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Within a context of increased globalisation, migration, mobilities and education has become a growing field of interest in international and comparative education – as evidenced by the number of papers on the topic in *Compare*, including the special issue of March 2010, ‘Migration, Education and Socio-Economic Mobility’. The international BAICE conference in September 2012, *Education, Mobility and Migration: people, ideas and resources* demonstrated the wide variety of perspectives on the issue and raised new questions, both empirical and theoretical, with regard to the educational experiences of different migrant groups, and the new challenges these present for educational practice and policies at a local, national and global level.

Education is at the centre of this context of increased migration and mobility (Adams & Kirova 2007). Rethinking the role of education in relation to new movements, flows and networks, and new forms of diversity and identity has become central to educational discourse, both in policy and research. Consequently, there is the need to account for the complexity that lies beneath the umbrella terms ‘migration’ and ‘mobility’ or ‘mobilities’. Whilst migration usually refers to the movement of people across geographic boundaries to reside in a different country, region or location, mobility is mostly used to refer to the ability to move within a social structure (such as social mobility) or across space (physical mobility) or the ability of knowledge, ideas and practices to move across national educational systems and institutions. Current research has approached these concepts from many different angles and in practice they are often used interchangeably since migration of people often involves various forms of social, geographic and educational mobilities. In a demographical mobile age, it is hard to distinguish between these two associated elements. Thus, some focus on the nature of migration patterns within different national contexts, exploring, for example, how migrants are received and how they experience the political, cultural and educational conditions of their new country (Rutter 1999). Migration researchers seek out the experiences of young migrants in school, parents’ perceptions and educational beliefs, as well as tapping teachers’ views and practice in relation to particular migrant groups, both from a national and cross-national perspective (for example Pinson, Arnot and Candappa 2010 research on refugees and asylum-seeking students). Others examine the processes of acculturation, integration, inclusion, language issues and social identity construction through education (for example Vertovec & Wessendorf: 2009; Welply 2010). Alternatively educationalists critically assess at the policy level how, for example, immigration and asylum policies affect the provision of education for different groups of migrants (for example Demirdjian 2012). The politics of immigration reveals a good deal about the cultural ethos of countries and the expectations that educational institutions can cope with and resolve the tensions such politics create.

Secondly, at the international level, studies on migration and education focus particularly on immigration patterns from the global South to North. Arguably this is the most politically controversial aspect of migration today since this pattern has triggered the aggressively hostile conditions which migrant groups experience in, for example, Europe, the US, and Australasia. Closed door immigration legislation and citizenship rights reflect the powerful presence of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, xenophobia and Islamophobia in schools and society in the Global North. Researchers have drawn attention to the consequences of such international migration and its implications for the Global South (e.g. Rao 2010). The financial and economic benefits from migration for the sending countries - such as remittances which help stimulate development, for example, by financing schooling in developing countries have been recognised but so too have their negative consequences. The effect of this economic analysis is that migration studies in the past focused first, on

(…) the investment of migrant remittances in the education of their children back home; and second, the perspective of ‘brain drain’ that refers to the migration of skilled workers from the developing to the developed world (Rao 2010, 137).

As Cao (1996) points out early studies expressed worries about highly skilled professionals moving out of the sending countries and not necessarily returning or being in a position to transfer back skills. However, these flows are not unilateral or uni-dimensional – it is more the case of ‘brain circulation’. Recent studies stress the complexity of transnational interconnections between sending and the receiving countries.

