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Foreword

Education and training systems can play a key role in helping countries unlock the benefits of migration. This involves supporting immigrants to develop and use their skills, participate in the labour markets of host countries, contribute to welfare arrangements, and feel a sense of belonging in their host communities. However, the road to integration is not always well-paved and easy to navigate. Many countries face challenges when it comes to the integration of immigrants, also because there is limited knowledge about what policies and strategies are effective for successful integration.

Over the past two years, the OECD *Strength through Diversity: The Integration of Immigrants and Refugees in Education and Training Systems* project has developed a rich evidence-base to help countries identify the needs of new arrivals, while putting in place or scaling up integration policies to support immigrants and the communities in which they settle. This report provides a synthesis of the project’s findings and identifies eight policy pillars that can help sustain and support the effectiveness of policy design and implementation.

Importantly, the *Road to Integration* is not only about identifying how the skills of immigrants can be developed and effectively used. It is also about promoting their overall social and emotional well-being, recognising differences in migration-related experiences and ensuring that all people - both native populations and migrant communities - have the cognitive and affective skills required for openness to diversity and change.

The OECD, with its *Strength through Diversity* project, stands ready to support countries in developing and implementing policies for more inclusive education and training systems. This not only can benefit immigrants, but support all individuals to engage constructively with others in increasingly diverse and complex societies.

The development of this report was guided by Andreas Schleicher and Yuri Belfali and was overseen by the Education Policy Committee. Paulo Santiago provided support in the last stages to help finalise the report. The report was led by Francesca Borgonovi and drafted by Francesca Borgonovi, Lucie Cerna, Alessandro Ferrara and Caitlyn Guthrie. Emma Linsenmayer edited the report and Rachel Linden co-ordinated its production. Diana Tramontano, Matthew Gill, Hanna Andersson and Nikita Quarshie provided administrative and editorial support. The report was enriched by the thoughtful contributions provided by the many individuals who participated in Phase I of the *Strength through Diversity* project.

Andreas Schleicher
Director for Education and Skills
Special Advisor on Education Policy to the Secretary-General
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Executive Summary

Migration has been at the centre of policy debate across the OECD in recent years. Policy responses aimed at supporting and facilitating the integration of immigrants have been polarising in many countries. Policy makers, civil society organisations, schools and citizens in OECD countries all contribute to support newcomers. Migration flows can create some challenges for host communities, but they also represent an opportunity for countries that face an ageing native-born populations to overcome the associated threat of labour and skills shortages. Education and training systems can play a key role in ensuring that countries are able to effectively tackle the challenges associated with migration and unlock migration’s benefits. Education and training systems have a unique role to play if new arrivals are to be able to develop and use their skills, participate in the labour markets of host countries, contribute to welfare arrangements, and feel a sense of belonging in their communities.

However, a lack of coordination between different actors and a lack of knowledge on what strategies work can reduce the effectiveness, reach and suitability of policies aimed at supporting immigrant and refugee students. Education and training systems not only enable immigrants to acquire skills necessary for entering the labour market, they also help immigrants understand the culture and traditions of the country of destination and can ensure that native populations have the cognitive and affective skills that are necessary to be open to diversity and change.

The Road to Integration. Education and Migration identifies eight policy pillars that can sustain and support the effectiveness of policy conception, design, and implementation in education.

Consider the heterogeneity of immigrant populations

Individuals with an immigrant background are a highly heterogeneous group. Characterising individuals by their immigration background can help target service delivery and, as a result, support integration processes. However, grouping individuals based on their immigration background can create barriers within communities and hide other important dimensions that are more critical for their personal development, overall well-being and their long-term integration. Individuals with an immigrant background should receive support to help them achieve their potential, but care should be taken if and when targeted initiatives are implemented to avoid stigmatising individuals because of their background.

Develop approaches to promote the overall well-being of immigrants

Important differences remain not only in the skills immigrants have, but also in the levels of social and emotional well-being they report, which are equally important for immigrants’ successful integration. Examining different sets of vulnerabilities that accompany direct
and indirect displacement and the fact that they might affect students’ sense of themselves is imperative to design effective education policies. While education and training systems clearly can and should play a role in promoting the overall well-being of immigrants, their role should be seen in light of a broad and co-ordinated effort encompassing the education, health, social and welfare systems, and potentially involving partnerships among schools, hospitals, universities and community organisations.

**Address the unique needs of refugee students**

Refugee children often face a wide array of unique challenges including the need to overcome interrupted or limited schooling and trauma. Schools and education systems can address the multiple needs of refugee children by adopting a holistic model that ensures access to education with a strong support for academic, social, physical and psychological development, integrates early assessments with individualised development plans, allows for flexibility to account for non-standard learning pathways and builds professionalism among the teaching community.

**Ensure that motivation translates into a key asset for immigrant communities**

Many immigrant students and their families have high levels of learning motivation and hold the ambition to obtain high levels of educational qualifications in order to enter professional occupations. By strengthening migrants’ skills (so that their motivation and ambitions can be realised), ensuring that individuals can build on their ambitions, providing career and education guidance, and helping individuals and their families develop realistic short-, medium- and long-term plans, education systems can ensure that individual migrants and their host communities capitalise on such motivation and ambition.

**Provide comprehensive language support**

Effective communication depends on language abilities. Providing comprehensive language support so that migrants master the language that is spoken in their host communities is crucial if immigrants are to be able to integrate in their host communities and benefit from education and training opportunities. At the same time, language is a key vehicle for migrant communities to maintain their identity and cultural roots. Education systems can support migrant communities by promoting plurilingualism in schools and offering mother tongue tuition, offering targeted language support, supporting opportunities for informal language learning and making use of assessments to monitor and improve language skills and building the capacity of teachers to work in linguistically diverse classrooms.

**Organise resources to reduce the influence of socio-economic status on the outcomes of immigrants**

Many immigrants have a low socio-economic status and attend schools in socio-economically disadvantaged classrooms. Deprivation explains differences in the academic performance, skills accumulation and some aspects of general well-being between individuals with and those without an immigrant background in different OECD countries. Moreover, socio-economic status often exacerbates other forms of disadvantage associated with having an immigrant background. In order to ensure that immigrants are not held back by a relatively disadvantaged socio-economic condition, education systems should
consider how institutional and governance aspects of education policy can be used to reduce the influence of socio-economic status on the outcomes of immigrants.

Build the capacity of teachers to deal with diversity

Teachers are key actors in supporting immigrant students reach their full potential. However, as a broad array of social and demographic changes increase the diversity in schools and classrooms, teacher capacity to support the individual needs of all students should be strengthened. For example, teachers need to receive initial teacher training and professional development opportunities to respond to the specific needs of diverse populations, including immigrants, and adapt their teaching practices to more diverse classrooms. Hiring professionals that reflect the student body, integrating diversity and inter-cultural topics into initial teacher education, offering continuous professional development in diversity, supporting teachers in diverse classrooms and preparing school principals for diversity in schools can all ensure that teachers are better equipped to promote the integration of all students, including immigrant students.

Break down barriers to social cohesion while ensuring effective service delivery

This pillar requires the identification of innovative ways to ensure that the learning needs of immigrants are catered for in the most cost-effective way but also that they enjoy plenty of opportunities to be with non-immigrants. Organising effective service delivery is necessary not only to ensure the academic and broader well-being of individuals with an immigrant background, their long-term integration prospects, but also to promote positive public attitudes towards migration among native populations.
Chapter 1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the resilience framework adopted in the context of the Strength through Diversity project and how education systems can use it to develop holistic policy approaches to support the integration of immigrants and refugees. The chapter identifies the following policy principles: supporting the acquisition of skills and competences among immigrant communities; promoting the overall social and emotional well-being of immigrants; recognising differences in migration-related experiences and building the skills that are necessary to deal with psychological and behavioural challenges induced by acculturation (among both immigrants and natives).
Scope of the Synthesis Report

Migration has been at the centre of policy debate across the OECD in recent years, largely because of the refugee crisis. Policy responses aimed at supporting and facilitating the integration of immigrants have been deeply polarising in many countries. Since 2014 a wealth of evidence has been produced on integrating immigrant communities. Policy makers, civil society organisations, schools and concerned citizens in OECD countries all contribute to support newcomers. However, lack of coordination between different actors and lack of knowledge on what strategies work reduces the effectiveness, reach and suitability of policies aimed at supporting immigrant and refugee students in education systems.

This Synthesis Report identifies eight pillars of policy-making that the *Strength through Diversity* project deemed crucial for education systems and various actors to effectively support newcomers. For each pillar, the report details a set of principles driving the design and implementation of system-level policies and school-level practices.

The eight pillars ask policymakers to:

1. consider the heterogeneity of immigrant populations
2. develop approaches to promote the overall well-being of immigrants
3. address the unique needs of refugee students
4. ensure that motivation translates as a key asset for immigrant communities
5. provide comprehensive language support
6. organise resources to reduce the influence of socio-economic status on the outcomes of immigrants
7. build the capacity of teachers to deal with diversity
8. break down barriers to social cohesion while ensuring effective service delivery.

Background to the Synthesis Report

An estimated 4.8 million immigrants arrived in OECD countries during 2015, an increase of about 10% from the previous year, with family reunification and free movement across borders each accounting for about a third of these entries. The recent wave of migration has reinforced a long and steady upward trend in the share of immigrants in OECD countries, which has grown by more than 30% since 2000 and has become increasingly diverse (OECD, 2018[1]). Over this period, several OECD countries that had previously been the country of origin of many immigrants, including Ireland, Italy and Spain, became destination countries. Before the global economic crisis of 2008, immigration rates in these countries were sometimes as high as those of traditional OECD immigration countries (OECD, 2015[2]).

Children represent a significant portion of global migration flows, especially within refugee populations. According to a 2016 UNICEF report, 1 in 8 immigrants worldwide is a child, as is more than one in two refugees – a proportion that has doubled between 2005 and 2015 (UNICEF, 2016[3]). Accommodating the unprecedented inflows of immigrant children into education systems is one of the key challenges facing host countries today. At the same time, given the high likelihood that a large number of new arrivals will settle permanently in their country of destination and the fact that foreign-born adults differ widely in skills...
and attitudes, it is crucial that education and training systems provide learning opportunities to support the labour market and social integration of immigrant children and adults.

