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Abstract

Mass migration is the human face of globalization. Where immigrant workers are summoned, families and children will follow. The great global migration wave of the past generation has generated a powerful demographic echo. Nearly all the high-income countries of the world are experiencing substantial growth in their immigrant-origin student populations. Concurrently, globalization is placing new demands on education systems the world over. As a consequence, schooling systems are facing something they never faced before: educating large and growing numbers of immigrant-origin youth to greater levels of competence and skill at a time of economic upheaval and cultural malaise. This article reviews the basic scholarship in anthropology and allied fields with a focus on language, transnationalism, poverty, segregation, undocumented status, and racialization as they structure the academic pathways of immigrant-origin youth in a variety of destinations.
INTRODUCTION

Migration maketh man, and today when 49% of all global migrants are women, migration maketh woman (UNDP 2010). Migration is written in our genetic code and is encoded in our bodies: in our bipedalism, in our stereoscopic vision, in our neocortex. Modern humans are the children of immigration, and migrations today are once again transforming humanity. As we enter the second decade of the twenty-first century, the lives of hundreds of millions of people are shaped by the experience of migration: 214 million as transnational migrants, approximately 740 million as internal migrants, and millions more as immediate relatives left behind (UNDP 2010).

Globalization has increased immigration in a variety of ways. First, the integration and disintegration of markets stimulate migration because where capital flows immigrants will follow (Sassen 1988, Massey et al. 2002). Second, the new information, communication, and media technologies both enable the postnationalization of production and stimulate migration by suggesting new structures of desire, tastes, and consumption practices (Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard 2004). Third, globally integrated economies, especially in high-income countries, are structured around a predilection for foreign workers—both in the knowledge-intensive sectors and in the least desirable sectors of the economy (Piore 1980, Cornelius 1998, Saxenian 1999). Fourth, the affordability of mass transportation puts the option of migration within the reach of millions who, heretofore, could not do so. Fifth, globalization has stimulated new migration because it has produced uneven results—wage differentials, when controlled for cost of living differences, continue to grow in many of the best-traveled South-North migration corridors. Globalization structures new migratory flows by increasingly coordinating markets, economies, social practices, and cultural models. Demographic and ecological factors will also play a decisive role in mass migrations moving forward. The number of international migrants continues to grow at a steady rate, likely passing the 400 million mark by 2050, “as a result of growing demographic disparities, the effects of environmental changes, new global political and economic dynamics, technological revolutions and social networks” (International Organization for Migration 2010, p. xix).

Viewed anthropologically, immigration involves not only a change in residency but a change in community. Scholarly research has specialized in two broad types of large-scale migration: internal migration (within the confines of a nation-state or territory) and international migration (across international borders). Although the large-scale movement of people within a nation-state is a phenomenon of a separate order from mass migrations across international borders, internal migrants often share many characteristics with international migrants: Most move from rural villages to urban centers, and many experience linguistic and cultural discontinuities and face similar bureaucratic and legal restrictions. Much scholarly and policy attention has been focused on international migration. Yet most migrants are internal migrants staying within the confines of their nation-states. India and China, following their insertion into global capitalism, have experienced unprecedented levels of internal migration. With more than 320 million migrants in India and well over 200 million in China, the two countries combined now have more than double the number of international migrants the world over. This review is limited to the school experiences of the children of international immigrants, yet we acknowledge that some of the most important anthropological contributions to the study of immigration have focused on internal migration (for example, Colson 1971, Brandes 1975, Scudder & Colson 1982, Morgan & Colson 1987).

Mass migration is reshaping economies and societies the world over, yet many facets of immigration remain overlooked, misunderstood, or neglected. The dominant approaches to the study of mass migration privilege labor factors (Piore 1980); economic variables (Borjas 1999); demographic forces (Passel & Cohn 2009); and,
in recent years, border controls (Andreas 2009), undocumented immigration (Chavez 1997), and immigration qua security (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2005). Though these approaches have generated some scholarly consensus, important aspects of mass migration remain unexplored.

Distinct patterns of kinship, household, family, and social organization are of paramount importance in structuring worldwide migratory waves. The fundamental unit of migration is the family—variously defined in different parts of the world and structured by distinct culturally coded legislative, economic, reproductive, and symbolic forms. At the manifest level, immigration may be driven by labor, demographic, economic, and environmental variables. However, below the surface, immigration’s enduring root is the family. Immigration is an ethical act of, and for, the family. Immigration typically starts with the family and family bonds sustain it. Immigration will profoundly change families as well as the societies in which immigrants settle (Foner 2009, Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2011).