Thirdly, migration also occurs from South to South. Such migration carries its own challenges in relation to education, not least its challenges to simple notions of push/pull dynamics. The majority of the world’s migrants have moved from one developing country to another (World Bank 2011). There is considerable danger that, in income poor countries, migrant communities receive little support, and can instead encounter hostile responses and discriminatory practices, from those whose livelihoods might be thought to be threatened (see Bartlett 2012)

These three migratory patterns alone do not do justice to the complexity of migration and the transformations which it brings to educational systems, to those who participate in educational institutions and to the pedagogical/professional practice which is confronted with previously unknown levels of diversity, plurality and difference. Migration changes the social fabric of educational institutions and its purposes by increasing diversity but also by challenging the ways in which they function as learning centres and places of socialisation, and also their methods of dealing with shifting notions of what citizen rights, welfare and employment entitlements are made available to the newly arrived group. The movement of educational ideas, of educational personnel and the migrant teacher and student indicate the pressure on the fields of comparative and international education to recognise this world on the move. In the 21st century, such global movements and transformations which in one way lock nationally shaped educational institutions together in a common global project challenge us to think critically about our theoretical and methodological models, helping us break out of what Beck (2005) called ‘methodological nationalism’.

Recent research on migration, mobilities and education has promoted alternative perspectives. There is increasing concern to deconstruct these two concepts by identifying the influence of psychological/social interpretations by migrant groups themselves of such issues - not just migrant adults but youth and children. A variety of methodological approaches allow us to widen the focus to be able to listen to the voices of migrant groups and individuals (Rao 2010). This has involved interpretative research, whether ethnographies and qualitative case studies (a few of which are presented in this special issue) and interdisciplinary research which offer us the chance to explore the varied political, social and geographic/spatial experience and identities of migrants (Adams & Kirova 2007; Modood & Salt 2011). However, such methodological approaches are not unproblematic. Moving beyond a numerical measurement and linear analysis of migration which seeks to identify its societal consequences means that there is less emphasis on pattern and more on the specificity of experience that is relevant to different migrant communities, different generations, but also different sub-groups such as migrant youth, students and children, migrant parents of children, teachers and academics. This plurality of sample, whilst reminding us of the kaleidoscope of migratory experiences, makes it difficult to develop strong generic conceptual frameworks.

The purpose of this special issue is to demonstrate a range of contemporary perspectives on how migration and mobility has or can impact on education. Below we locate the contributions within three major themes.

**Poverty, migration, child mobility and social reproduction**

Recent studies on migration, mobility and education consider the prevalence of poverty and wealth and different aspirations towards upward mobility within such unequal structures. Internal and external migration is often presented as a pathway towards upward social mobility and a means of escaping poverty; yet as Bryan Maddox (2010) argued, migration also carries risks for the poor, such as incomplete schooling, and the loss of some initial advantage for the family, for example, in terms of child labour, or a means of livelihood. Thus migration may be less about social mobility and more about the social reproduction of existing disadvantages within the country (Maddox 2010; McEvoy, Petrzelka, Radel & Schmook 2012)

Maddox (2010) drew our attention to the limitations of our understanding of modernity and development which can imply education is only effective if it contributes to occupational mobility, increased income and possibly a break, even if temporary, from poverty. However, migration issues relating to education cannot simply be put into the pre-existing grid of human capital theory, credentialism or cost benefit analysis. As he pointed out not all the returns from migration are tangible and quantifiable – for example, quantitative analysis of educational outcomes cannot tap the micro-changes associated with ‘status, income and occupational identity’ which the poor experience through education (Jeffery, Jeffery, and Jeffery 2008). Ideally moving beyond formal measurements in terms of educational attainment or occupational position in the job market will mean that ‘marginal returns’ will be addressed and these educational returns might even be identified where there are no prospects of employment (Maddox 2010, 215). For some migrants, this takes the form of what has been called a ‘Faustian Bargain’ (Wood 2003 cited in Maddox 2010, 214).

The opportunity for ‘escape’ through migration also entails risks for the poor. It may be viewed as last chance strategy (....) and may lead to the dissolution of the family as a viable social and economic unit (Maddox 2010, 214).

Whilst it is important to recognise the issues and challenges faced by child migrants, both the loss suffered and the difficulties faced in a new environment and receiving country, it is equally necessary to acknowledge their agency in the process, at all phases of their trajectories, to overcome ‘deficit models of educational interventions’ (Adams & Kirova 2007:326) and recognize their resilience (Boyden 2003). This migration/poverty/education nexus is addressed by the first two articles of this special issue, those by Jo Boyden and by Caroline Dyer in two different scenarios in which the poor migrate – one in search of schooling, the other seeking schooling forms which validate rather than destroy their migratory cultures.