While migration flows can create challenges for host communities, they also represent an opportunity for countries that face ageing native-born populations to overcome the associated threat of labour and skills shortages (Boeri, 2012; Cerna, 2016; EMN, 2011; OECD/EU, 2014). To integrate immigrants successfully into society and unlock the potential benefits of migration, countries must implement effective education and social policies. Education and training systems have a unique role to play if new arrivals are to be able to develop and use their skills, participate in the labour markets of host countries, contribute to welfare arrangements, and feel a sense of belonging in their communities.

Education and training systems can play a key role in promoting long-term integration processes because they enable immigrants to acquire skills necessary for entering the labour market. Furthermore, these systems can help immigrants understand the culture and traditions of the country of destination. Similarly, education can play an important role in shaping the attitudes that native populations hold towards immigrants. Migration in fact requires both immigrants and natives to undergo a process of acculturation. Acculturation has been defined as “culture change that results from continuous, first-hand contact between two distinct cultural groups” (Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, 1936). In other words, acculturation refers to the process affecting individuals who move from one culture to another and how these individuals’ self-identities change to accommodate information about and experiences with a new culture (Ryder, Alden and Paulhus, 2000).

However, it is important to note that acculturation also affects individuals who do not move, but live in communities into which people move. These individuals also undergo a potential change in self-identity to accommodate information about and experiences with the cultures of the newcomers. This is significant, in particular when the size of the immigrant group is large, when there is a high degree of heterogeneity in immigrant populations (Berry, 1997) and when economic, demographic and social dynamics induce either a real or a perceived competition between individuals and social groups over resources and influence. If education and training systems are not mobilised to ensure that natives are well-equipped to deal with the challenges that diversity entails and are ready to reap the benefits that diversity brings, there is a risk that natives, particularly those who experience lack of economic, political or social inclusion, may respond to increased diversity by expressing feelings of racial intolerance and prejudice and by feeling threatened by new arrivals (Dustmann and Preston, 2001). Such prejudice may stem from perceived competition in the labour market (Scheve and Slaughter, 2001; Mayda, 2006), fear that immigrants will reduce the availability of welfare services (Dustmann and Preston, 2007) and/or that immigrant children will lower educational standards (OECD, 2015).

A holistic approach

The OECD’s Strength through Diversity: The integration of immigrants and refugees in school and training systems project developed a holistic approach to examine if and how education and training systems can ensure that societies are well-equipped to deal with the challenges and reap the full benefits that arise from international migration flows.

The term diversity in the context of this report is used to refer to one specific aspect of the diversity that is present in countries and in education systems: diversity arising from international migration. Although the report discusses challenges and opportunities related to the linguistic profile of individuals, linguistic profiles are only considered when
discussing individuals with a migration background rather than, for example, linguistic minorities within countries. The report recognises that diversity of country of birth is just one aspect of diversity: diversity in culture, religion, language, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status, gender, physical health, mental health and learning potential (encompassing giftedness as well as specific learning disabilities and impairments) all contribute to the uniqueness of the student body teachers experience on a daily basis and of social dynamics within countries.

The project adopted a resilience framework to analyse different ways education and training systems can promote positive change to achieve broad individual and social well-being for all. In the psychological literature, resilience refers to the capacity of individuals to overcome adversity and display positive adjustment (Daniel and Wassell, 2002[16]; Howard, Dryden and Johnson, 1999[17]). The term “adversity” in the literature on resilience refers to the challenges and difficulties that individuals experience in life, which could stem from underlying familial, societal or environmental factors or conditions, or from onset events or circumstances (e.g. change in life status or situation). Adversity in this report is used to indicate the difficulties that individuals experience because of migration, by the very nature that migration means a change in the individual’s physical and social environment from the one that they were originally familiar. The degree of adversity differs greatly across individuals, depending on their migration experience and personal circumstances. It can range from the small challenge related to understanding how an education system is organised and the procedures that need to be fulfilled to benefit from educational services to trauma, legal issues and disruption in family bonds and social networks. In fact, even individuals in receiving communities may face a degree of adversity (as understood in psychological literature) because the arrival of new individuals in a community can change the physical and social environment they are used to, a change that requires adaptation on the part of everyone.

Resilience research indicates that even when exposed to the same challenges and difficulties, individuals can reach a wide range of outcomes, from the very positive, to the highly negative. How individuals fare given exposure to challenges depends on the specific assets and vulnerabilities they have when exposed to such challenges, but also on the unique combination of risk, protective factors and circumstances that accompany the experience of challenging events. The resilience framework depicted in Figure 1.1 implies that those who experience challenging circumstances are not equally susceptible to challenging circumstances and, as a result, display different degrees of adjustment.
In a broad sense, native populations and institutions such as schools, workplaces also experience potential challenges as a result of international migration: just as immigrants have to adjust to a new country, individuals who live in host countries and the institutions they create have to adjust to new arrivals. Acculturation is a process that affects all individuals within a country, and refers to the changes individuals make in their habits, behaviours and beliefs as a result of the encounter with others. Therefore, migration shapes the learning and training needs not only of those individuals who have a recent and direct family experience of migration (i.e. they are foreign-born or are the children of foreign-born parents) but also of individuals who have an indirect experience with migration, such as those who attend school or live in communities with sizable numbers of individuals with an immigrant background.

Migration often determines diversity, and for this diversity to become a source of richness school professionals and policy makers need to adjust policy and practice in several ways. For example, teachers who operate in multicultural and multilingual classrooms cannot take for granted the understanding of all the pupils in their classrooms. They need to be well attuned to their students in order to ensure their progress. At the same time, they need to develop strategies to ensure that all students have the cognitive, social and emotional skills that are needed to interact with others. While this is important in general, it becomes crucial in multilingual and multicultural classrooms, which is more common in the presence of many students with an immigrant background. In some countries, current and aspiring new teachers are already receiving the support they need to be able to and feel comfortable with teaching in diverse settings with a student body reflecting a wide range of backgrounds and needs. In other countries, particularly countries where immigration is a new phenomenon, teachers are older and development opportunities are not available, building teacher capacity is an important priority. The positive outcomes experienced by students with an immigrant background in some countries illustrate what is possible to achieve in this respect (OECD/EU, 2018[18]).
In order for countries to benefit from migration it is crucial that policies and practices implemented by education and training systems will:

1. support the acquisition of skills and competences among immigrant communities
2. promote the overall social and emotional well-being of immigrants
3. recognise differences in migration-related experiences
4. build the skills that are necessary to deal with psychological and behavioural challenges induced by acculturation (among both immigrant and natives).

This holistic policy approach recognises that the long-term integration of immigrants is important to support social cohesion. This depends crucially on the capacity of both immigrants and natives to have the skill sets needed to fully integrate in the labour market but also to play an active and positive role in the social life of their communities. Given the ultimate goal of broad social cohesion and long-term integration of immigrant communities in OECD countries, Figure 1.2 illustrates the different objectives of policy design and service delivery by education and training systems identified in the project.

Figure 1.2. A holistic policy approach to education and economic integration in times of greater international migration

By adopting a mixed-methods approach, the *Strength through Diversity: The integration of immigrants and refugees in school and training systems* project combined information gleaned from in-depth data analysis, policy discussions with stakeholders and reviews of policy documents to identify the specific components that promote resilience. The project did so by identifying the specific assets and vulnerabilities that accompany individuals, institutions and societies experiencing diversity, in addition to identifying how actors at different levels can be mobilised in coherent and goal-directed ways to promote integration and social cohesion.
This Synthesis Report summarises the project’s evidence generated between 2017 and 2018 and integrates emerging insights from across the different work-streams (data analysis and indicator development, thematic policy reviews and country spotlight reports). A list of the project’s publications, policy fora and events that collectively form the knowledge base used for this report can be found in Annex 1.A, while Figure 1.3 illustrates the three key work-streams around which the project was structured.

**Figure 1.3. Strength through Diversity work streams**
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Chapter 2. Consider the heterogeneity of immigrant populations

This chapter builds on evidence from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the OECD Survey of Adult Skills. The extent to which policies and practices can be implemented to provide adequate support to immigrants is discussed, recognising the heterogeneity of their circumstances which is dictated both by their unique migration experiences and learning journeys (both prior to and post migration).
Public discussions often group all individuals with an immigration background together and discuss them as a homogeneous group characterised by low skills, language difficulties and disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds. Indeed, individuals with an immigrant background, defined here as being either foreign-born or having at least one foreign-born parent, share an important characteristic: they are either foreign-born or have at least one foreign-born parent. Characterising individuals by their immigration background can be useful to target service delivery and, as a result, support integration processes. However, grouping individuals based on their immigration background can create barriers within communities and distinguish between different social groups. Homogenising individuals because of status and background often has the intended (or unintended) consequence of dehumanising members of the particular group considered. As a result, some people may find it harder to develop strong connections and feelings of empathy towards members of this group.

The consideration that immigrants are homogeneous in many countries is rooted in the fact that in the past, migration flows often followed established paths that determined the composition of immigrant communities: geographical proximity, linguistic proximity or colonial ties. As a result, the specific make-up of immigrant communities in many countries was relatively homogeneous. However, today immigrant populations are highly heterogeneous, both across and within countries (OECD, 2018[1]; OECD, 2018[2]).

In order to address the risks associated with having an immigrant background and support the resilience of immigrants and refugees, education professionals (teachers, educators and trainers) need to know the personal histories of individual students and trainees, develop the tact that is necessary to discuss their past experiences, and be aware of how migration can affect academic performance, social integration, and well-being (emotional and psychological). Individuals with an immigrant background should receive support to help them achieve their potential, but care should be taken if and when targeted initiatives are implemented to avoid stigmatising individuals because of their background.

Data show that immigrant populations are highly heterogeneous, both across and within the countries. For example, data from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills indicates that around one in every four immigrant adults attained only primary education or lower. At the same time, almost as many as one in three foreign-born individuals in OECD countries holds a higher education degree (OECD, 2018[1]). Data from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills also reveals that in many countries the languages spoken by foreign-born participants were highly diverse.