The children of immigrants are the fruit borne of immigration (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2001). Immigrant-origin children are a fast-growing sector of the youth population in diverse countries the world over including Australia, Canada, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Spain, and Sweden (Meir & Morehouse 2008). In the United States, the country with the largest number of immigrants in the world (at more than 38 million in 2010), approximately one-quarter of all youth are of immigrant origin (more than 16.6 million in 2010), and it is projected that by 2020, one in three of all children will be growing up in immigrant households (Frey 2011). The transition of immigrant-origin children to an ever-larger list of immigrant-dependent countries is a topic of scholarly interest, policy relevance, and practical urgency.

Just as schools throughout the world face the challenge of educating growing numbers of immigrant students, the process of globalization imposes yet another demand on education. Schools today must nurture a growing number of complex skills, competencies, and sensibilities in students to equip them to engage in the globally linked economies and societies of our time, preparing them to become globally conscious and culturally competent citizens facing increasingly complex problems and choices in the public and political spheres (Cheng 2007, Hugonnier 2007, Levy & Murnane 2007, Suárez-Orozco & Sattin-Bajaj 2010).

In the high-income countries of the world, new systems of accountability and high-stakes testing are sweeping across diverse nations as an instrument of dominant policy precisely at the time when the mass arrival of immigrant-origin students is taking place. These educational policies are not always attuned to the needs of immigrant students and, in many cases, have been shown to have detrimental consequences. For example, research (Cummins 1999) suggests that it takes years of optimal language teaching and learning before immigrant-origin second-language learners can be ready to compete in high-stakes tests used for the now ubiquitous international student assessments and comparisons, such as under the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) regime (Christensen & Segeritz 2008). Likewise, high-stakes tests such as the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, the Regents exams in New York, and the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) have severe implications for academic success and future access to higher education. Qualitative researchers have challenged the assumption that these tests are unbiased, objective measures, and they have shown how knowledge of language and cultural schema can influence scores. Thus, testing has become a means of “border control” (Fine et al. 2007) reproducing social inequality and marginalization.

Other reform initiatives, such as the charter school movement in the United States and like-minded initiatives in other countries, likewise largely ignore and avoid engaging new immigrant students, thus locking them out of significant educational opportunities (Sattin-Bajaj & Suárez-Orozco 2009). Hence,
some of the most significant educational-policy experiments of the past decade are misaligned with the largest growing population of new students. To effectively support immigrant students’ academic achievement and psychosocial development, educators and policy makers require a firmer grasp of the cultural psychology of immigration and the vicissitudes of immigrant academic language acquisition as well as a greater degree of pedagogical flexibility, cultural competency, and responsiveness than have been previously demanded of them.

IMMIGRATION, SCHOOLING, AND LANGUAGE

Mass migrations have ushered in the era of hyperdiversity. The global cities of the twenty-first century now resemble the breathtaking cultural and linguistic diversity once associated with the most insular places on Earth such as the highlands of New Guinea or the Amazonian Mato Grosso. As families migrate, their languages move with them, leading to greater linguistic and cultural diversity. The new hyperdiversity challenges modernist ideologies linking identity and belonging to a single national language and cultural tradition. In the United States, students come to schools speaking a combined total of more than 460 different languages (Kindler 2002). In New York City public schools, approximately half of all students originate in immigrant-headed households speaking an estimated combined 176 different languages (see http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/29/nyregion/29lost.html?_r=1). But this is not simply a New York, London, or Paris issue. There are now well over a dozen global cities with more than one million immigrants—from Hong Kong to Melbourne, from Moscow to Singapore, and in more than two dozen global cities, immigrants now account for more than one-quarter of the population, inter alia, in Amsterdam, Auckland, Muscat, and Perth (see http://www.migrationinformation.org/datahub/gemm.cfm#map1list).

Throughout the world, educational systems are challenged by mass migrations as multiple stakeholders negotiate how to educate children of immigrants who often come to school with a range of skills and risks that are unlike that of native-born students. How to best develop the means to communicate in the dominant language, thereby developing advanced academic language skills required for higher-order cognitive work, and the matter of maintaining immigrant languages are fiercely debated the world over (McAndrew 2007). Language acquisition and academic trajectories are bound together with processes of identity formation, acculturation, assimilation, and economic integration (Suárez-Orozco 1989, 1991; Portes & Zhou 1993; Portes & Fernández-Kelly 2008; Portes & Hao 1998, 2002; Suárez-Orozco et al. 2008).