Jo Boyden’s presidential address at the BAICE 2012 conference, published here, draws our attention to the fact that child mobility away from the family and their migration in search of schooling has considerable strategic relevance to the resourcing of poor families. Drawing on the insights gained from the massive data collected on some 3,000 boys and girls born in the mid 1990s and 2001-2 by the Young Lives project from Ethiopia, Andhra Pradesh (India), Peru and Vietnam, Boyden highlights the impact of educational expansion and its associated aspirational shifts on this pattern of survival. Whilst in developed countries, schooling is associated with residentially fixed homes (except those rich who shop for boarding schools for their children abroad), in poor countries children in increasing numbers are leaving home alone to find secondary schools or just ‘good schools’. In this scenario ‘education can be less a casualty than a driver of child migration’. High aspirations of a better life and social mobility leads to a physical search for school education that takes children far from their families. As she points out, ‘the global link between school education and childhood mobility is becoming ever more apparent’

Such ‘independent child migration’ is shown to raise a number of important questions for migration studies not least the notions that such non-parent residence is a familial crisis that childhood should be spatially restricted, and that young people leaving home is a ‘shame’. Boyden demonstrates through the data, that child migrants show respect for their parents and elders since they aim to make a contribution to their family’s income by improving their learning (a task that is fast becoming ‘the children’s chief familial responsibility). They try to fulfil their family’s collectively high aspirations of achieving a good education for them and of gaining a better life both psychologically and physically. Migrating in search of better schooling is a form of educational investment whether in private or government schools (Srivastava 2013) which, according to Boyden is, ‘fundamental to mutual relations between generations’. Significantly, the movement between schools, on the one hand, and school transfers, on the other, is understood to be part of the global marketization of education, leading to more interest in the patterns of school choice, new forms of residential accommodation, and different forms of family/household-school connections.

The delivery of education through geographic catchment areas is challenged by this migratory practice. Boyden’s analysis makes us consider whether the notion of entitlement to education promoted by EFA restrictively still builds on traditional models of formal schooling and educational opportunities. Similarly Caroline Dyer’s paper ‘Does mobility have to mean being hard to reach? asks us to challenge EFA’s assumptions about the sedentary nature of schooling. Drawing insights from her research in Western India on the Rabaris of Kuch, Dyer draws attention to the marginalisation associated with mobile pastoralists, a group that has been much neglected in studies on migration and education. The 2010 Education For All Global Monitoring Report (GMR) called for urgent action to addressing their educational deprivation. However, the terms ‘nomad’ and ‘pastoralist’ themselves, as Dyer argues, are also contested and debated notions, often interpreted within a deficit discourse.

To explore what Sen defines as ‘ways of judging’ injustice, Dyer builds on a livelihoods-orientated analysis (Scoones 2009) to examine the ‘terms of inclusion’ of institutional responses to pastoralists’ educational deprivation around the world. She suggests that the models and institutional arrangements commonly offered for the education of mobile pastoralists contribute to their exclusion and marginalisation. A recognition of the ‘livelihood sustainability’ of pastoralism can help reframe the relationship of education to mobility, and overcome the dichotomy between formalised education and ‘situated livelihood learning’. Here formal education would be ‘*complementary to*, rather than in *competition with’* the latter. This reconceptualisation of the terms in which ‘social injustice is understood’ has implications for the provision of education for mobile pastoralists and for wider understandings of issues of migration, education and mobility in contexts of chronic poverty.

**Networks of migration within and across national educational systems**

The second theme in this special issue refers to the very different experience of groups of migrants who find themselves for a range of different reasons, whether through forced migration or choice migration – studying in schools abroad. Here there is a multitude of issues to research, not least the educational and community experiences of migrant youth and students trying to make sense of their studies, their new lives and the structural conditions they face. These issues also include teachers who often feel unprepared to deal with the new diversity of children in schools. The curricular issues too are multiple schools are carrying as it were the demographic challenges of globalisation whilst still embedded in their national histories and demands.

