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I am a child trapped in the migration web. Where is my right to education?

Maria Pia Belloni Mignatti
International migrants under the age of 20

- Between 2000 and 2010, the number of international migrants under the age of 20 increased by almost 2 million.
- They represent the fastest-growing sector of the child/youth population in many industrialized countries.
- Human mobility not only affects the millions of migrant children who leave their countries of origin, but also countless children left behind, as well as children born to migrant parents in countries of destination.

Children, adolescents and migration

- Globally, there are 35 million young migrants (on average, 36% of the global population is younger that 20 years)
- Only 14 % under the age of 20
- The group of 15 to 19 years is the largest group, accounting for some 34% of all migrants under the age of 20
- The age group 10 to 14 represents around 26 % of the total migrant population under 20 years of age

(UNICEF Division of Policy and Practice, 2009)
Number of adolescent and youth international migrants: a global picture
Am I a child?

- A child is ‘every human being below the age of 18 years unless, under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained earlier’ (CRC art. 1)

- Not everyone has their birth registered or a document to prove it
Invisible Children

• 41% of all births each year in the developing world (except China) go unregistered, denying the rights of over 50 million children to an official identity, name, and nationality (UNICEF, Innocenti Research Center)

• Within the context of the global economic financial crisis, many countries are enforcing migration laws; regular migrant children at risk of becoming irregular and they “disappear”

• If children are not counted, they are forgotten in the migration’s policy discussion
A troubling reality: poverty

• More than 15% of the 200 million children in the 35 OECD countries are seen to be living in relative poverty (*Measuring child poverty, UNICEF, Innocenti Report, 2012*)

• In the European Union, figures from 2010 show that 27% of children were at risk of poverty or social exclusion (20 million children) (*Eurostat, Population and social conditions, Statistics in focus - 9/2012.* )

• In USA more than 16% of the population live in poverty (20% children) (*November 2012 the U.S. Census Bureau*)
Poverty: looking at the migrant children in EU

- Migrant most at risk of poverty
- In Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, Portugal and Spain one fifth of children living in “migrant households” is deprived
- This also the case for a number of new EU members states (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Romania and Slovakia) but for a much lower number of immigrant
- In Austria and Belgium two-thirds of deprived children are in migrant families, the same for Luxembourg but with a lower absolute levels of deprivation

A costly mistake

• Failure to protect ALL children, migrant included, from poverty is one of the most costly mistakes a society can make even in difficult economic times.

• Children protection must be upheld in good and in bad times; it must be absolute, not contingent, for migrant children too.

• Poverty in childhood: negative socioeconomic outcomes from lower educational achievement and behavioral problems to lower earnings in the labor market.
Migrant children have right to have rights

• Non-discrimination (article 2 (1) CRC)

• Best Interests of the Child (article 3 (1) CRC)

• Right to life, survival and development (article 6 CRC)

• Right to express their views, the right to be heard (article 12 CRC)

• If not explicitly stated otherwise in the Convention, these rights must also be available to all children – including asylum-seeking, migrant and refugee children – irrespectively of their nationality, immigration status or statelessness
Education: the most powerful tool to fight poverty

- Helps break the intergenerational chains of poverty
- Is critical for migrant children’s integration
- For maintaining social cohesion of host societies
- For economic development

(Globally, 61 million children of primary school age were out of school in 2010 (UNESCO, 2011))
Right to education

Education must not be limited by a ZIP code

• A wide range of international conventions, recognizes this as a fundamental right of every child without discrimination

• If migration is “a two way process of mutual accommodation between migrants and the receiving societies”, migrant children should become actors of this process through education
The difficult access to education for migrant children

• Practical and legal obstacles (obligation to show a residence permit, or other ID)

• In case of irregular migrant children: fear of detection by authorities (deportation/detention where the right of education is ignored)

• Lack of language skills at age of arrival (lack of integration/language programs in the educational system)

• Lower educational attainment in the country of origin

• Pressure from the family to learn an income (exploitation)

• Lower human capital of the parents
Discrimination

• No access to social support because of nationality/migration status (denial of financial support for extracurricular expenses)

• Risk of not receiving a diploma at the end of the school year because of the lack of residence permit or ID