Two constants have defined the relationship between immigration and language. First, every wave of large-scale immigration in multiple destinations generates a fear that new immigrants will not learn the dominant language. Second, the children of immigrants from widely divergent origins inevitably gravitate toward the new language (Tse 2001, Portes & Hao 2002) and, over time and across generations, lose their native language skills (Fillmore 1991). Yet these mutually cancelling concerns miss the defining element of mass migration in the era of globalization: Academic language learning as a cultural construct is changing what is required in terms of language acquisition for this generation of immigrants. Most large-scale studies of immigrants depend on self-reported data of oral proficiency, which differs from the decontextualized, written language necessary for higher-order cognitive engagement and academic success (Cummins 1999).

Academic language proficiency is central to any understanding of educational trajectories of immigrant youth in high-income countries with strict accountability regimes of the high-stakes-testing variety. Scholarly research has shown a high correlation between proficiency in academic language skill and academic achievement as measured by standardized tests (Valdes 2004, Suárez-Orozco et al. 2008). First- and second-generation immigrant youth
are often found to score lower than their native-born peers on standardized tests in the United States as well as in European contexts (Barth et al. 2008). The science results of PISA’s 2006 study by the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD) of 57 different countries revealed that, “[i]n fact, first-generation immigrant students in OECD countries lag on average more than 50 points behind their peers, which is roughly equivalent to one and a half years of schooling when considering the OECD average difference in performance between school years” (Christensen & Segeritz 2008, pp. 13–14). Likewise, the 2006 math and reading results show that “the achievement gaps for immigrant and nonimmigrant students in reading and mathematics in 2006 are similar to those found in science in 2006” (Christensen & Segeritz 2008, p. 15). Although there are important cross-country differences in the academic trajectories of immigrant-origin youth (Christensen & Segeritz 2008) and although, over time, some immigrant-origin youth do remarkably well (Kasinitz et al. 2008), the general trend is worrisome, especially as the share of immigrant-origin students continues to grow in a number of countries.

Research on second-language acquisition and bilingualism informs debates on educational models that promote success for immigrant youth, especially which language should be used for instruction, under what circumstances, and for how long. One recurring finding (Cummins 1999, Collier 1995, August & Hakuta 1997, Hakuta et al. 2000) is that it takes approximately five to seven years for immigrant language learners to develop the academic language proficiency required to compete fairly with native speakers in standardized-assessment regimes at the center of education reforms the world over. Another consistent finding suggests that “balanced bilinguals,” that is, youth who maintain their home language as they acquire a second academic language, tend to have better educational trajectories over time (Portes & Rumbaut 2001).

Anthropologists and other qualitative researchers have used ethnographic methods to complicate the picture of language-acquisition processes and academic outcomes. Using a sociocultural lens, these scholars have critiqued deficit models and have demonstrated that the “funds of knowledge” that immigrant students and their families bring with them, including language and cultural knowledge, are crucial for educational engagement and change (Arzubiaga et al. 2009, Moll 2010, Rios-Aguilar et al. 2010). In this line of scholarship, language is not a monolith to be clinically measured and found wanting; instead, it is a complex set of social practices intertwined with identity formation, power inequalities, and social belonging (Cummins 2000, Heller 2007). Ethnographic research has examined how local contexts intersect with processes of language acquisition, identity formation, and achievement (Souto-Manning 2006, Michael et al. 2007, Suárez-Orozco et al. 2008).

**THE TRANSNATIONAL LIVES OF IMMIGRANT YOUTH**

With large-scale migration, transnationalism has entered the mainstream classroom. When “home” may be in two countries, culturally based home-school discontinuities acquire a new meaning. Anthropologists have pioneered the scholarly study of migrants shuttling back and forth in transnational labor and living arrangements the world over (Basch et al. 1994). Transnational migrants remain substantially engaged (economically, politically, and culturally) in their newly adopted lands and in their communities of origin, moving back and forth in ways not always seen in previous eras of large-scale immigration (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2001). Millions of children throughout the world are being raised transnationally.

The transnational lives of immigrant children have only recently come into scholarly focus. On the basis of a study of schools in the states of Nuevo Leon and Zacatecas, Hamann & Zuñiga (2008) estimated that as much as 2% of students enrolled in Mexico’s primarias (primary schools) and secundarias (high schools) had transnational experiences,
including considerable schooling in the United States. Approximately half of the transnational students in this study were born in the United States or had a U.S.-born mother. The authors suggest that perhaps 1%, or as many as 220,000, students being educated in Mexico, are in fact U.S. citizens living transnational lives.