Not all countries which let in migrants and their families welcome them or promise integration. Indeed Bauman (2004) called migrants the ‘flotsam of globalisation’ - part of the wasteland left over from wars, famines, and industrial shifts globally. Migrants’ experience of the school system in the receiving country is framed by the institutional cultures and pedagogic regimes of the school but also by immigration policy The temporality of migration as Rao (2010) points out is critical to the experience of education. Time allows individuals and groups to stay but not to participate in civic membership and hence become fully integrated. Young people are particularly vulnerable here. They might come with parents on temporary visas, as trafficked or, unaccompanied minors. What is often the case is that migrant students are ‘non-citizens’ in a twilight zone without membership of society. Researching these migratory experiences is challenging, not least because poor and ‘illegal’ migrants are not easily identified. They may be rendered invisible formally by the state and also informally by a school system that does not want to stigmatise them (Pinson et al. 2010).

We know from research that the forms of marginalisation and ‘othering’ of migrant students inside schools and colleges are also underpinned by the unequal power hierarchies inscribed in nationalist and postcolonial imagery and memory (Bhabha 1994), which often shapes policy and practice. These processes of exclusion are found not just in South/North migration; South-South migration also carries these forms of marginalisation and exclusion. Bartlett (2012) reminded us in an article in *Compare* of the exclusionary practices that make it impossible for young migrant Haitians to fit into Dominican society where they experience physical and mental abuse, denial of the right papers to claim birth and citizenship, thus forcing some to drop out of school. South-South migration still has colonial history embedded in its notions of skin colour, which constructs ‘black’ as dangerous and ‘bad’ and views immigrant youth as deviant and source of trouble. The implications for EFA and MDGs of these postcolonial processes of exclusion within schooling are fruitful topics for future research. Addressing the ethics of schooling, its structures, processes and teacher attitudes are critical to the well-being of young migrants within Southern states.

It is also important that research on the school experiences of migrant students recognises the importance of religion and language. Addressing religious diversity presents significant challenges for schools, but also for particular groups such as Muslim youth. These youth might not be ‘migrants’ in terms of temporality (they would be classified as second/third generation nationals rather than newly arrived), however, increased Islamophobia in schools in receiving countries, combined with an emphasis on security and the ‘War on Terror’ have created different conditions for the processes of identify formation, identification and belonging of such youth, they are being treated ‘as if newly arrived’. These new conditions mean that religion has become the new identity marker, in some cases over other forms of national identification (Basit 2009; Shain 2011). In a context in which multiculturalism is being questioned across Europe (Vertovec & Wessenhorf 2009), contemporary forms of religious discrimination and tensions in school carry broader social implications for migrant receiving societies.

The language issues associated with increased demographic movement are also ever more important for state schools whether in the Global North or South, not least because of the new so-called ‘superdiversity’ in schools in urban areas (Blommaert 2011) has meant that language has moved beyond an educational challenge to become a social and political one. The ‘moral panic’ around non-English speaking children in schools, echoed by tabloids in Britain is exemplifies the new challenges faced by migrant students. Recent research emphasises the need for support in learning the language of the receiving country, whilst encouraging oracy and literacy in children’s home languages (Mallows 2012). Studies have emphasised forms of curriculum innovation, and there is also a push towards more bilingual learning to build on children’s skills in their home language, and encourage literacy development in both languages. These new perspectives, however, face strong challenges and point to the paradox of international migration: whilst flows of people have taken on a global dimension, national curricula on the whole remain embedded within strong national cultures. The question of how monocultural and monolingual school systems can embrace the new diversity offered by global migration is yet unanswered (Welply 2010; Blommaert 2011).