Table 2.1 illustrates the diversity of foreign-born individuals surveyed in the OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC). In Australia, Canada and New Zealand, over one in four individuals in PIAAC was foreign-born. In certain countries, such as Greece and Lithuania, foreign-born individuals were particularly likely to have arrived before the age of 6. In Denmark, England (United Kingdom), Ireland, New Zealand and Norway, at least one in five foreign-born individuals were recent immigrants. While in Chile virtually all immigrants speak the host country language and in the Czech Republic, England (United Kingdom), Estonia, France, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Lithuania, New Zealand and Spain over two-thirds of them speak the host language, in Finland, Norway, Singapore, Sweden and the United States, less than one in two immigrants speak the host country language. In Canada, Israel and Russia, more than one in two foreign-born individuals completed tertiary education, while in Italy and Slovenia, respectively, less than one in ten and one in five have.
## 2. Consider the Heterogeneity of Immigrant Populations

### Table 2.1. A profile of immigrants in the Survey of Adult Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share in total population</th>
<th>Share among native-born</th>
<th>Share among foreign-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign-born (%)</td>
<td>Recent immigrants (%)</td>
<td>Immigrants who arrived before age 6 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England/N. Ireland (UK)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders (Belgium)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At most upper secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Highest qualification obtained in host country</th>
<th>Highest qualification obtained in elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England/N. Ireland (UK)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders (Belgium)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sample includes persons aged 16 to 65.

StatLink: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933940037](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933940037)
Individuals differ not only in their background characteristics, but also in the experiences they have with migration. Such differences are importantly associated with both the specific difficulties individuals encounter, as well as the assets they are equipped with (OECD, 2018[1]). Individuals’ migration experience interacts with additional factors such as personal and family circumstances, relationships with peers, school personnel and system-level support, to shape the uniqueness of each individual with an immigrant background.

Evidence from the 2015 edition of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) highlights some of the differences observed among 15-year-old students with an immigrant background. Across OECD countries, 23% of students with an immigrant background were foreign-born and had at least one foreign-born parent; 31% were native-born but had two foreign-born parents; 38% were native-born and had one native-born and one foreign-born parent and a further 8% were foreign-born but had native-born parents (OECD, 2018[1]).

Between 2003 and 2015 in most OECD countries, the number of students with an immigrant background largely increased: the percentage of native-born children of native-born parents decreased between 2003 and 2015 in as many as 26 out of the 39 countries and economies with comparable data (OECD, 2018[1]). On average across OECD countries, the decrease of native-born children of native-born parents was as large as 6 percentage points and it was over 15 percentage points in Ireland, Luxembourg and Switzerland. The percentage of native-born students of native-born parents increased only in Latvia, Macao (China), Russia and Uruguay. While in most countries the number of students without a recent experience of migration in the family shrank significantly between 2003 and 2015, Figure 2.2 suggests that countries differ markedly in the composition of their student population and in how the make-up of the group with an immigrant background has evolved over time.
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Figure 2.1. Students with an immigrant background, by group

Percentage of students that are either first-generation immigrants, returning foreign-born immigrants, second-generation immigrants, or native students of mixed heritage, by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Second-generation immigrant students</th>
<th>Native students of mixed heritage</th>
<th>First-generation immigrant students</th>
<th>Returning foreign-born students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macao (China)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (China)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABA (Argentina)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYROM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-S-J-G (China)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of students with an immigrant background.
Source: OECD, PISA 2015 and 2003 Database.

StatLink: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939581
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Figure 2.2. Changes in the percentage of students with an immigrant background between 2003 and 2015

Percentage point change between 2003 and 2015

Note: Changes between 2003 and 2015 that are statistically significant are indicated with darker or striped bars. Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the cumulative percentage point change in the share of first-generation immigrants, second-generation immigrants and native students of mixed heritage between 2003 and 2015.

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database and PISA 2003 Database.

StatLink: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939600

These trends reveal major changes that are not only quantitative, but also qualitative: the number of immigrants arriving in many OECD countries is increasing, and so is the heterogeneity of immigrant groups. Increases in the quantity and diversity of individuals with an immigrant background will require that host communities develop the skills needed to adapt to new concepts of identity, culture and citizenship. Policy responses will also need to be designed, implemented and evaluated, in addition to being tailor-made to adequately respond to the different needs of diverse populations. However, increases in diversity provide greater opportunities for host communities to grow because the pool of talent that countries can draw upon is larger (Alesina and La Ferrara, 2005[3]).

Another way to express that a quantitative increase in the share of foreign-born populations has been accompanied by a qualitative increase in the diversity of foreign-born populations at the population level is to identify the likelihood that any two individuals within a
population will have been born in the same country. Figure 2.3 shows how the overall level of birthplace diversity has changed in OECD countries between 1990 and 2010. This change is due both to an increase in the overall number of foreign-born individuals as well as an increase in diversity in countries of origin.

Figure 2.3. Trends in the likelihood that two individuals who are resident in the same country were born in different countries, by country of residence

The likelihood of any two individuals within a population to have been born in different countries

Note: Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the likelihood of two individuals being born in different countries in 2010.

StatLink  http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939619

From evidence to action: Lessons from the field including examples of policies and practices to recognise the individuality of immigrants.

Migration poses significant challenges for education and training systems because it can create large variability in the number of people that require education services and resources within short timeframes. This is problematic both for education systems in countries that had been adjusting to shrinking student populations due to low fertility and in countries where provision is already stretched thin, especially in remote areas or socio-economically disadvantaged communities where immigrants and refugees often converge. Migration also increases the heterogeneity of populations served and the types of needs they have. For example, access to prior education and training can vary substantially across regions. Even when access and participation are equal, the differences in the learning outcomes, learning styles and individual strategies that students adopt when learning in different school systems can be large.

Consider the various dimensions of an individual’s migration experience

Education is an important means through which migration can be managed since it is the primary organised vehicle through which societies transmit social and cultural codes that forge social relations. Yet, collecting data, evidence and statistics on immigrants and their
characteristics to ensure that education and training systems have the capacity to meet their needs is complicated. Population movements take very different forms: international vs. internal; temporary vs. permanent; those moving in successive stages vs. those returning; documented vs. undocumented; and voluntary vs. forced. The populations also vary: internally displaced and refugee populations; students vs. workers and, in the latter case, skilled or unskilled, and so on.

Three factors involving an individual’s background are key for a discussion on data and statistics needed to address questions related to education, migration, and displacement:

- **Space**: The implications of movements on education and organising resources that education systems need to meet the needs of immigrants are significantly different depending on the distance of the migratory movement and its relation to national, international and regional borders. These factors can be discussed in terms of free mobility and legal restrictions, but also cultural distance and ease of adapting to a new location.

- **Time**: Similarly, the implications for education systems also depend on the (intended) duration of movement and residence (e.g. seasonal, short-term and circular vs. permanent). Additional aspects that can affect education systems include age at migration and the number of generations that have passed since migration and displacement have occurred.

- **Reason**: People move for different reasons. They may migrate willingly for employment, education, or family formation/reunification. Migration can also be due to displacement, with people fleeing from war or persecution in their country of origin or increasingly, relocating due to natural disasters and climate change. The educational implications of these movements can vary drastically. For example, displaced children may not have attended school for a long time, have particularly low skills for their age, or have suffered traumatic experiences, which may reduce the ability to adjust to a new school environment.

Similarly, two types of education outcomes related to migration and displacement are also framing the discussion:

- **Individual**: The migration and displacement experience shapes the ability of children, youth and adults to complete their education and acquire the different types of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are necessary to succeed in their personal, social and professional life. Different education-related data sources capture distinct outcomes along this range. For example, the data from the Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA) can help measure knowledge, skills and increasingly attitudes and global competence (in the 2018 cycle). The International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS) data could be used for civic and citizenship skills as well as attitudes and knowledge.

- **Social**: Education is a key mechanism for promoting tolerance, including towards immigrants and refugees. By promoting tolerance, education can also foster the values, attitudes, and norms that improve interpersonal trust and increase civic engagement, which are important pillars of democracy.

Preparing teachers to consider the various dimensions of migration experiences of students with an immigrant background can help students fully benefit from their education. Initial teacher education (ITE) systems that are competence-based, in addition to transversal and comprehensive curricular approaches have been shown to be effective in providing student...
teachers with knowledge on diversity. Research from the European Commission’s 2017 report, “Preparing teachers for diversity: the role of initial teacher education (European Commission, 2017[4]),” shows that diversity plays a central role in the policies and strategies of 37 countries (mostly EU-members). However, the report calls for a paradigm shift to explicitly target different kinds of diversity in policies. Classrooms should be consistently monitored and evaluated to ensure policies and mechanisms are the best adapted to students with an immigrant background from year to year. This requires institutional support, strong partnerships, effective governance and elaborated frameworks to link theories to practice. Good practice examples include the National Centre for Multicultural Education in Norway (http://nafo.oslomet.no/om-nafo/about-nafo/) and the “Let’s compare our languages” programme in France (www.schooleducationgateway.eu/en/pub/resources/toolkitsforschools/detail.cfm?n=562).

An approach practiced in New York City (United States) provides teachers with an opportunity to enter the student’s environment. Teachers in New York visited the neighbourhoods where their students lived, which allowed them to better understand their students’ home environments and the cultural backgrounds. This exercise also promoted empathy through a reversal of roles since students normally enter the teacher’s environment at school and in the classroom.

In Hungary, teachers participate in teacher training with a team of psychologists. The programme aims to improve their pedagogical practice to diverse groups of students by observing themselves and understanding the psychological effects of their teaching practice.

Another mechanism to promote the consideration of various dimensions of an individual’s migration experience is to hire teachers that reflect the diverse student body in a given school. Research shows that teachers from diverse backgrounds are better able to attend to the emotional development of their students (based on student test scores). Furthermore, data found that students who are taught by teachers of colour do better on standardised tests. This does not mean that students of colour should be matched with a teacher of colour per se, but rather that the composition of the teaching staff in any given school should be diverse, which can benefit students with an immigrant background, native students and other teachers.

Develop a stronger evidence base

Many international and national surveys and assessments can help us better understand the migration phenomena to support the design and implementation of effective education policies. However, the current evidence infrastructure could be improved to better identify the heterogeneity of immigrant populations.

Countries must develop better indicators and implement more effective evaluation mechanisms to assess how well practices, policies and programmes are supporting different groups of students with an immigrant background. Evaluation is important for measuring teacher incentives, resource allocation, initial teacher training, professional development and policies towards teachers with an immigrant background.