Millions of other children are educated in culturally patterned long-distance family arrangements where separations and reunifications across national boundaries are normative. Within North America, few studies can give us a glimpse into the percentages of youth involved. In a recent study conducted in Montreal, among 254 first- and second-generation immigrant-origin high-school students from the Philippines and the Caribbean, approximately 62% of the Filipino-origin participants and 38% of the Caribbean-origin participants had experienced separations during their migration (Rousseau et al. 2009). In a nationally representative survey of 1772 youth that restricted its sample to documented immigrants, nearly one-third of the participants between ages 6 and 18 had been transnationally separated from at least one parent for two or more years (Gindling & Poggio 2009). Notably, the rates of separation were highest for children of Latin American origin, which happen to be more than half of all migrants to the United States. This is a low estimate because separation rates are higher among the unauthorized or those who are in the process of regulating their documentation status. Thus, in keeping with reports in other postindustrial settings, separations from parents appear to be quite frequent among first-generation immigrants in North America.

The Longitudinal Immigrant Adaptation Study (LISA) also found high rates of transnational family separations among new immigrant students. This U.S. bicoastal interdisciplinary study, conducted with 400 recently arrived immigrant students from China, the Dominican Republic, various countries in Central America, Haiti, and Mexico recruited from public schools, Suárez-Orozco et al. (2008) found that the majority had been separated from one or both parents for protracted periods of time—from six months to ten years. LISA data revealed that nearly three-quarters of the students were separated from one or both of their parents during the migration process. The LISA study found significant differences between immigrant groups in regards to family separation: Chinese families were least likely to be separated over the course of migration (52%), whereas the vast majority of Central American (88%) and Haitian children (85%) were separated from either one or both of their parents during the course of migration. Approximately 26% of children in the study were separated from both parents, a pattern most often occurring in Central American families (54%). In cases where the child was separated from only one parent, approximately 26% of children were separated from the mother, whereas approximately 20% of children were separated from the father. The length of separation from parents was unexpectedly long: Some individuals in the study reported being separated from one or both parents for nearly their entire childhood, though the length of separation varied widely across regions of origin. Of the youth who were separated only from their mothers, 54% of Central American children endured separations lasting four years or more, as did approximately one-third of both the Dominican and Haitian families. Chinese and Mexican children underwent fewer and shorter separations from their mothers. When separations from the fathers occurred during migration, they were often very lengthy or permanent ones. For those families who were separated, 28% had separations from fathers that lasted more than 4 years. Notably, the LISA study found that immigrant youth who underwent protracted family separations and complicated reunifications were at higher risk to show a pattern of declining academic achievement over time once they resettled in the new country (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2010a).

Recent scholarly work has identified a related pattern of “satellite children” born in the United States to immigrant parents but
raised by grandparents in China. A study of immigrants in New York City estimated that more than 50% of the mothers had sent their youngsters to Fujian Province to be raised by grandparents. The mothers reported undocumented status, substantial immigration-related debt burdens, and exhausting six-day work weeks as the main reasons for raising their children transnationally (Kwong et al. 2010, Yoshikawa 2011). Many of these transnationally raised children, the mothers expected, would return to the United States to complete their formal education. It remains to be seen how these youth raised “here” and “there” will adapt to schools in the long term.

The experiences of transnational students run counter to many basic assumptions of state-based systems of education, which emphasize acculturation, monolingualism, and citizenship in a single nation (Amit 2002, García 2009). Lukose (2007) suggests that examining transnational students can provide critical insights into the production of the categories of nation, citizen, and immigrant. Sanchez (2007) points out the implications for pedagogy and educational practice, advocating approaches that emphasize global citizenship and culturally relevant pedagogy, while drawing upon the multiple identities and experiences transnational youth bring to the classroom.

Yet, qualitative researchers have also pointed out the limitations of culturally relevant pedagogy as a silver bullet for the linguistic and academic development of immigrant youth (Wortham & Contreras 2002). A recurring concern in the research literature highlights the residential and linguistic segregation experienced by immigrant-origin language learners and that typically results in unequal resources, lowered expectations, and insufficient exposure to high-level academic content and critical-thinking skills. Even in schools that seem diverse and integrated from the outside, ethnographic work has unearthed cleavages between immigrant students and their native-born peers (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2008). Although immigrant youth and native youth may share a building, culturally they might as well be living in separate continents. The failure of school settings to generate meaningful interactions results in, inter alia, a lack of exposure to the linguistic modeling that native-born peers could provide immigrant youth, and native-born students also lose the opportunity to gain knowledge about the world beyond their borders.