Kulyk’s article in this edition examines such tensions and contradictions of school-based language policies within Ukraine, examining the situation of two minority linguistic groups in Ukraine: the Hungarians of Transcarpathia and the Crimean Tatars of the Crimean peninsula. The findings were based on research conducted in localities with a majority and minority Hungarian populations and with Crimean Tatar minorities. Building on semi-structured interviews with education officials and minority activists, along with questionnaire responses of students in their final year of secondary school (grade 11) and their parents, Kulyk describes the policy approach to the education of minority languages for these groups contrasting it with the beliefs of students and parents within these minority groups.

Kulyk contrasts the preservation of instruction in Hungarian language with the limited instruction in Crimean Tatar – both being problematic for the social integration and the ethnocultural identities of each group. The extensive instruction in Hungarian for this minority group creates problems in terms of integration within mainstream Ukrainian speaking higher education and labour market. Conversely, the restricted instruction in the language of the Crimean Tatar leads to a limited proficiency for young Crimean Tatars in the minority language, rendering their cultural identity more vulnerable. In light of these findings, the author argues in favour of bilingual education, which integrates instruction in the majority language (Ukranian) and in minority languages

Another dimension of migrant student experience in ‘receiving schools’ is that of social/ethnic difference. New concepts such as ‘ethnic capital’ have been suggested to understand the experience of migrants in receiving societies in a context of increased globalisation (Modood & Salt 2011). Rao (2010) implies that credentials, even language credentials, are less important than social networks. The ethnic capital of migrant students, and their communities are not just nationally contained but part of a diaspora in which there are two directional or even a circular transmission of ideas. We are becoming more aware of the locking together of receiving and sending countries in diasporic educational networks which are more than the sending back of remittances. The article by Van Linden and her colleagues in this special issue exemplifies this aspect of international migration - it shows us how fledging alliances were created between the South Sudanese diaspora in the Netherlands and their home base in Sudan. The ambition to help develop the educational system of one’s home country creates a virtuous (if difficult) knowledge circle.

Building on a theoretical framework which combines capacity development, human capabilities and transnationalism, the authors identify the opportunities and challenges of the micro-development educational projects in South Sudan, initiated by the South Sudanese diaspora. The authors conducted a review of relevant policy documents, and participated as observers in seminars, meetings and celebrations of the South Sudanese diaspora in the Netherlands and interviewed the main initiators of three projects. The commitment of members of the South Sudanese diaspora to participate in the reconstruction of public infrastructure, especially schools, in South Sudan appears as a form of compensation to their home country, albeit with different goals - education for peace-building, education to provide a safe environment, or education to develop self-sustenance. Diasporas, understood as ‘the people living the social phenomenon of transnationalism’ can play a central role in these forms of capacity development partnerships, both through their knowledge of the local context and their commitment and loyalty to their home country.

**Higher education and international student mobility: concerns and opportunities**

In contrast to the study of migrant students in schools, research on global migration in higher education, is fast becoming an established field of research (see, for example, Gu, Schweisfurth and Day 2009; Robinson-Pant 2005, 2009). Bileçen’s article in this special issue offer new insights into the relationship between education and social reproduction by exploring international postgraduate students’ identifications with local nationals in Germany, whilst Kadiwal and Rind make a thoughtful contribution to the study of migrating offshore education in the Middle Eastby focusing on the tensions within transnational knowledge adaptations.

Studies within higher education tend again to reflect *either* macro analyses emphasising economic and organizational factors (see, for example, Martens, Rusconi and Leuze 2007) *or* research regarding students’ (and teachers’) experiences, identification processes and future intentions in the wider social context (e.g. Gu, Schweisfurth and Day (2010), and Robinson-Pant (2005, 2009). Identity here is not seen as a static notion but is viewed as a continuous social process which involves negotiations between different, at times conflicting, and changing experiences and values. In this context, Ann Robinson Pant’s (2013) review (included in this special issue) of Rachel Brooks and Johann Waters’ (2011) book on student mobilities, migration and the internationalisation of higher education raises important points. Brooks and Waters’ (2011) emphasis on identity construction, new networks and different kinds of cultural capital held by international students especially from the South encourage us to move away from focusing on the one-way transfer of students (i.e. a linear approach) to think about the transnational interconnections between globalisation, migration and knowledge construction.

