: Routledge.

Collett, E., & Petrovic, M. (2014). The Future of Immigrant Integration in Europe. Mainstreaming Approches for Inclusion. Brussels: Migration Policy Institute Europe.

Combs, M. C., Da Silva Iddings, C., & Moll, L. (2014). 21st Century Linguistic Apartheid: English Language Learners in Arizona Public Schools. In P. Orelus (Ed.), *Affirming Language Diversity in Schools and Society. Beyond Linguistic Apartheid*. New York: Routledge.

Contreras, A. R. (2002). The impact of immigration policy on education reform: Implications for the new millennium. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(2), 134-155.

Crivello, G. (2011). 'Becoming Somebody': Youth Transitions through Education and Migration in Peru'. *Journal of Youth Studies, 14*(4), 395-411.

Cusset, P.-Y., Garner, H., Harfi, M., Laine, F., & Marguerit, D. (2015). Young People from Immigrant Backgrounds: What Are the Barriers to Their Economic Integration?". Paris: France Stratégie.

Davies, L. (2005). Schools and War: Urgent Agendas for International and Comparative Education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 35*(4), 357–371.

de Block, L., & Buckingham, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Global Children, Global Media: Migration, Media and Childhood*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Rudder, V., Poiret, C., & Vourc'h, F. (2000). *L'inégalité raciste. L'universalité Républicaine à l'épreuve*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Delamotte, R., Penloup, M.-C., & Reuter, Y. (2016). Décrocher/Raccrocher à l'école : la part du français. *Repères. Recherche en didactique du francais langue maternelle.*(53), 7-12.

Devere, H., McDermott, K., & Verbitsky, J. (2006). Just a refugee: Rights and status of refugees in New Zealand. Forced migration and global processes, in F. Crepeau, D. Nakache, M. Collyer, N. H. Goetz, A. Hansen (Eds) *Forced Migration and Global Processes: A View from Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford: Lexington Books. pp 343-67.

Dronkers, J., & Heus, M. (2016). Educational Performance of the Children of Immigrants in Sixteen OECD Countries. In D. Besharov & H. Lopez (Eds.), *A World in Motion: Trends in Migration and Migration Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016a). Refugee education in countries of first asylum: Breaking open the black box of pre-resettlement experiences. *Theory and Research in Education*, 14(2), 131-148.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016b). Refugee education: The crossroads of globalization. *Educational Researcher*, 45(9), 473-482.

Dryden-Peterson, S. and Adelman, E. (2016) 'Inside Syrian refugee schools: making room for refugees. education-plus-development/2016/02/17/inside-syrian-refugee-schools-making-room-for-refugees-in-second-shifts/

Dyer, C. (2018). Education Inclusion as a Border Regime: Implications for Mobile Pastoralists in Ethiopia's Afar Region. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 27*(2-3), 145-165.

European Commission Report. (2013). Study on Educational Support for Newly Arrived Migrant Children Brussels: European Commission.

Fabricant, M., & Fine, M. (2012). *Charter Schools and the Corporate Makeover of Public Education: What's at Stake?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Feliciano, C., & Lanuza, Y. An Immigrant Paradox? Contextual Attainment and Intergenerational Educational Mobility. *American Sociological Review, 82*(1), 211-241.

Felouzis, G. (2005). Ethnic Segregation and its Effects in Middle School in France. *Revue Française de Sociologie, 46*(5), 3-35.

Ferfolja, T. & Vickers, M. (2010) Supporting refugee students in school education in Greater Western Sydney, *Critical Studies in Education*, 51:2, 149-162, DOI: 10.1080/17508481003731034

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Gándara, P., & Aldana, U. (2014). Who's Segregated Now? Latinos, Language, and the Future of Integrated Schools. *Educational Administration Quaterly, 50*(5), 735-748.

Gándara, P., & Rumberger, R. W. (2009). Immigration, language, and education: How does language policy structure opportunity. *Teachers College Record*, 111(3), 750-782.

Gibson, M., Carrasco, S., Pamies, J., Ponferrada, M., & Rios-Rojas, A. (2013). Different Systems, Similar Results: Youth of Immigrant Origin at Scool in California and Catalonia. In R. Alba & J. Holdaway (Eds.), *Children of Immigrants at School* (pp. 84-119). New York: New York University Press.

Gillborn, D. (2006). Critical Race Theory and Education: Racism and Antiracism in Educational Theory and Praxis. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 27*(1), 11-32.