The experiences of immigrant and transnational youth in schools have yielded a number of school ethnographies deploying postmodern and critical race theories to examine questions of identity formation, academic trajectories, and “social mirroring” (Suárez-Orozco 2004, pp. 173–99). Such accounts challenge essentialist models of identity and instead explore ways that identities are situated and produced, and they point to the ways race, undocumented status, class, and gender intersect with acculturation in institutional settings (Suárez-Orozco 2000, pp. 194–226). Schools are institutional sites where youth negotiate the complex terrains of belonging within and between cultures, as shown in ethnographies of Dominicans in New York City (López 2003), Latinos in California and the Southwest, (Villenas & Foley 2002, Meador 2005, Cammarota 2006), Hmong in the Midwest (Lee 2005), South Asians in the Northeast (Maira 2004), and urban Lao (Ngo 2010) as well as a multiethnic high schoolers in Toronto (You 2000). The matter of identities in school is not limited to personally crafted selfhood related to academic engagement and achievement; it also suggests larger processes of social integration, including “social mirroring” as racialized symbolic violence (Suárez-Orozco 2004) and “race gender outlooks” (López 2003). Yet the question of agency versus the victimization of youth remains taut, as some authors emphasize the negotiation and fashioning of new identities as a form of resistance (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco 2001), whereas others emphasize how hegemonic forces shape and greatly limit the possibilities for youth to transcend their “othered” position (Vigil 2002).
POVERTY, SEGREGATION, UNDOCUMENTED STATUS, AND COLOR

Poverty

In the age of linguistic and cultural hyperdiversity, there is considerable heterogeneity in socioeconomic status between and within immigrant groups. Immigrants today, unlike in previous eras of mass migration, are among the most highly educated and skilled workers in their new countries. Never before in world history have so many highly educated and skilled people joined the migration flow in such high numbers. This is true in the United States, as well as in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other destinations, where immigrant-origin scientists, engineers, and medical doctors are overrepresented as a total share of the population (see Migration Information Source 2010; http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=779). Even though immigrants seldom originate in the poorest regions of the world, research suggests that they are more likely than their native counterparts to encounter poverty in their new societies (Kazemipur & Halli 2001). Poverty, defined as a “condition of relative deprivation within society” (Kurtz 1973, p. 53), is created in part by unique disadvantages that are often associated with immigrant status, such as “language barriers, incompatibility of educational credentials, limited transferability of job skills, unfamiliarity with the market demands, and lack of access to job and educational networks” (Kazemipur & Halli 2001, p. 1132; de Haan & Yaqub 2009).

The children of immigrants have “greater market-income poverty rates than children in native-born families” (Hernandez et al. 2010, p. 425). In affluent countries worldwide, poverty among children of immigrants has increased steadily in recent years with gaps between native-born and immigrants ranging from 7% in Australia and Germany to 12% in the United States and to 26–28% in England and France (Hernandez et al. 2010). Differences among ethnic groups are also prevalent. U.S. data on Latino children show that, in 1999, 22.8% were living in poverty, compared with 7.7% of whites (Therrien & Ramirez 2000). In 2006, however, the poverty rate for Latino children had nearly doubled that of white native-born children (28% and 16%, respectively) (Fry & Gonzales 2008). For immigrant Latino families, poverty rates reach higher percentages, with 35% of foreign-born Latino immigrants living in poverty compared with 27% of their second- or third-generation counterparts (Fry & Gonzales 2008).

Poverty reverberates deeply. In the United States, children of immigrants are four times as likely as native-born children to live in crowded housing conditions and three times as likely to be uninsured, and 37% of Latino immigrant families report difficulties affording food (Capps 2001). Children raised in poverty are vulnerable to an array of distresses including difficulties concentrating and sleeping, anxiety and depression, as well as a heightened exposure to delinquency and violence. Poverty has long been recognized as a significant risk factor for poor educational outcomes (Weissbourd 1996, Luthar 1999). Persistent poverty leads Latino students, the largest immigrant-origin population of students in the United States, to shoulder financial responsibility for their families; many Latino students contribute to their family income by working after school. In 2007, 17% of Latino students between the ages of 16 and 18 held jobs (Morigi 2008). Research suggests that working long hours can distract from concentration on schoolwork and is related to lower grades (Warren et al. 2000). After-school work is also associated with lower achievement on math and science scores in the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) data, and it has a particularly negative effect on boys (Post & Pong 2000). Cammarota (2008) details the interrelationships of work, family economy, and educational aspirations in his ethnography of Latino youth in California, documenting generational differences in gender and work and the effects of neoliberal ideologies shared by high schools and fast-food restaurants.
Poverty coexists with a variety of other factors that augment risks, such as single parenthood, residence in violence-ridden neighborhoods, gang activity, and drug trade as well as school environments that are segregated, overcrowded, understaffed, and poorly funded. Poverty, however, is not solely an inner-city phenomenon. In the United States since the 1990s, poverty grew in the suburbs for the first time and at a greater rate than in cities (Murphy 2010). This augments the challenges suburban schools already face in engaging children of immigrants with their diverse language skills and unique needs. Poverty is also associated with high rates of housing mobility and concurrent school transitions that can be highly disruptive to educational performance (Gándara & Contreras 2009).