• Xenophobia and racism in the classroom

• Discrimination is often a major factor affecting achievement; discrimination is unjustified, illegitimate unequal treatment.
Segregation

• High share of migrant children grouped in "lower-ability streams"

• Concentration in schools limits academic performances

• Over-representation in schools for children with special needs
The consequences

• Low achievement, high dropouts, types of school diploma attained

• Clear evidence of lower levels of educational attainment than national children, in science, mathematics and reading

• European target: to reduce early school leaving to less than 10 % by 2020, from 14,4 % in 2009

Early school leavers’ rate by type of background and gender, EU-27, 2008

Source: Eurostat, LFS 2008 ad hoc module
On a purely economic basis...

- Every additional year of schooling improves average earnings by approximately 10% globally.
- A country with a literacy score 1% higher than average, has 2.5% higher labor productivity.
- An 20% increase in primary school enrollment rates raises growth by 0.3% per year and secondary school enrolment growth by 0.2% per year.
- 1-year deficiency in schooling represents 4-12% of per capita welfare income losses.
- *(Right in Principle and in Practice: A review of the social and economic returns to investing in children, UNICEF, 2012)*
Comparing education outcomes: some good news

- Australia, Canada and New Zeeland: no performance differences between migrant students and native peers
- Little differences in Switzerland, Germany, Belgium
- In Finland and Sweden reading scores improve for the second generation
- In Ireland, UK, Australia the second generation performs similarly to or even better than non-immigrant average
- 2000-2009 reading scores of second-generation immigrants has improved in Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, Germany; they decreased in Greece, Sweden, France, Italy
Educational attainment of the population aged 15 to 64 by place of birth, 2009-10

Percentage

Note: Foreign and national populations in Japan instead of the foreign- and native-born.
* Information on data for Israel: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932315602.
What determines outcomes?

- favorable environment for migrant education
- Knowledge of the language
- Lower levels of economic inequality
- Years of schooling
- Lower concentration in schools of students with a low socio-economic background
- Economic investments in the educational system
- Participation in early childhood education
Pre-school migrant children: some data

• The age group 5 to 9 represents 23% of the total migrant population under 20 years of age (USA)

• The age group 0 to 4, 17 % of the total migrant population under 20 years of age (USA)

• 28% are in a linguistically isolated household, more likely than their native counterparts to be in parental care only (59 versus 44 %) and less likely to be in center-based care (14 versus 25 %)

(Children of Immigrants: National and State Characteristics, Brief 9 Washington, Urban Institute, August 2009)

• In Europe non-national children under 6 represent 3 % of the total children population. Lack of data. In EU data on children either failed to be disaggregated from family data or were grouped into age categories, e.g. 0-12 years
Early childhood education and care (ECEC)

• Providing all children with high-quality early-childhood education and care (birth-8) is an economic rewarding investment with great benefits for both the individual and the society
Heckman equation

Develop + Sustain = Gain

Every dollar invested returns 4 to 9 dollars on a long-term basis

• James Heckman, Nobel Prize-winning economist,
  www.info@heckmanequation.org
Returns across lifecycle

Adapted from: Carneiro and Heckeman, 2003
Benefits of ECEC

• Less dropouts of school; more likely to be successful academically

• Positive behavioral/ emotional outcomes (self-confidence); Health-related behaviors

• Beneficial impact of ECEC on children from poor families is twice as high as for those with a more advantaged background

  (S.W. Barnett,' Maximizing returns from prekindergarten education', (2004) p. 10)
Benefits of ECEC

• Big differences in cognitive, social, emotional development between children from rich and poor backgrounds; if not addressed, this gap tends, to widen by age 5

• An early childhood development program is even more effective when targeted to the poorest and most marginalized children in developing countries. (World Bank 2011)

• Spill-over effects; long-lasting impact with favorable economic/social returns

(Lynn Caroly, Early Childhood Education. Proven Results. Future Promises, RAND corporation, 2005)
Best practices in USA

- USAID “Child development is a cornerstone for all development, central to U.S. development and diplomatic efforts
- 19 programs with rigorous research evaluations demonstrated great benefits