Gillborn, D. (2008). Tony Blair and the Politics of Race in Education: Whiteness, Doublethink and New Labour. *Oxford Review of Education, 34*(6), 713–725.

Gillborn, D. (2010). The Colour of Numbers: Surveys, Statistics and Deficit-Thinking About Race and Class. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(2), 253-276.

Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, Critical Race Theory, and the Primacy of Racism: Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*(3), 277-287.

Giroux, H. (2008). Education and the Crisis of Youth: Schooling and the Promise of Democracy. *The Educational Forum, 73*(1), 8-18.

Gosh, R., & Galczynski, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Redefining Multicultural Education: Inclusion and the Right to Be Different*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Grabska, K. (2006). Marginalization in urban spaces of the global south: Urban refugees in Cairo. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(3), 287-307.

Halstead, J., & McLaughlin, T. (2005). Are Faith Schools Divisive? In R. Gardner, J. Cairns & D. Lawton (Eds.), *Faith Schools. Consensus or Conflict?* London: Routledge.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Routledge.

Hadley, S. (2010) *Seasonality and access to education: the case of primary education in sub-Saharan Africa*. Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity.Institute of Education:London.

Hovil, L. (2016). *Refugees, conflict and the search for belonging* (1st edition. ed.). Cham, NY: Springer International Pub. Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre.

Ichou, M. (2014). Who They Were There: Immigrants' Educational Selectivity and Their Children's Educational Attainment. *European sociological review*, *30*(6), 750–765.

İçduygu, A., & Şimşek, D. (2016). Syrian refugees in Turkey: Towards integration policies. *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 15(3), 59-69.

Jackson, L. (2014). Michael S. Merry, Equality, Citizenship, and Segregation: A Defense of Separation. *Educational Theory*, 64(6), 661-667.

Jackson, L. (2016). *Muslims and Islam in U.S. Education: Reconsidering Multiculturalism*. New York: Routledge.

Johnson, E., & Johnson, D. (2015). Language Policy and Bilingual Education in Arizona and Washington State. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 18*(1), 92-112.

Joppke, C. (2017). *Is Multiculturalism Dead?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Khosrokhavar, F. (2018). *Nouveau Jihad en Occident*. Paris: Robert Laffont.

King, R., & Mai, N. (2008). *Out of Albania: From Crisis to Social Inclusion in Italy*. New York: Berghan Books.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure and Future*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2011). *The Crises of Multiculturalism. Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. London: ZED Books.

Lipman, P. (2011). *The New Political Economy of Urban Education: Neoliberalism, Race, and the Right to the City*. New York: Routledge.

Liu, Y., Fisher, L., Forbes, K., & Evans, M. (2017). The Knowledge Base of Teaching in Linguistically Diverse Contexts: 10 Grounded Principles of Multilingual Classroom Pedagogy for EAL. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 17*(4), 378-395.

Lo Bianco, J., & Ball, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Learning from Difference: Comparative Accounts of Multicultural Education*. New York: Springer.

Logan, J., & Burdick-Will, J. (2016). School Segregation, Charter Schools, and Access to Quality Education. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 38*(3), 323-343.

Lorcerie, F. (2017). Si les élèves ont le droit de parler de la religion, quelle part pour la pédagogie? *Les Cahiers Pédagogiques,* -(44), 23-25.

Lorcerie, F., & Mignard, B. (2017). L'école, la laïcité et le virage sécuritaire post-attentats : un tableau contrasté. *Sociologie [En ligne], 8*(4), Published online le 27th January 2017, consulté le 20th June 2018. URL : http://journals.openedition.org/sociologie/3391.

Maddox, B. (2010). Marginal Returns: Re-Thinking Mobility and Educational Benefit in Contexts of Chronic Poverty. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(2), 213-222.

May, S. (2014). Justifying educational language rights. *Review of Research in Education*, 38 (1), 215-241.

Meer, N. (2014). *Key Concepts in Race and Ethnicity*. London: Sage.

Mendenhall, Mary, Sarah Dryden-Peterson, Lesley Bartlett, Caroline Ndirangu, Rosemary Imonje, Daniel Gakunga, Loise Gichuhi, Grace Nyagah, Ursulla Okoth, and Mary Tangelder. 2015. "Quality Education for Refugees in Kenya:

Pedagogy in Urban Nairobi and Kakuma Refugee Camp Settings." *Journal on Education in Emergencies* 1(1): 92-130.

Merry, M. (2016). *Equality, citizenship, and segregation: A defense of separation*. New York: Springer.