SEGREGATION

Latin American immigrants in the United States form the largest international migration flow in the twentieth century. Many settle in segregated, impoverished, urban, suburban, and rural communities. Latino children are now the most segregated students in U.S. schools (Orfield & Lee 2005). Immigrants who settle in predominantly minority neighborhoods may have little, if any, direct, systematic, and intimate contact with peers from the middle-class mainstream population. A pattern of triple segregation—by race, language, and poverty—shapes the lives of many new immigrants in varied countries.

In Germany, immigration accounts for a significant share of the population. In 2005, approximately 15.3 million people were immigrants or of migrant background. Immigrants are largely segregated, with most immigrant-origin people concentrating in the western part of the country and only a small share living in the eastern states (Clauss & Nauck 2010).

Segregated, poor neighborhoods are more likely to have suboptimal schools characterized by unequal resources, overcrowding, fear of violence, distrust, low expectations, and institutional anomie. Lacking the academic language skills, newly settled immigrant students are often enrolled in the least demanding classes, which eventually results in exclusion from courses needed for college preparation. Such settings may undermine students’ ability to sustain motivation and academic engagement. In many European countries, the children of immigrants are tracked early on into trade and vocational pathways rather than into the academic tracks that typically lead to professional careers. Crul (2008) compared the experiences and academic outcomes of second-generation Turkish youth above the age of 15 in Germany, the Netherlands, France, Austria, and Belgium. Beyond family human capital, Crul identified the age at which schooling begins (different in each country), the number of contact hours between pupils and teachers, the school-selection mechanism, the age at which students are put into an academic versus a career track, the stigma attached to vocational programs, and the availability of apprenticeship programs. Each of these factors shapes the likelihood of an immigrant student’s success or failure. The earlier formal schooling begins and the more contact hours, inter alia, the better the long-term academic pathways of immigrant children tend to be (Crul 2008).

UNDOCUMENTED STATUS

The United Nations estimates that there are between 40 and 50 million unauthorized migrants worldwide (UNDP 2010). The United States has the largest concentration of undocumented immigrants in the world—approximately 11 million people are unauthorized. There are approximately 1.1 million youth living in the United States without proper documentation, and millions more are living in households headed by at least one undocumented immigrant (see http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=61). Research suggests that undocumented students often arrive after multiple family separations and traumatic border crossings. Once settled, they may continue to experience fear and anxiety about
Racialization: the production of racial identities; the process of reducing social groups to a set of socially-constructed physical characteristics or behaviors

Phenotype: observable physical characteristics

Maghreb: countries in North Africa, formerly colonized by the French, including Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria

being apprehended, separated again from their parents, and deported (Suárez-Orozco et al. 2008, Chaudry et al. 2010). A large proportion of undocumented children are raised in families with parents who work, but many are employed in very low paying professions with erratic working conditions (Capps 2001, Gándara & Contreras 2009, Yoshikawa 2011). Furthermore, although the majority of these children are citizens, more than three million of them have parents who are unauthorized migrants and thus do not access social services that could serve to mitigate the harshest conditions of their poverty (Yoshikawa 2011). Such psychological and emotional duress takes a toll on the academic experiences of youth raised in the shadow of the law (Cervantes et al. 2010), which has also been documented through narrative and qualitative research (Bagley & Castro-Salazar 2010, Suarez-Orozco 1989). Undocumented students with dreams of graduating from high school and going on to college will find that their legal status stands in the way of their access to postsecondary education (Gonzalez 2009).

Concentrated poverty, deep segregation, and unauthorized status are the ingredients for a combustive cocktail. At the very least, these structural factors accelerate the processes of racialization via cultural disparagement (De Vos & Suárez-Orozco 1990) and negative social mirroring (Suárez-Orozco 2004) of new immigrants.