Both Bileçen’s and Kadiwal and Rind’s paper in this special issue contribute to the debate about international students’ identification processes. Bileçen’s article is based on semi-structured interviews with international doctoral students in two universities in Germany and highlights the students’ engagement with different ‘Others’. The interesting aspect is that these ‘Others’ are not only defined as German nationals (external difference) but also as the students’ co-nationals who share the same nationality, ethnicity, language and ‘in some instances even the same class’ and who also live in Germany (internal differences). This internal differentiation from co-nationals was reflected by the majority of respondents from China, the Philippines, Mexico, Russia and Turkey. The author thus highlights the diverse status of immigrant groups and the ways in which well-educated migrant groups counter the ‘cultural stereotypes perpetuated by mainstream society’ whilst at the same time stereotype members of the same community living in Germany, thus adding to the latter’s social inequality and exclusion. Migrant students in higher education may therefore contribute to internal social class differentiation in the receiving society.

The article ‘Selective cosmopolitans: tutors and students’ experience of off-shore higher education in Dubai’ by Kadiwal and Rind included here, explores the experience of international postgraduate students and their teachers in a different setting – that of the ‘UK University’ in Dubai. Many of their interviewees migrated to Dubai from countries such as Egypt, Lebanon and Palestine to participate in this off-shore education. This model of education is financially lucrative for universities but it also offers opportunities for such students to stay in their country or region rather than travel abroad to the ‘host’ university. However here there are cultural-political tensions such as that between such off-shore education and the local culture (see also Miller-Idriss & Hanauer 2011; Rizvi 2010). These authors focus on the adaptation of the U.K. Post-Graduate Certificate in Education for Dubai, conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews with tutors and students. They uncover complex negotiation processes and difficult, linguistic and cultural political dimensions. The authors suggest that the tutors from the UK and the international students reflect a selective cosmopolitanism whereby ‘central tensions surrounding language and culture’ are negotiated strategically and ambivalently (Skrbis & Woodward 2007).

**Conclusion**

The authors in this special issue in different ways strongly emphasise the fluidity, diversity and complexity of the terms migration and mobility. Using social constructionist approaches, each in turn emphasises processes relating to agency, negotiation, identification, and differentiation whether these are to meet family obligations, sustain livelihoods, negotiate language, aspire to social mobility or create global partnerships. Thus whilst Boyden explores the negotiation of schooling as a benefit for the family, Dyer considers the negative discourses that have to be negotiated by those who do not fit the sedentary culture of schooling. Kulyck highlights the interconnectedness of negotiating language diversity within unequal structures whilst Van Linden taps into the interconnectedness of diasporas with their home country’s education system, negotiating change. Kadiwal and Rind develop Skrbis and Woodward’s (2007) notion of the ambivalent and strategic cosmopolitan in the Dubai setting of off shore education and Bileçen uses internal and external differentiation to decipher the identification processes of international students in Germany.

Analysing the formation of education networks and processes whether across the rural-urban divide, within migratory communities and diasporas, or across the Global North and South is critical to the politics and governance of education within a globalised world. Network examples (whether the establishment of new bonds, the use of existing networks or differentiation from possible common identities) in this special issue are only the tip of the iceberg. Migration is not linear, it is part of the global civil society and resistances take therefore global shape. Underlying the discussions in these papers is the notion of transnationalism which a number of authors have referred to. This concept ‘broadly refers to multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states’ (Vertovec 1999, 447). Transnationalism is seen as an important aspect of integration (see Vertovec 2010) although not the same; The nation-state remains an important analytical category (amongst others) in so far as the structures and systems (e.g. economic, political, legal, etc.) of the nation state, and of the countries-of-origin, third countries and receiving countries contextualise the agency of people who are affected by these structures and systems, and maintain or change them via their actions (see Schneider 2012). This special issue encourages us to explore the interconnectedness of such national structures, patterns of negotiation, voice and agency, and also to redefine our analysis of the effects and benefits of migration as a social process.
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