Michael-Luna, S. (2013). What Linguistically Diverse Parents Know and How It Can Help Early Childhood Educators: A Case Study of a Dual Language Preschool Community. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 41*(3), 447-454.

Miles, S., & Singal, N. (2010). The Education for All and Inclusive Education Debate: Conflict, Contradiction or Opportunity? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14*(1), 1-15.

Miller, E., Ziaian, T., & Esterman, A. (2018). Australian School Practices and the Education Experiences of Students with a Refugee Background: A Review of the Literature,. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22*(4), 339-359.

Modood, T., & Meer, N. (2013). Framing Multicultural Citizenship in Europe. In T. Triandafyllidou, T. Modood & N. Meer (Eds.), *European Mutlticulturalism(S): Cultural, Religious and Ethnic Challenges*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Modood, T., & Salt, J. (2011). *Global Migration, Ethnicity and Citizenship*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Nicolai, S., Wales, J., & Aiazzi, E. (2017). Education, migration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Nogera, P. (2017). Introduction to "Racial Inequality and Education: Patterns and Prospects for the Future. *The Educational Forum, 81*(2), 129-135.

O Ensor, M., & Gozdziak, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Children and Migration. At the Crossroads of Resiliency and Vulnerability*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

OECD (2015) *Helping immigrant students to succeed at school – and beyond*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/Helping-immigrant-students-to-succeed-at-school-and-beyond.pdf

OECD (2017) *Interrelations between public policies, migration and development*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264265615-en.

Pal Sian, K. (2015). Spies, Surveillance and Stakeouts: Monitoring Muslim Moves in British State Schools. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 18*(1), 183-201.

Pecenka, J., & Anthias, F. (2015). Minority Faith Schools as Claims for Cultural Recognition? Two Examples from England. *Identities. Global Studies in Culture and Power, 22*(4), 433-450.

Pinson, H., Arnot, M., & Candappa, M. (2010). *Education, Asylum and the 'Non-Citizen' Child: The Politics of Compassion and Belonging*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Polat , F. (2011). Inclusion in Education: A Step Towards Social Justice. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(1), 50-58.

Portes, A., & Rivas, A. (2011). The Adaptation of Migrant Children. *The Future of Children, 21*(1), 219-246.

Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in Late Modernity : Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rao, N., & Hossain, M. (2012). “I Want to Be Respected”: Migration, Mobility, and the Construction of Alternate Educational Discourses in Rural Bangladesh. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 43*(4), 415-428.

Raveaud, M. (2006). *De L'enfant au citoyen : la construction de la citoyenneté à l'école en France et en Angleterre*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Raveaud, M. (2008). Culture-Blind? Parental Discourse on Religion, Ethnicty and Secularism in the French Educational Context. *European Educational Research Journal, 7*(1), 74-88.

Richardson, R., & Bolloten, B. (2015). The Great British Values Disaster – Education, Security and Vitriolic Hate. Retrieved on the 24th of November 2017. URL: http://www.irr.org.uk/news/the-great-british-values-disaster-education-security-and-vitriolic-hate/

Roy L. and Roxas, K. (2011) Whose Deficit Is This Anyhow? Exploring Counter-Stories of Somali Bantu Refugees' Experiences in "Doing School". *Harvard Educational Review.* 81(3), 521-542.

Safi, M. (2011). Penser l'intégration des immigrés : les enseignements de la sociologie américaine. *Sociologie [En ligne], 2*(2), 140-164.

Schweisfurth, Michele. 2015. “Learner-Centred Pedagogy: Towards a Post-2015 Agenda for Teaching and Learning.” *International Journal of Educational Development* 40 (1): 259-66.

Shankar-Brown, R. (2015). Urbanization and Persistent Educational Inequalities: The Need for Collective Action Towards Equity and Social Justice. *National Youth-At-Risk-Journal, 1*(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.20429/nyarj.2015.010104

Short, G. (2002). Faith–Based Schools: A Threat to Social Cohesion? *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 36*(4), 559-572.

Slee, R. (2009). The Inclusion Paradox: The Cultural Politics of Difference. In M. Apple, W. Au & L. A. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education*. New York: Routledge. Pp 177-189

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2008). Language rights and bilingual education. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1578-1592). Springer, Boston, MA.

Suárez-Orozco, C., Martin, M., Alexandersson, M., Dance, L. J., & Lunneblad, J. (2014). Promising Practices: Preparing Children of Immigrants in New York and Sweden In R. Alba & J. Holdaway (Eds.), *The Children of Immigrants at School*. New York: New York University Press.