- Chicago Child-Parent Centers (CPC). Provides children in high-poverty neighborhoods with a one- or two-year part-day school-year center-based preschool programs with a strong parents involvement component (estimated public benefit of $12.90 per dollar invested)

- High/Scope Perry Preschool Project (Michigan) (same goals, same return)

- Carolina Abecedarian Project (North Carolina). Provides periodic home visits and full-day year-round center-based child care and early education services, as well as other family supports, to very low-income children starting a few weeks after birth and continuing to kindergarten entry
Best practices in USA

- *California State Preschool Program*, focused on children (4 years old) in low-income families; public funds provided through federal, state, and local entities

- *HIPPY (Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters)*, international program developed in Israel, now present in USA, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa. Provides low-income, low-education parents of children aged 3-5 with a two-year structured curriculum and associated materials that is delivered daily by parents at home

- *AVANCE program* (Texas), devoted to building stronger families and communities by improving the self-esteem, competence of parents and their children. The nine-month program is primarily an intervention model for low-income Mexican-American or Latino families

European strategy

- “Europe’s future will be based on smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. In this context ECEC is essential for successful lifelong learning, social integration, personal development and later employability”

- In order for ECEC to be a strong start for individuals and a potential equalizer for European societies, provisions must be of sufficient quality

- In all education and training systems where fees are required for ECEC, parental contributions must be adjusted in order to facilitate access for disadvantaged groups

- The most successful systems are those that have more comprehensive services helping children, but also their families; more efforts and more financial support are needed

Best practices in EU

- Examples of high-quality, full-day integrated services in Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Northern Italy (Reggio Emilia). Age-integrated services combine education/care functions in one center (full-day care, playgroups, pre-school-education programs, leisure-time activities, parents support programs).

- In Denmark and Austria: programs to determine language skills and needs of young migrant children. In Copenhagen language classes for parents.

- Austria: kindergartens have responsibility in preparing children for primary school; 120-hours course of German for immigrant children.

- Bridging the diversity (Berlin, Germany): Language programs/integration.
Best practices in EU

• Sweden (five officially recognized minority languages): diversified system; the learning of Swedish is taken on slowly: only at age 4 are children addressed to only in Swedish

• The Netherlands: long tradition in combating disadvantages in education

• France, special programs for immigrant children and parents in the “lieux d’accueil”. All children are allowed in nursery school

(Migrant pre-school children in eleven European cities A short analysis of measures, The Netherlands, 2008)
Obstacles to ECEC

- A number of structural factors can affect affordability, availability, and access to ECEC programs for disadvantaged immigrant children.

- Immigrant parents with few years of schooling and from certain countries of origin tend to be unaware of how important early education programs are (lack of information).

- ECEC in most countries are provided in a segmented market, with different types of care and education (center-based care, home-based care, half- or full-day care).

- Prices, financing systems, quality regulations; risk to reinforce existing disadvantages (discrimination).

- Private, partly/fully subsidized organizations provide educational supply; different accreditation regulations, and differences in quality (Benchmarks for Early Education Services in OECD Countries, UNICEF, Innocenti Research Center, 2008).
“When I approach a child, he inspires in me two sentiments; tenderness for what he is, and respect for what he may become.”

Louis Pasteur
Promote long-term effectiveness of early-childhood programs

- Target children and families at highest risk of school difficulties
- Begin participation early, and continue to second or third grade (6-7 years old)
- Provide comprehensive child-development services
- Active and multi-faceted parent involvement (integration)
- Child-centered, structured curriculum approach
- Small class sizes and teacher/child ratios
- Regular staff development and in-service training for certified teachers
- Systematic evaluation and monitoring
- More public funds
<The Lerncafe’>

• The ‘Lerncafe’ Gratz initiative launched in 2007 now present across the whole of Austria.

• Young immigrants – aged 6 - 15 – are welcome to drop into the ‘Lerncafe’ (or Learning Cafe) after school. There, they do their homework together and organize activities for their free time. Attendance is completely voluntary, and children are neither forced to study nor attend regularly.

• By learning to interact socially with others, building their self-confidence and German language skills, Austria’s immigrant children have a much better chance of integrating into the Austrian society.