In Chile, several distinct national tests monitor a number of characteristics of diverse students (including the number of minority students in schools, geographic location of schools, whether the school performs well depending on contextual factors and so on). Schools are then classified and well-performing schools receive money and a ‘big achiever’ status. However, the classification system’s implementation by policymakers is not reliable.
and can result in inaccurate classifications, which can prevent schools that need additional resources from accessing them.
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Chapter 3. Develop approaches to promote the overall well-being of immigrants

This chapter identifies the extent to which individuals with an immigrant background compare to those without - with regards to their levels of skills, but also in terms of their overall well-being - using evidence from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the OECD Survey of Adult Skills. The chapter examines principles that can guide the design and implementation of policies and practices in education and training systems to support the overall well-being of immigrants and refugees.
Supporting the academic performance of all students is often a top priority for countries and school systems to empower new generations and to promote growth. When faced with large migratory flows, research shows that education systems have a crucial role to play in ensuring immigrants integrate well in the host country, which can depend largely on their academic performance. The academic skills of students with an immigrant background tend to be much lower than that of native students. According to PISA 2015 results, on average across OECD countries, as much as 51% of first-generation immigrant students (foreign-born students of foreign-born parents) failed to reach baseline academic proficiency in reading, mathematics and science, compared to only 28% of students without an immigrant background.

The large gap in the academic performance of immigrant and native students’ can explain why countries might focus their education policies on honing immigrant students’ academic skills. Academic skills can increase the readiness of students to learn the necessary skills needed to enter the labour market and help the host country thrive.

However, major differences exist not only in the skills immigrants have, but also in the levels of social and emotional well-being they report, which are equally important for immigrants’ successful integration. In fact, there is a large degree of variation in how vulnerable different immigrant groups are in terms of experiencing low levels of social and emotional well-being. Such variation differs systematically depending on the country in which they (or their parents) had settled, the characteristics of the schools they attend (in the case of immigrant children) and the experiences they have in the labour market (in the case of immigrant adults).

This chapter shows that individuals with an immigrant background who have positive academic and/or labour market outcomes may not necessarily have high well-being outcomes due to vulnerabilities and lack of resilience. Low well-being of immigrants can be detrimental to their integration process and therefore, to the overall well-being of the host country. Policies and efforts should focus on increasing the academic, social and emotional resilience of immigrants in order to overcome individual vulnerabilities and increase well-being. The chapter will examine a set of principles that could guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to support the overall well-being of immigrants and refugees.

The academic, social and emotional resilience of immigrant students

Resilience refers to children’s positive adaptation, both overall and in key areas, namely academic, social, emotional and motivational. These are key determinants of immigrant children’s current well-being and are key indicators of these children’s capacity to thrive economically, socially and emotionally as adults. The size of the disadvantage that immigrants face varies across dimensions of resilience and countries.

To investigate immigration-related disadvantages in a broad measure of resilience, which encompasses academic, social and emotional dimensions, a single indicator of academic and socio-emotional well-being was built. Students are considered to be academically sound and socially and emotionally resilient if they attain baseline academic proficiency, report a sense of belonging at school and report being satisfied with life.

Figure 3.1 reports the percentage of academically resilient and overall resilient immigrant students. Results show that, on average across OECD countries, only about half of academically resilient immigrant students were also resilient in other well-being dimensions. Significant differences exist across countries of destination. In Macao (China),
the percentage of academically resilient immigrant students was the largest (88%), but the percentage of immigrant students who were considered overall resilient was just above the OECD average (31%). In Colombia, France, Macao (China), Montenegro, the Slovak Republic and Tunisia, less than 40% of immigrant students who were academically resilient were also socially and emotionally resilient. By contrast, in Finland and the Netherlands, over 70% of immigrant students who were academically resilient were also socially and emotionally resilient.

**Figure 3.1. Academically, socially and emotionally resilient immigrant students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Academically resilient</th>
<th>Academically, socially and emotionally resilient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macao</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrant students who were academically resilient. Academically resilient students are those who reach at least PISA proficiency level two in all three PISA core subjects – math, reading and science. Socially resilient students are those who reported that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I feel like I belong at school” and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statement “I feel like an outsider at school”. Emotionally resilient students are those who reported a life satisfaction of 7 or above on a scale from 1 to 10. Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.*

**StatLink** [http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939638](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939638)**

The academic performance and social well-being of immigrant students is significantly related to their country of origin and of destination. Students from different countries of origin residing in the same country might experience different adversities and adjustment. This is the result of socio-economic disparities and linguistic differences between students, but also of the cultural gaps, geographic proximity and historical ties between host and destination countries. Students from the same country of origin have different academic and well-being outcomes across different host countries. The interaction of host- and
origin-country characteristics influences the academic and social resilience of immigrant students in different ways.

Results from Figure 3.2 show that the interaction of students’ country of origin, country of birth and the outcome being observed give rise to very different outcomes. Second-generation immigrant students from Iraq were more likely to be academically resilient in Denmark, while they were more likely to be socially resilient in Finland. The same is not true for second-generation immigrant students from the same country and in the same two host countries. First-generation immigrant students from Pakistan were more likely to be academically resilient in the United Kingdom than in Denmark, but they were more likely to be socially resilient in Denmark. By contrast, second-generation immigrant students from Pakistan were more likely to be both socially and academically resilient in the United Kingdom.

The figure also shows that some host countries might be particularly effective at securing the well-being of students, irrespective of their country of origin. First-generation immigrant students from Iraq, Pakistan and Somalia are more likely to be socially resilient in Denmark than in the other host countries considered. However, the same is not true for second-generation immigrant students (for example those from Somalia). Other countries might be more effective at integrating students from certain countries of origin, due to historic and linguistic affinities. For example, second-generation immigrant students from Pakistan are more likely to be academically and socially resilient in Pakistan.
The ability of education systems to foster different forms of resilience

The discussion so far has shown that academic resilience does not necessarily imply resilience in other well-being outcomes and that education systems may have different abilities to support each type of resilience for students with an immigrant background. Table 3.1 shows the relative risk for immigrant students of not being resilient compared to native students by resilience outcome and host country.
### Table 3.1. Relative risk for immigrant students of not being resilient compared to native students, by resilience outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Not attaining baseline academic proficiency</th>
<th>Not reporting a sense of belonging at school</th>
<th>Not reporting being satisfied with life</th>
<th>Not reporting low schoolwork-related anxiety</th>
<th>Not reporting a high motivation to achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.278</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.898</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2.309</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2.516</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3.014</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All ratios are statistically significant. Students who attain baseline academic proficiency are students who reach at least PISA proficiency Level 2 in all three core PISA subjects: science, reading and mathematics. Students who reported a sense of belonging at school are those who reported that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I feel like I belong at school” and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statement “I feel like an outsider at school”. Students who reported being satisfied with life are those who reported a life satisfaction of 7 or above on a scale from 0 to 10. Students who reported low schoolwork-related anxiety are those who reported that they “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statements “I often worry that it will be difficult for me taking a test” and “Even if I am well prepared for a test, I feel very anxious”. Students who reported high motivation to achieve are those who reported that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I want to be the best, whatever I do”.

**Source:** OECD, PISA 2015 Database.

**StatLink**  [http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933940056](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933940056)

Immigrant students were at least twice as likely as native students to fail to achieve baseline levels of academic proficiency in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Slovenia and Switzerland. By contrast, immigrant students in...
Australia, Canada and Hungary were as likely as native students to fail to achieve baseline academic proficiency.

In most countries, immigrant students are less vulnerable when it comes to sense of belonging at school than they are when considering academic proficiency. However, in Iceland, the Slovak Republic and Spain, immigrant students were considerably less likely than native students to report a sense of belonging at school. In particular, in the Slovak Republic, immigrant students were almost twice as likely as native students to report a weak sense of belonging at school. In Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, immigrant students were at a lower risk of reporting a weak sense of belonging at school.

In France, Iceland, and Spain, immigrant students were considerably less likely than native students to report being satisfied with their life. In Austria, Finland, Luxembourg and Switzerland, they were considerably more likely than native students to report high levels of schoolwork-related anxiety.

In most countries, immigrant students expressed greater motivation to achieve compared to native students. In particular, in Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland and the Netherlands, immigrant students had about 30% less risk of reporting low motivation compared to native students and in the United Kingdom immigrant students had 46% less risk of so reporting. In Israel and Mexico, immigrant students were more likely than native students to report low motivation to achieve.

The table suggest that countries differ greatly in the dimensions of well-being to which immigrant students are most vulnerable. For example, while immigrant students in Belgium, Finland, Germany and Slovenia appear to be particularly vulnerable to poor academic proficiency but not to other aspects of well-being, students in Mexico, the Slovak Republic and Spain appear to be particularly likely to have only a weak sense of belonging at school and to report low satisfaction with life.

The non-labour market outcomes of adult immigrants

While employment and wages are important for adults’ well-being, non-economic factors also contribute to well-being and to the smooth functioning of societies as a whole. These factors are becoming increasingly important in the policy discourse. Examining the broad well-being of migrants is useful in identifying alternative benchmarks of integration. Labour market integration is important for migrants because it enables them to acquire economic resources, gives them a sense of purpose and provides opportunities for social bonding. It is important for host communities because their participation in the labour market contributes to the economic and social well-being of the country. However, in order to understand how and why people develop a sense of belonging to a community it is also important to consider immigrants’ broader life experiences.

Health is an important outcome, both in itself and as a potential determinant of differences in labour market participation and performance, and in engagement in lifelong learning activities for all adults. For example, adults who are highly proficient in information processing skills might be better able to manage their health and, as a result, might be in a better position to use their skills in the labour market.

Results from PIAAC show that, on average across participating countries, the shares of immigrant and native adults who reported to be in excellent or very good health are similar. However, in Chile, England (United Kingdom), Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Spain and Singapore, immigrants were more likely than natives to report being in
good health. By contrast, in France, Germany, Israel, the Netherlands and Sweden, they were less likely to report being in good health.

Interpersonal trust is a strong predictor of individual well-being (Helliwell and Wang, 2010[1]). Figure 3.3 shows the percentage of immigrants and natives who reported that they disagree or strongly disagree that only few people can be trusted. In 12 OECD countries, natives were more likely than immigrants to report that they strongly disagree or disagree that only few people can be trusted; in Denmark and the Netherlands the differences between the two groups are particularly large. For example, in Denmark, 46% of natives, but only 32% of immigrants reported that they disagree or strongly disagree that only few people can be trusted, a difference of 14 percentage points. In the Netherlands, 33% of natives but only 22% of immigrants reported the same, a difference of 11 percentage points.