Racialization

The arrival of large numbers of immigrants from the global South into the high-income countries of the world has resulted in systemic patterns of residential and school segregation and can be related to broader dynamics of racialization of marked native minorities. The idea of “race,” the stepchild of nineteenth-century pseudoscience, included in these earlier iterations cranio metrics (measuring of skulls) as a means of classifying groups of people (Mosse 1964, p. 89) into fixed hierarchical relationships of superiority and inferiority (Gould 1996, De Vos & Wagatsuma 1972). As Boas (1940) observed, “a stratification of society in social groups that are racial in character will always lead to racial discrimination. As in all other sharp social groupings the individual is not judged as an individual but as a member of his class” (pp. 16–17). Research on the racialization of immigrants by phenotype, ethnicity, and religion suggests a preexisting mechanism of discrimination that structures inequality in schools. In the United States, this process starts at preschool (Fuller et al. 1994) and continues into primary and secondary school (Gándara & Contreras 2009), then on into college (Teranishi 2010).

Racialized hierarchies lent the aura of science to atavistic superstitions that clustered people of “purer” origin to avoid the danger of contamination by outsiders (Zollschan cited in Mosse 2000, pp. 201–2). As applied to immigrants, “racialization” (Bashi 1998, Omi & Winant 1994, Shih 2008) is an appropriate construct foregrounding the sociohistorical processes of segregation, marginalization, micro- and macroaggressions, and collective disenfranchisement.

In countries such as the United States, large and growing numbers of poor immigrants of color and the undocumented, are de facto and de jure relegated to spaces where socially constructed phenotype (Gilman 2000, Bonilla-Silva 2004) aligns with entrenched patterns of segregation and marginalization of native minorities (Corni 2002, Ogbu & Simmons 1998, Vigil 2002). Portes & Zhou (1993; Portes 1996) have appropriately termed this dynamic as “segmented assimilation” wherein certain immigrants join the marginalized space of native minorities creating what they term a new “rainbow underclass.” Meanwhile, other countries have witnessed the emergence of a complex interweaving of factors racializing immigrants and other minorities. These can include religion (France and its Maghreby minority), country of origin (Japan and its Korean and other minorities), and social class (Spain and its Roma minority).
Access to quality schools is elusive to many new immigrants of color. Using data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), Orfield & Lee (2005, p. 21) report that, in the western United States, Latinos make up 76% of students in high-poverty schools. In the currency of racialization, dark-skinned immigrants appear to pay a heavy penalty in the U.S. education system. Murguia & Telles (1996) working with the National Chicano Survey report that 10.2% of light-skinned Mexican Americans completed college as opposed to 5.3% among dark-skinned Mexican Americans. Using the Boston Social Survey Data of Urban Inequality as part of the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality, Gomez (2000) reports that, in the northeast United States, the postcollege wage earnings of dark-skinned Latinos were lower than those of light-skinned Latinos. Massey & Denton (1989) analyzing U.S. Census data report that it will be more difficult for darker-skinned Hispanics than for their lighter-skinned counterparts to integrate into white communities. Color and poverty are correlated with a host of other factors shaping educational trajectories.

Restricted mobility (Massey & Denton 1989), negative social mirroring (Suárez-Orozco 2004), and inequitable access to quality education (Orfield & Lee 2005) among immigrants are not isolated U.S. phenomena, as the cases of Koreans and other minorities in Japan (Lee & DeVos 1981, Castro-Vazquez 2009) and of Europe and its Muslim minorities attest.

The Maghreb population of North Africa arrived in a Europe marked by a colonial history rife with violence, discriminatory practices, and unequal opportunity. A perfect storm of racialization included religious, national origin, color, and socioeconomic biases. The Maghreb immigrant population was often segregated in specific schools on the basis of residential ghettoization (Grillo 1985). Even though the French expected Maghrebis to assimilate (Oslor & Starkey 2009) and learn French, secondary-school students in France were not learning the languages of their low-status new immigrants.

In spite of the fact that 99% of the students in France studied a foreign language and 75% learned a third language, only 0.2% studied a non-European second language (Ministere de l’Education Nationale cited in Akinci & De Ruiter 2004, p. 260). Maghreb assimilation and absorption into “French-ness” (Kamali 2009, p. 253) can be particularly elusive for Muslim girls who wear the hijab and wish access to quality education.