Taylor, C. (1992). Multiculturalism and the "Politics of Recognition". In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism and the "Politics of Recognition"*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, S., & Kaur Sidhu, R. (2012). Supporting Refugee Students in Schools : What Constitutes Inclusive Education? *International Journal of Inclusive Education.*, *16*(1), 39-56.

Tomlinson, S. (2009). Multicultural Education in the United Kingdom. In J. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. London: Routledge.

Unterhalter, E. (2014) Measuring Education for the Millennium Development Goals: Reflections on Targets, Indicators, and a Post-2015 Framework, *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 15:2-3, 176-187, doi: 10.1080/19452829.2014.880673

Uptin, J., Wright, J., & Harwood, V. (2016). Finding education: Stories of how young former refugees constituted strategic identities in order to access school. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(3), 598-617.

van der Linden, J.; Blaak M., Aate Andrew F. (2016) The contribution of the diaspora to the reconstruction of education in South Soudan: the challenge of being involved from a distance. In M. Arnot, S. Schneider, O. Welply (Eds). *Education, mobilities and migration. People, ideas and resources*. London: Routledge

van Praag, L., Boone, S., Stevens, P., & Van Houtte, M. (2015). How Tracking Structures Attitudes Towards Ethnic out-Groups and Interethnic Interactions in the Classroom: An Ethnographic Study in Belgium. *Social Psychology of Education, 18*(1), 165–184.

van Zanten, A. (1997). Schooling Immigrants in France in the 1990's. Success of Failure of the Republican Model of Integration? *Anthropology and Education Quaterly, 28*(3), 351-374.

van Zanten, A. (2005). New Modes of Reproducing Social Inequality

in Education: The Changing Role of Parents, Teachers, Schools and Educational Policies. *European Educational Research Journal, 4*(3), 155-169.

Vang, Z., & Chang, Y. (2018). Immigrants' Experiences of Everyday Discrimination in Canada. Unpacking the Contributions of Assimilation, Race, and Early Socialization. *International Migration Review, First published 29th May 2018.* http://journals.sagepub.com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1177/0197918318764871.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-Diversity and Its Implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024-1054.

Vertovec, S. (2017). Talking around Super-Diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, Published online 5th December 2017. Retrieved 18th of June 2018. URL: https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406128*.

Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (Eds.). (2009). *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies, and Practices*. London: Routledge.

Wang, X., Spotti, M., Juffermans, K., Cornips, L., Kroon, S., & Blommaert, J. (2014). Globalization in the margins: toward a re-evalution of language and mobility. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5(1), 23-44.

Warmington, P., Gillborn, D., Rollock, N., & Demack, S. (2018). "They Can't Handle the Race Agenda": Stakeholders' Reflections on Race and Education Policy, 1993–2013. *Educational Review, 70*(2018), 409-426.

Welply, O. (2010). Language Difference and Identity in Multicultural Classrooms: The Views of 'Immigrant-Background' Children in French and English Primary Schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(3), 345-358.

Welply, O. (2015). Re-Imagining Otherness: An Exploration of the Global Imaginaries of Children from Immigrant Backgrounds in Primary Schools in France and England. *European Educational Research Journal, 14*(5), 430-453.

Welply, O. (2017). "My Language…I Don't Know How to Talk About It": Children's Views on Language Diversity in Primary Schools in France and England. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 17*(4), 437-454.

Welply, O. (2018). 'I'm Not Being Offensive but…': Intersecting Discourses of Discrimination Towards Muslim Children in School. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*. *21* (3), 370-389.

Wieviorka, M., & Khosrokhavar, F. (2017). *Les Juifs, les Musulmans et la République*. Paris: Robert Laffont.

Ybarra, V. D., Sanchez, L. M., & Sanchez, G. R. (2016). Anti-immigrant anxieties in state policy: The great recession and punitive immigration policy in the American states, 2005–2012. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 16(3), 313-339.

Youdell, D. (2012). Intelligibility, Agency and the Race-Nationed-Religioned Subjects of Education. In K. Bhopal & J. Preston (Eds.), *Intersectionality and "Race" in Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race ethnicity and education*, 5(1), 29-50.

Leonardo, Z. (2004a). Critical social theory and transformative knowledge: The functions of criticism in quality education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(6), 11-18.

Leonardo, Z. (2004b). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36(2), 137-152.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, Whiteness, and Education*. New York: Routledge.