**Figure 3.3. Immigrant adults and interpersonal trust, by immigrant background**

Percentage of immigrants and natives who report disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that if you are not careful other people will take advantage of you

Note: Immigrants are defined as those participants whose country of birth is different than the country in which they sat for the test. Statistically significant differences are marked in bold. Estimates based on a sample size less than 30 are not shown (Japan, Poland and Turkey). Countries are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrants who report disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that “if you are not careful other people will take advantage of you”.


StatLink: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939676](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939676)
From evidence to action: Policies and practices to promote the overall well-being of students with an immigrant background

This chapter has highlighted major differences in the academic, social and emotional outcomes of native students and students with an immigrant background. There is a large degree of variation in the vulnerability of different groups of students and such variation differs systematically, depending on the country in which they (or their parents) had settled, the characteristics of the schools they attend and of their families.

Defining resilience using multiple indicators that reflect academic, social and emotional well-being implies a clear role for education systems in promoting the full development of children with an immigrant background. Examining different sets of vulnerabilities that accompany direct and indirect displacement and the fact that they might affect students’ sense of themselves is imperative to design effective policies. While education systems clearly can and should play a role in promoting the well-being of students with an immigrant background, their role should be seen in light of a broad and co-ordinated effort encompassing the education, health, social and welfare systems, and potentially involving partnerships among schools, hospitals, universities and community organisations.

*Adopt the “CHARM” Framework for a resilience approach*

In the past couple of decades the resilience approach has been increasingly used in youth studies, but has been hardly applied to research on international migration and integration (Smith, 2006[2]). Building upon a strength based perspective, the resilience approach puts more emphasis on support mechanisms with an underlying objective of mobilising the potential of children and their resources (Wong, 2008[3]). In other words, it is an attempt to identify personality characteristics as well as environmental resources to moderate the negative effects of stress (Bernard, 1991[4]); (Kirby and Fraser, 1997[5]); (Masten, 1994[6]); (Werner and Smith R.S., 1992[7]).

The aspects well-being that are compelling for immigrant students include academic performance, socio-emotional well-being and motivational drive for the future. Immigrant children’s academic literacy in different topics (math, science and reading) shows how well they do in school today and predicts their preparedness for life as adults. Their social relations, feelings about their (school) life and views for the future are indicative of how adjusted they are now, but also positive and confident for the future. The resilience framework helps assess where children stand in relation to these different dimensions of life and investigate how some children cope better with adversity and challenges than others.

One of the underlying objectives of the resilience approach is to move away from a deficit model of resilience and adjustment (Wong, 2008[3]). This objective is particularly crucial when studying the case of immigrant children who at times are perceived as a liability for host countries. Instead of focusing on the weaknesses of immigrant children, the resilience approach illustrates the potential of individual students whereby their capabilities are recognised. In the presence of multiple factors that put immigrant children at risk, the resilience approach identifies characteristics that help them cope with adversity and challenges. The resilience approach has a wider focus on the social environment that shapes the experiences of children. By paying equal attention to family, school and country characteristics, it permits the identification of other contextual and structural factors that explain children’s adjustment processes (Ungar, 2011[8]).
The core features of the resilience framework have been translated into a tool to define policy objectives for equity in learning and well-being outcomes of immigrant students in school (Bilgili, 2017). The "CHARM" framework helps to assess the extent to which destination country policies and practices support the educational and socio-emotional well-being of immigrant children. It evaluates whether policies consider C “cumulative adversity”, H “holistic approach”, A “adjustment as a dynamic process”, R “relational development” and M “multilevel approach”. Accordingly, the CHARM framework also helps to assess the extent to which destination country policies and practices support immigrant students’ resilience (Bilgili, 2017).

The first component is the idea of “cumulative adversity”, which implies that the level and depth of challenges faced by children may be higher for some children than others depending on their experiences, and consequently some children may be more vulnerable than others. Policies should distinguish between different experiences of migration (for example between first and second-generation immigrant children or refugee and unaccompanied children) and consider the combination of the migration experience with other adversities such as a low socio-economic background.

The second component refers to having a “holistic approach” towards children’s well-being, addressing their multidimensional development and not just one dimension. The effectiveness of a holistic approach is dependent on the complementarity and coherence between policies. That is to say, policies targeting one dimension of children’s lives should not negatively affect their well-being in another domain, or from a more positive perspective, policies regarding different life domains should enhance each other’s positive effects.

The third approach is based on the idea that “adjustment is a dynamic process” and that adjustment in different dimensions may change over time. In other words, policies that have a long-term perspective and are able to adjust to the needs of immigrant students can promote resilience among immigrant students in a more sustainable way.

The fourth element is the theory of “relational development”, which highlights the central role that risk and protective factors play in shaping the likelihood that children will be able to overcome initial disadvantage. Policies and practices should explicitly consider the removal of risk factors and the promotion of protective factors at different levels (individual, family, school) as a way to promote the resilience of immigrant students.

The last element is the “multilevel approach”, which emphasises the importance of not only focusing on the child but also their social network and environment. In this perspective, policies and programs should assemble and promote the collaboration between the actors involved in the lives of immigrant children (such as children, their families, school staff and the wider community).

Table 3.2 presents policy goals that are associated with each of the five policy approaches. The CHARM policy analysis framework aims to assess to what extent countries and jurisdictions take into account these policy goals. Evaluating how policies are documented, drafted, discussed and implemented is crucial for a systematic CHARM analysis. For an example of how the CHARM framework is applied to evaluate policy goals and approaches, see (Bilgili, 2017) for a study on the education policies in Ontario, Canada.
Table 3.2. CHARM Policy analysis framework and policy goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience framework</th>
<th>Policy approaches</th>
<th>Policy goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| C                    | Cumulative adversity | Identification of challenges related to migration  
|                      |                   | Combination of challenges due to migration with other types of challenges  
|                      |                   | Targeted support for different types of immigrant students  |
| H                    | Holistic approach | Coherent and complementary policies  
|                      |                   | Promoting multiple dimensions of student well-being  
|                      |                   | Identification of associations between different dimensions of well-being  |
| A                    | Adjustment as a dynamic process | Immediate and continuous support  
|                      |                   | Immediate support for school enrolment  
|                      |                   | Continuous support in post-enrolment period  
|                      |                   | Identify of critical periods of risk  
|                      |                   | Monitoring of multiple outcomes in the long run  |
| R                    | Relational development | Identification of protective and risk factors  
|                      |                   | Identification of individual, family-, school- and community-related protective and risk factors  
|                      |                   | Identification of specific factors for immigrants and refugees  
|                      |                   | Documentation of evidence, strategies, measurements  
|                      |                   | Consideration of broader structural and sociological issues  |
| M                    | Multilevel approach | Family, school and community involvement  
|                      |                   | Promotion of student resilience in schools  
|                      |                   | Encouragement of parental involvement in school  
|                      |                   | Wider community involvement, including non-immigrants  |

**Promote the overall well-being of students with an immigrant background**

In Ontario, Canada, “Developing child and student well-being means supporting the whole child – not only the child’s academic achievement but also his or her cognitive, emotional, social and physical well-being” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014[10]). Promoting the well-being of children helps ensure that students can be better learners and excel in school. The board has developed a well-being framework as a guide for schools and the district to ensure the socio-emotional, cognitive and physical well-being of students (Bilgili, 2017[9]). For example, the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board (OCDSB) aims to enhance the use of resources to improve the well-being of all learners by 2019 (OCDSB, 2015[11]).

An effective project targeting the well-being of immigrant students is the Boston Hospital SHIFA (Supporting the Health of Immigrant Families and Adolescents) project. Since 1992, more than 5 000 Somali refugees and immigrants have settled in Boston, Massachusetts (United States). While many Somali youth suffer from mental health problems related to trauma and stress, few receive the help they need because of cultural or other barriers. Based at the Lilla G. Frederick Pilot Middle School in Boston, the project provides culturally appropriate services, from prevention to full intervention, including parent workshops, home visits and phone calls, teacher training, student groups and direct intervention for students. The programme works with schools for one to two years to develop skills among the school staff to address mental health and cultural issues relevant to the Somali refugee experience. An evaluation of Project SHIFA suggests that
community-wide acceptance of the programme led to high rates of engagement by children and families and resulted in a significant decrease in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms over eight months. Involvement in Project SHIFA is also associated with greater parental involvement with the school, increased sense of belonging at school, and a reduction in immigrant students’ rejection of school (Ellis et al., 2013[12]).

The Bridges programme, based at New York University (NYU) in New York City (United States), also aims to build immigrant parents’ resilience by strengthening their cultural identity. The prevention programme seeks to enhance the well-being of young children attending New York public schools by providing consultation to teachers and a workshop series to parents of students in first grade. Consultation includes education on cultural competence, ethnic socialisation, and common mental health problems among young children. Consultants, a team made up of NYU Child Study Centre clinicians and community representatives, help teachers use behaviour-management techniques, incorporate cultural activities in the classroom, and engage families.
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3. DEVELOP APPROACHES TO PROMOTE THE OVERALL WELL-BEING OF IMMIGRANTS


Chapter 4. Address the unique needs of refugee students

Refugee children face a wide array of unique challenges when they arrive in their new country. They need to learn the language of their host country, overcome interrupted or limited schooling, and adjust to a new education system. They also need to be able to communicate with others, feel a sense of belonging and develop a strong personal identity. Refugee children need to feel safe, and must be able to cope with loss, separation and/or trauma. Schools and education systems can address these multiple needs by adopting a holistic model for refugee integration. This chapter examines a set of principles that can guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to ensure that the particular needs of refugee students are addressed. Examples include policies that respond to the learning, social and well-being needs of refugees.
Refugees are often considered to be in the same category as immigrants, resulting in policies for immigrants also being used for refugees. Immigrants and refugees indeed share certain motivations and characteristics such as dealing with the disruption of migrating to a new country and adjusting to a different culture and lifestyle. Both immigrant and refugee youth can be confronted with an identity crisis as they try to meet the cultural demands of their parents and of their peers (McBrien, 2005). Furthermore, students with an immigrant or refugee background experience considerable challenges in education systems in host countries.