Substandard educational opportunities have tended to reinforce a stratified class structure. The general failure to prepare the children of immigrants to succeed educationally has resulted in higher rates of unemployment and underemployment, typically relegating the Maghrebi of immigrant origin to low socioeconomic status and frustrated class mobility (Grillo 1985). Citing the French National Institute for Statistics (INSEE), Hargreaves (2007) reported that in 1999 the unemployment rate was 12% for French nationals and 24% for immigrants (p. 42). Hargreaves (2007) also indicated that in the 1990s Maghreb workers were twice as likely to be unemployed as French workers with similar qualifications. Likewise, Simon (2003) compared Moroccan and Turkish immigrants to French nationals and found that higher education is not sufficient to overcome disproportionate unemployment statistics. A number of social psychology studies have identified a pattern of racialized labor and housing-market discrimination of Muslim-origin immigrants in France. Following the attacks of 9/11 and subsequent terrorist attacks and plots in Madrid, London, and Stockholm, the general marginalization of Muslim immigrants in Europe and elsewhere has entered a new worrisome phase.

CONCLUSION

To paraphrase Lévi-Strauss, immigration is “good to think” and interrogate hidden schemas and practices of the modernist nation-state. Schools, our tools of state-making in the modernist era, are geared toward producing citizens and workers of a nation-state rather than
dual citizens with global sensibilities. Transnational displacements bring education, language, and identity to the forefront, interrupting the taken-for-granted cultural schemas and social practices that structure belonging to and membership in the nation. Educational anthropologist Ritty Lukose (2007) notes, “The issue here is not to assume a straightforward trajectory into a U.S. mainstream, but to examine immigration as a key fault line in and through which national identity is forged in a new global dispensation” (p. 414). The practices of the autonomous, sovereign nation-state are misaligned with the realities of global migration. Schools throughout the world struggle to educate ever-larger numbers of students who simply do not fit normative assumptions. The transnational student who calls “home” two distinct households that happen to be in two different countries is a case in point, as is the child who, though chronologically an adolescent, has the English vocabulary of a 5 year old but an eighth-grade knowledge of content in her native language.

High-stakes assessments and accountability regimes are constructed around the notion of normative linear development of monolingual native-born students and ignore other language-development pathways and cultural skills. These mismatches are contributing to currently ubiquitous “achievement gaps” and the marginalization of too many new arrivals and other racialized native minorities in disparate countries. Growing inequality and concentrated poverty associated with certain types of immigration and racialization further contribute to the marginalization of immigrant youth, leading to problematic patterns of social stratification rather than the integration and equal access espoused by modernist liberal ideologies in many receiving nations.

By placing education, language, and identity as central to scholarly analysis, anthropological research on immigrant and transnational youth complicates the neoliberal narrative of globalization. Although cultural production and identity may take hybrid forms described by many postmodern diaspora and third-space theorists, the lived realities of students are constricted by the structure of educational institutions that marginalize difference, subvert belonging, and frustrate mobility while naturalizing the practices of the neoliberal nation-state. Students who transfer between systems across nations must cope with disorientation, disruption, and anomic. Schools are institutional spaces not yet amenable to supporting or responding with agility and efficiency to the hybrid experiences that yield different developmental trajectories manifest in language, academic engagement pathways, and educational outcomes. Mass transnational displacement can result in gaps instead of bridges or bifocals.

Suárez-Orozco (2004) has argued that “[e]ducational systems tied to the formation of the nation-state citizens and consumers bonded to local systems to the neglect of larger global forces are likely to become obsolete, while those that proactively engage globalization’s new challenges are more likely to thrive” (p. 23). Yet he also notes that educational institutions are resistant to change. This lag time becomes evident when examining the effects of the influx of large numbers of immigrants in schools. The effects of transnational migration should be registered. Developing more flexible institutional structures that better metabolize the multicultural and multilingual energies of diverse students ought to be a priority moving forward—good examples to build upon already exist (see Meir & Morehouse 2008, Suárez-Orozco et al. 2010b; see also http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/immigration/pathways/). Yet too many schools still deploy the defeatist and deforming lens that sees immigrant youth as problems disrupting the prescribed flows and curriculum progressions that assume students have gone through a predetermined course of development. Following Anderson (2009), anthropologists would do well to turn their attention to ethnographic work that informs educational policy that supports the integration of immigrant youth.

Immigration is the human face of globalization—the sounds, colors, and smells of humanity. The world is full of migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, and citizens born mute to the contours of immigration and citizenship policies. The lived realities of migration are marked by social dislocation, structural disorder, and erasure. The social forces that elude the reach of policy often surface in schools, which provide an arena for embodied and persistent socialization. The educational experiences of skilled immigrants and their children highlight the enduring power of social and cultural capital in determining opportunities and access.
of a miniaturized, interconnected, and fragile world. The children of immigrants, the smallest actors in the new global stage, are set to reshape the future character of an ever-growing list of destinations the world over. Their future is our future.
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