However, refugee students are particularly vulnerable due to their forced displacement, which is not characteristic of immigrant students. For this reason, refugee students require comprehensive policies that respond to their targeted needs. Schools and education systems play a key role in addressing refugee students’ learning, social and well-being needs. Ensuring their integration in the education system can in turn affect the future labour market and social integration potential of refugee students. In many countries, refugees may take 5 to 10 years to be employed and 15 to 20 years to reach comparable employment rates to the native-born and labour immigrants (OECD/EU, 2018; OECD, 2017). Poor labour market integration can translate into lower well-being for refugees; however, their successful integration can help promote social inclusion, reduce tensions with native populations and create more equal societies (OECD, 2019).

Policies in many countries do not sufficiently distinguish between refugee and immigrant students, and often do not take a comprehensive approach to refugee integration. Policies are more likely to focus on access to education or mental health rather than incorporating a combination of learning, social and emotional needs of refugee students. What is more, official statistics often do not capture the vulnerability of refugee children and youth. Refugee students have likely missed several years of schooling, been forced to move many times and might have experienced hardship and trauma on their journeys. Therefore the needs of refugee students are of a different nature and degree to those of students with an immigrant background, which explains the need for more targeted and comprehensive policies.

This chapter will examine a set of principles that can guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to ensure that the particular needs of refugee students are addressed. Examples include policies that respond to the learning, social and well-being needs of refugees.
What we know about refugee children

The term ‘refugee’ refers to people who have successfully applied for asylum and have been granted refugee protection. The 1951 Geneva Convention and its 1967 Protocol defines a refugee as a person

“who owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it”.

Figure 4.1 reveals that OECD countries hosted around 2.5 million refugees in 1990 and 2000, around 2 million in 2010 and about 6.4 million 2017. This signifies a threefold increase in seven years. In 2017, about half of refugees were located in Turkey, 1 million of whom were school-age (UNHCR, 2018[5]). Besides Turkey, other countries that have been greatly affected (in absolute numbers) by refugee flows are Germany (970 302), France (334 143), Sweden (240 899) and Italy (167 260) (UNHCR, 2018[6]).

Figure 4.1. Number of refugees in OECD countries

Data on refugee children is scarce, which limits the opportunity to inform policy development and offer targeted support services. Even if refugees access education, their educational achievements and needs remain invisible, as they are no longer captured in their home country’s Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) and not yet included in their host country’s EMIS (OECD, 2018[8]).

Although governments are responsible for collecting education-related data through EMIS, capacity constraints prevent the accurate and complete collection of sex, age and other disaggregated data on refugees. Capacity constraints are due to a lack of information on residence status, high turnover of individuals (making it difficult to properly track numbers)
and confidentiality (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2017[9]). A significant methodological challenge is ensuring sample sizes reflect the most marginalised groups, such as unaccompanied minors or refugees with disabilities, for which there is hardly any information available (OECD, 2018[8]).

Across the European Union and the OECD, only data on the number of children who apply for asylum are collected in a co-ordinated manner (UNHCR; UNICEF, 2017[10]). On average across the OECD, around 30% of applicants in 2017 were younger than 18 years old, with a higher proportion (above 45%) in Austria, Germany, Hungary and Poland. In Austria and Hungary, around 40% of applicants were younger than 14 years old (Figure 4.2). Such a high proportion of refugee children and adolescents further challenges policy-making to respond appropriately to these vulnerable groups.

Figure 4.2. Distribution by age of (non-European Union) first-time asylum applicants in selected OECD countries, 2017 (%)

Note: Countries are ranked in descending order of the share of first-time asylum applicants that were younger than 14. The OECD average is the average of OECD EU countries shown in the figure
Source: Adapted from: (Eurostat, n.d.[11]),

In 2017, nearly half (48%) of first instance asylum decisions in the OECD resulted in positive outcomes, that is granting applicants refugee or subsidiary protection status, or an authorisation to stay for humanitarian reasons (Figure 4.3). For first instance decisions, some 26% of all positive decisions in the OECD countries in 2017 resulted in grants of refugee status. This figure differs considerably by country of destination. For example, over 70% of first instance decisions resulted in grants of refugee status in Ireland and Lithuania, whereas in countries such as the Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Spain and the
Slovak Republic, fewer than 10% of decisions did (Eurostat, 2018[12]). Data that disaggregates decisions on refugee status by age, however, are not available.

**Figure 4.3. Distribution of first instance decisions on (non-European Union) asylum applications, 2017**

Note: Countries are ranked in descending order of the share of individuals who obtained refugee status out of all first instance decisions. The OECD average is the average of OECD EU countries shown in the figure.


Access to education and enrolment rates are often taken as indicators of refugee integration. Nevertheless, many refugee children are not enrolled in school. Globally, 91 per cent of children attend primary school compared to only 61% of refugee children. As refugee children become older, the challenges increase: only 23 per cent of refugee adolescents are enrolled in secondary school, whereas 84 per cent of all children are (UNHCR, 2017[14]). While many OECD countries are making efforts to enroll newly arrived children in education, challenges still persist especially for children from pre-primary and upper secondary ages, who often fall out of national compulsory education systems (UNICEF, 2018[15]).

**Challenges of refugee children**

Refugee children face more obstacles than other children with an immigrant background such as adjusting to a new language and culture, overcoming disrupted or minimal prior education, disruption to family networks, insecure housing, poverty, negative stereotypes
and discrimination (Bloch and al., 2015[16]; Sirin and Rogers-Sirin, 2015[17]; European Commission, 2013[18]; Crul, 2016[19]). Refugees can be affected by several layers of disadvantage that is linked to their forced displacement and low socio-economic status and harmed by frequent negative attitudes held by the host population towards refugees.

Additional challenges related to the nature of their forced migration include mental health issues, weak prior links with the host country (OECD, 2016[20]) and documentation of education (e.g. credentials and diplomas). Without systematic assessments of refugee students’ skills, it is difficult to place them in the appropriate programme or level of instruction (OECD, 2019[21]). Furthermore, access to education is a challenge since refugee children are five times more likely to be out of school than non-refugee children (UNHCR, 2016[21]).

At the school level, education systems are not well prepared to receive asylum seekers and refugees. The school curricula often do not provide basic language skills and social competences that refugees need. Additionally, the social context in which the education system is responsible for schooling refugees is not always supportive of welcoming these newcomers (Essomba, 2017[22]).

Refugee students have often been treated as a homogenous group, which has prevented detailed examinations of pre-migration and post-migration factors (McBrien, 2005[11]). These factors are relevant for understanding the particular needs of refugee students and developing appropriate educational support (Rutter, 2006[23]). Refugees arriving in different OECD countries often have diverse national, cultural, linguistic, ethnic and racial backgrounds and circumstances, including their educational experiences in countries of asylum (Sidhu and Taylor, 2009[24]; Matthews, 2008[25]). Even individuals from different regions within the same host country may have diverse educational needs.

**Holistic model for the educational integration of refugees**

It is important to consider a holistic model for refugee educational integration that recognises the complexity of refugee children’s needs (i.e. their learning, social and emotional needs) (Arnot and Pinson, 2005[26]; Sidhu and Taylor, 2009[24]).

The holistic model (Figure 4.4) depicts the relationships between needs, factors, policies and educational integration. The educational integration of refugee children can only take place if all (or at least most) of their learning, social and emotional needs are addressed. Refugee children need to learn the host country language, develop their mother tongue, overcome interruptions in schooling or limited education, and adjust to a new education system. They also need to be able to communicate with others, feel a sense of belonging and develop a strong personal identity. Furthermore, refugee children need to feel safe, and be able to cope with loss, separation and/or trauma (Cerna, 2019[27]). Different individual, interpersonal and institutional (school-level) factors can shape the prevalence of needs of refugee children. Factors include all individual, interpersonal and school-level characteristics that influence the needs of refugee children. Among individual factors are language proficiency, mother tongue proficiency, and physical and mental health. Interpersonal factors include connections with peers as well as family and social support of refugee children. School-level factors include the learning environment, teacher-student interactions, school engagement, assessment at school-level, extra-curricular activities and parental involvement in the school community (Cerna, 2019[27]). A variety of targeted policies and practices shape these factors.
While the three main pillars of needs and the factors within the holistic model are similar to a multidimensional model for immigrant students (OECD, 2018[28]), each pillar in this model can carry a different weight. For example, catering to learning needs might be the main priority for immigrant students, whereas for refugee children, catering to the emotional needs might be at the core of the model, followed by social and learning needs. The level of importance assigned to each pillar varies depending on the personal and educational background of the refugee child in question.

Existing research shows that schools identified as offering a holistic model were able to respond to the psychosocial and emotional needs of their students through life skills programmes, welfare and pastoral support, admission support, extensive induction processes and provision of lunchtime and after-school activities (Arnot and Pinson, 2005[29]). A holistic approach also works in partnership with other relevant agencies to address multiple complex needs. These include social work, health organisations, community organisations and other support services (McBride, 2018[30]).

From evidence to action: Lessons from the field including examples of policies and practices to support refugee children in education

Evidence suggests that refugee children have different learning, social and emotional needs and are especially vulnerable due to their forced displacement. Addressing their needs can be accomplished by adopting a tailored holistic model for refugee integration in education. However, considerable data gaps and limited evidence makes it challenging to assess the
extent of these children’s vulnerability and to evaluate whether approaches towards refugee integration are successful. This section highlights some of the policies and practices used by countries and other stakeholders, which can support refugee children in education (more are presented in Cerna, 2019[27]). Policy makers should also consider partnerships with relevant agencies (such as social work, labour market agencies, health organisations, community organisations) to address the multiple complex needs.

**Responding to learning needs**

Responding to the learning needs of refugee students, especially access to education is an important policy concern across OECD countries. This can include providing refugee children with academic support from teachers and other professionals, offering language support, assessing skills and language, and providing a positive learning environment (Szente and Hoot, 2011[31]).

**Provide access to refugees to all levels of education and allow for flexible pathways**

Access to education at all educational levels, especially pre-primary and post-compulsory education for refugee students is important. However, access to education is only the first step; good quality education and flexible pathways to education are key.

For example, in Turkey, Syrian children can attend early childhood education in public schools, but shortages of places and resources have led many nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) and international agencies to provide services. In June 2017, UNICEF-led initiatives enrolled 12 800 Syrians aged 3 to 5 in school. Some NGOs (e.g. Mother Child Education Foundation, Support to Life, Mavi Kalem Social Assistance and Solidarity, Yuva Foundation) provide teacher education, education materials, home visits, psychosocial and mental health support, and learning and recreational activities (UNESCO, 2018[32]).

In Luxembourg, changes introduced in August 2017 aim to strengthen the integration of newly arrived foreign students into the compulsory schooling system of Luxembourg. The extension of the multilingual education programme to early childhood education and the introduction of care service vouchers help mitigate inequalities and provide an equal baseline for all children (OECD, 2018[33]).

In Austria, in order to reduce the number of youth without a school leaving certificate, a 2016 amendment to the Austrian Law on Education and Training raised the minimum age for the achievement of the compulsory school leaving certificate to 18 years (OECD, 2018[33]). In Sweden amendments were made in 2017 to ensure that those aged between 18 and 25 are able to extend their temporary residence permit for the duration of their upper secondary school studies. Young adults arriving after the age of eighteen can also attend general adult education or Swedish for Immigrants (SFI), i.e. classes for adults to learn basic Swedish (Crul, 2016[19]).

**Introduce early assessment and develop individualised development and learning plans**

As every refugee student has different experiences, knowledge and skills, schools should implement early assessments of language, skills and well-being needs. This would allow stakeholders to prepare an individualised plan for learning and development, foster social interactions and respond to refugee students’ well-being and mental health needs.
individualised learning and development plan should be regularly updated and be the responsibility of the teachers, school leaders, parents and the student.

In **Sweden**, early initial assessment is essential in providing productive language support to immigrant students (Siarova and Essomba, 2014[34]). Within two months of starting school, all new arrivals are assessed on their academic knowledge and language skills. Additionally, the academic assessments are offered in the students’ mother tongues in order to best assess previous knowledge without language barriers (Berglund, 2017[35]). Based on the student’s age, language skills and academic results, the principal and/or head-teacher determine the best educational trajectory (Bunar, 2017[36]). As of August 2018, it is mandatory that newly arrived students in Sweden from Grade 7 have an individual study plan. The mapping of a student’s previous knowledge and experience is also mandatory (Skolverket (National Agency for Education), 2018[37]).

The **Finnish** model of integrating newly arrived students into mainstream education provides that within the first year, an individual curriculum is designed for each student tailored to his/her needs and based on their previous school history, age and other factors affecting their school work (e.g. being an Unaccompanied Minor (UM), coming from a war situation). The teacher, student and family determine the student’s individual curriculum collectively (Dervin, Simpson and Matikainen, 2017[38]). In the **Netherlands**, schools are additionally encouraged to provide parents with regular updates on the learning progress of the child to ensure continuity and avoid class repetition (Tudjman et al., 2016[39]).

**Promote language support specifically targeted to refugee students and encourage the development of mother tongues**

Language can be a considerable barrier for refugee students. Tailored language classes should not take place in isolation, but should be designed to accommodate the learning and language needs as well as cultural norms of refugee students. Instruction in the language of the host country could be combined with encouragement to develop mother tongues to facilitate cooperation and communication with classmates.

For example, the Sprach-Kitas programme in **Germany**, launched by the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, provides early childhood and education programmes with language-focused support. The ministry plans to invest nearly EUR 400 million in 2017-2020 to expand the programme and staff (Park, Katsiaficas and McHugh, 2018[40]).

Outside of Europe, the **Canadian** government provides continuous support in language of instruction. Courses combine established second-language learning standards with specialised and certified teachers. A public body monitors curricular standards. Some provinces, including Alberta, Nova Scotia and Ontario have similar requirements (Huddleston et al., 2015[41]).

**Offer specific teacher training and professional development to support the needs of refugee students**

Well-trained teachers, school leaders and other professionals are key in supporting refugee students. Teacher training and professional development should raise awareness and understanding of refugee issues, the impact of the refugee experience on learning and behaviour, the school and the teacher’s role in promoting recovery from trauma, and strategies for addressing barriers to learning as a result of the refugee experience and
disrupted schooling. Furthermore, it is important to provide new staff members with information and professional learning on refugee issues (Foundation House, 2016[42]).

In Sweden, the National Agency for Education published *Build Swedish* (*Bygga svenska*) as a support measure for teachers to assess the language abilities of new arrivals. *Build Swedish* is based on the model of language development involving increased 1) participation in linguistic activities, 2) degree of independence and 3) degree of variety and security in language use (Söderlund, 2018[43]). The assessment aid is based on a socio-cultural view of language and language development, which emphasises social interaction and supporting roles in the learning process (Ingves, 2017[44]). These support materials are freely available on the National Agency for Education’s website (www.bp.skolverket.se/web/kartlaggningsmaterial).

In Australia, schools in Sydney, Wagga Wagga, and Southern New South Wales have benefitted from *Refugee Action Support* (RAS), a programme that combines tutoring for new arrivals and professional development for student teachers. With a focus on late literacy and numeracy learning, RAS empowers pre-service teachers to assist students with a refugee background with homework as well as generally support their studies in secondary school (Ferfolja and Naidoo, 2010[45]).

Refugee students might suffer more frequently from mental health issues than other students. In most cases, teachers lack trauma and mental health training. The Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings recommend that teachers provide psychosocial support by creating a safe and supportive environment through their interactions and specific, structured psychosocial activities (IASC, 2007[46]). Teachers can maintain relationships with students and their families, learn their background, observe student behaviour for signs of distress and seek help from specialised personnel, such as trauma-trained school psychologists (Sullivan and Simonson, 2016[47]). Teachers, therefore, need continuous professional development in areas such as constructive classroom management or the use of referral mechanisms.

**Responding to social needs**

Besides addressing learning needs of refugees, a number of countries also have different policies and practices to address the social needs of refugee students. These can include providing refugee children with opportunities to engage in social activities and community building, engage in identity formation and involve whole schools and communities (Szente and Hoot, 2011[31]).

**Provide opportunities for identity construction**

To help refugee children develop strong personal identities, providing opportunities for identity construction are crucial. In the classroom, introducing notions of identity construction can be useful for understanding the concerns and the experiences of refugees. Moreover, including student voices in the curriculum could encourage refugee students to contribute their experiences and participate in classroom discussions (Mosselson, 2006[48]).

Different programmes exist at the school and classroom levels to facilitate identity formation of refugee students. One example is the Kaleidoscope Cultures and Identity Programme, a six-session group programme for young refugees aged 14–24 years old currently enrolled in a secondary school in Australia. The programme seeks to: 1) explore the impact of living in a new culture, 2) break down social isolation, alienation and dislocation, 3) build trust, bonding and an understanding of others, 4) promote self-esteem.
and identity, and 5) integrate past experiences and build a vision of the future (Foundation House, 2016[42]).

At the classroom level, the Kaleidoscope programme has been adapted for grades 5-10. The 10-lesson unit for the mainstream classroom is designed to increase all students’ understanding of their own cultural background, and the diversity of cultural backgrounds in their classroom. It aims to break down social isolation, alienation and dislocation. Activities explore identity issues, promote an understanding of emotions and their influence on health, and assist in developing trust and belonging through inclusive teaching approaches (Foundation House, 2016[42]).

Create opportunities for social interactions between refugee and other students

Facilitating opportunities for refugee students to form friendships with students from their own backgrounds and other students, as well as creating a welcoming and safe community in schools and beyond are important to their successful integration. Ensuring refugee students have the opportunity to participate in extra-curricular activities is one strategy.

To promote friendship-building, a high school programme in New Brunswick, Canada, called “Lunch with a Bunch” allows students, both new arrivals and natives, to eat lunch outside the school once a week. The programme takes place outside of school walls so students can feel more at ease, allowing them to form friendships that will promote feelings of belongingness (OECD, 2018[49]).

Adopt whole-school and whole-community approaches to welcome and include refugee students and their families

A positive school climate and the adoption of a whole-school approach to integrating refugee students (that involves parents and communities) are crucial elements to ensure interventions and programmes benefit refugee students. In addition, schools are not the only entities responsible for refugee students, so taking a whole-community approach is key for the successful integration of these students. Coordination between the education system and other sectors including health, social, housing, labour market and welfare is also necessary.

In Australia, the Department of Education in New South Wales published guidelines for schools on how to implement a whole-school response to welcome and integrate refugee students. Strategies include educational, emotional well-being and social support, as well as strategies to: enrol refugee students as quickly as possible, provide orientation to them, provide co-ordinated learning support by all school staff, monitor and assess refugee students, engage parents and families, and engage with the wider community and government agencies (New South Wales Government, 2016[50]).

Another example stems from the United Kingdom where Citizens UK, the national community organising charity, and the National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT), promote Refugee Welcome Schools, an accreditation scheme to recognise schools that have made a commitment to welcome refugees in their institution and community. The schools educate students and staff about the importance of refugee protection over the course of a year, and participate in campaigns to improve the lives of refugees in the UK (Brimacombe, 2017[51]). While this is not an official accreditation, the initiative has been led by teachers who become “refugee welcome champions,” and engage in interschool dialogue, leadership activities, and community
outreach to exchange and share practices on how to effectively integrate refugees into their school communities.

**Responding to emotional needs**

Several countries also implement different policies and practices to address the emotional needs of refugee students (Szente and Hoot, 2011[31]).

**Support the well-being needs of refugees including mental health**

Supporting the well-being needs of refugees, including mental health, should be a top priority. Since many (though not all) refugee students have specific physical and mental health needs, an assessment of well-being needs is important. Support, if deemed necessary, should be provided early on with progress monitored regularly. Otherwise, interventions to support learning needs risk being unproductive.

One example is the government-financed NGO Pharos programme in the Netherlands that aims to support the social-emotional development of newly arrived students in secondary schools (www.pharos.nl). The three-component programme highlights the difficulties refugee children face, strengthens peer support systems for refugee children by offering opportunities to share their histories and experiences with other children, fosters teacher support for refugee children and strengthens the coping ability and resilience of refugee children (Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 2012[52]).

Another example is the “Playing with Rainbows” group, established in 2004 by a coalition of civil society organisations in Toronto, Canada, that aims to develop resources designed to promote mental health and facilitate the healing process for refugee children, youth and caregivers/parents that have experienced migration-related trauma. The coalition also educates service and care providers, as well as educators about the impact of trauma on interpersonal relationships, mental and physical health, behaviour, academic success, employment and all aspects of one’s life (Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 2012[52]).
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Chapter 5. Ensure that motivation translates into a key asset for immigrant communities

Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) data shows that, in most countries, students with an immigrant background are more motivated to achieve and hold more ambitious educational and professional expectations than native students. This stems from parents’ and students’ desire to improve their socio-economic status, which is often the reason to migrate in the first place. However, many immigrant children lack the foundation skills that are necessary to succeed in school and suffer from cumulative disadvantage, which make them underperform compared to their ambitions.

This chapter examines policies and practices that can ensure immigrants and their families capitalise on high levels of motivation. Examples include: ensuring that individuals hold ambitious, but realistic aspirations by supporting skills development so individuals are able to realise their ambitions; providing career and education guidance by working with individuals and their families on the development of short-, medium- and long-term plans and targets.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.
In public debates, opponents of migration sometimes depict immigrants as “lazy” and not willing to work hard. They blame immigrants for their poor academic, professional or integration outcomes, claiming that if only immigrants were more motivated, they would succeed. These opinions are mostly driven by the view that immigrants are a burden for welfare systems and that they come to host countries to exploit their benefits, without contributing in return. There is evidence that welfare concerns are the strongest driver of attitudes towards migration (Dustmann and Preston, 2007[1]).

PISA data shows that, in most countries, students with an immigrant background are more motivated to achieve and hold more ambitious educational and professional expectations than native students. This stems from parents’ and students’ desire to improve their socio-economic status, which is often the reason for migrating in the first place. However, many immigrant children lack the foundational skills necessary to succeed in school and suffer from cumulative disadvantage, which can lead to underperformance relative to their ambitions.

By ascribing immigrants’ poor outcomes to their low motivation, individual immigrants are blamed instead of tackling the real problem: understanding why high motivation and ambition among immigrant students does not translate into successful outcomes. The second route is likely to be more demanding and less popular since it might shift the blame from the immigrants to the education system and its shortcomings. However, if these problems are not resolved, high motivation among immigrants can undermine their integration in the long run. Unrealised ambitions can lead to psychological distress among adults, and specifically, among immigrants, unrealised ambitions can be detrimental to labour market integration and overall social cohesion.

This chapter examines some key differences in motivation and expectations between immigrant and native students, showing that the former are often more motivated and hold more ambitious (yet sometimes unrealistic) expectations for their future. It then outlines a set of principles that can guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to ensure that immigrants and their families capitalise on high levels of motivation. Examples include: ensuring that individuals hold ambitious, but realistic aspirations by supporting skills development, providing career and education guidance, and helping individuals and their families develop realistic short-, medium- and long-term plans and targets.

**Differences in achievement motivation**

One of the most important ingredients of achievement, both in school and beyond, is the motivation to achieve (OECD, 2013[2]). In many cases, people with less talent, but greater motivation to reach their goals, are more likely to succeed than those who have talent but are not capable of setting goals for themselves and staying focused to achieve them (Duckworth et al., 2011[3]; Eccles and Wigfield, 2002[4]).

Students with an immigrant background tend to have greater achievement motivation than their native peers, measured by the extent to which students report strongly agreeing or agreeing with the statement ‘I want to be the best, whatever I do’. Figure 5.1 shows that in 20 out of 40 countries and economies with available data, first-generation immigrant students were more likely to express high levels of achievement motivation compared to native students. The inverse was true in only two countries. In Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden, the difference was above 15 percentage points.

In the wide majority of countries, second-generation immigrant students and native students of mixed heritage reported levels of achievement motivation at least as high as
native students. Only native students of mixed heritage in Colombia, Montenegro and the United States, second-generation immigrant students in Israel, Lithuania, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates, and first-generation immigrant students in Israel and Singapore, were less likely than native students to report so. In all other countries where significant differences between groups were observed, immigrant students expressed motivation to achieve.

**Figure 5.1. Difference in high motivation to achieve**

Difference between students with an immigrant background and native students in reporting a high motivation to achieve

![Graph showing percentage point difference in high motivation to achieve between different countries](http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939752)

Notes: Differences between groups that are statistically significant are indicated in darker tones. For the OECD average, this number refers only to the subset of countries/economies with valid information on both groups of students.

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.

The achievement motivation of students with an immigrant background is noteworthy, given widespread concern over lack of engagement and motivation to learn among secondary school students, especially socio-economically disadvantaged students, in many countries (OECD, 2013[2]). Despite facing many adversities, many students with an immigrant background display motivational resilience, and this represents a key asset for their integration journey.

**Expectations to complete tertiary education**

Students who hold ambitious expectations about their educational prospects are more likely to invest effort into their learning and take advantage of the educational opportunities
available to them to achieve their goals (OECD, 2012[5]; Borgonovi and Pál, 2016[6]; OECD, 2017[7]; Nurmi, 2013[8]; Beal and Crockett, 2010[9]; Morgan, 2005[10]; Perna, 2000[11]). Therefore, expectations of further education can, in part, become self-fulfilling prophecies. When comparing students with similar levels of skills and similar attitudes towards school, those who expect to graduate from university are more likely than those who do not hold such expectations to earn a university degree (OECD, 2012[5]).

Despite the considerable challenges they often face, many immigrant students hold high educational expectations. Figure 5.2 shows that in 15 out of 52 countries and economies with available data, immigrant students who participated in PISA 2015 were more likely to expect to complete tertiary education compared to native students. In 11 countries they were over 10 percentage points more likely. By contrast, in 16 countries and economies, native students held more ambitious expectations for their education than native students did.

When comparing students of similar socio-economic status and, even more so, when comparing students of similar socio-economic status and academic performance, immigrant students are more likely than native students to hold ambitious expectations for their education. In 27 out of 52 countries and economies with available data, immigrant students were more likely to expect to complete tertiary education; the opposite was true in only seven countries and economies. On average across OECD countries, the percentage of immigrant students who expected to earn a university degree was eight percentage points greater than the percentage of native students who expected to do so.

PISA results also show that in most countries, immigrant students are more likely than native students to expect to work as managers, professionals or associated professionals, especially when comparing students with similar socio-economic status and academic performance. The data indicates that many immigrant students hold ambitious views for their futures and display the will to be active and successful contributors to society. The role of education systems is to nurture these ambitions and enable students to turn them into realised outcomes.
Figure 5.2. Difference in the expectation to complete tertiary education

Difference between students with an immigrant background and native students to complete tertiary education

Notes:
- Only countries and economies with valid estimates of the immigrant-native gap are shown.
- Statistically significant differences are marked in a darker tone.
- Socio-economic status is measured by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS). Only students with non-missing values for the index are considered.
- Academic performance is measured by whether a student achieved at least PISA proficiency Level 2 in all three core PISA subjects – science, reading and mathematics.
- Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the difference in the percentage of immigrant and native students who expect to complete tertiary education, before accounting for socio-economic status and academic performance.
- Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database, Table 8.3.

Unrealistic expectations

When students who expect to complete tertiary education have foundational skills, they are more likely to be able to achieve their goals. Immigrant students whose academic skills match their educational ambitions are more likely to be successful beyond their secondary education. On average across OECD countries, only 74% of immigrant students who held ambitious expectations for their education reached baseline levels of academic performance in reading, mathematics and science. By contrast, 87% of native students who held ambitious educational expectations attained baseline academic proficiency, about 15 percentage points more than the percentage of immigrant students who fit this profile.

Figure 5.3 shows the percentage of immigrant and native students who expected to complete tertiary education and who reach baseline levels of proficiency in reading, mathematics and science. In 24 out of 52 countries and economies with available data, the
percentage of students who held ambitious but realistic expectations of further education was lower among immigrant students than among native students. The opposite was true only in Australia, Canada, Hungary, Ireland, Macao (China), New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom. On average across OECD countries, immigrant students were four percentage points less likely than native students to hold ambitious educational expectations and attain baseline academic proficiency.

Figure 5.3. Students with ambitious but realistic educational expectations, by immigrant background

![Bar chart showing the percentage of students who expect to complete tertiary education and who attain baseline academic proficiency, with data for native and immigrant students.]

Note: Only countries with valid data for immigrant students are shown. Statistically significant differences between immigrant and native students are shown next to country/economy names. For the OECD and EU average, this number refers only to the subset of countries and economies with valid information on both groups of students.

Students with ambitious but realistic educational expectations are those who expect to complete tertiary education (ISCED levels 5a and 6) and also attain at least PISA proficiency Level 2 in all three core PISA subjects – science, reading and mathematics. Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrant students who expect to complete tertiary education and who attain baseline levels of academic proficiency.

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database, Table 8.4.
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Students who hold ambitious educational (and professional) expectations but do not attain baseline academic proficiency are unlikely to realise their goals. When expectations for the future are unrealistic, setting ambitious goals can have negative effects on immigrant integration in the long-term. Research has shown that unrealised ambitions are associated with psychological distress, such as stress and anxiety (Wrosch et al., 2007[12]), or long-term mental health problems (Reynolds and Baird, 2010[13]). Unrealised ambitions might have additional consequences for immigrants, who, in many cases, choose to leave their country specifically to achieve those goals. Migrants who do not manage to achieve baseline academic proficiency might feel disillusioned and disappointed by their host country and as a result their social attitudes might change and their efforts to integrate might be reduced.
Immigrant students appear to have levels of motivation and ambition at least as high as their native peers, so cases of failed integration are likely not attributable to a lack of motivation. Paradoxically, it appears that in many cases, immigrant students are “excessively motivated” and express unrealistically high expectations for their future. To ensure the successful integration of these students, education systems should either give them means to effectively achieve those goals, or redirect them towards more realistic, yet gratifying goals.

From evidence to action: Lessons from the field including examples of policies and practices to capitalise on the motivation of immigrants for long-term well-being

This section highlights policies and practices that countries and schools have used to draw on the motivation of students with an immigrant background. It provides policy responses and country examples at different levels of governance and offers opportunities and practical applications that can be assessed to promote the successful integration of students with an immigrant background.

Provide skills support to students and adults with an immigrant background to realise their ambitions

While students with an immigrant background might be highly motivated to achieve, they may not necessarily possess sufficient skills to reach their targets. Assessing the skills of students with an immigrant background, both foreign-born children who arrived after the start of schooling as well as native-born children of foreign-born parents, can help identify the needs of each individual child and target training. Identifying specific needs and targeting training can help students with an immigrant background gain the skills needed to realise their ambitions. Support requires an accurate assessment of children’s language skills (in both the mother tongue and the language of instruction) and other competencies at the time of entry into the education system as well as during their education. Continued assessment throughout their education is important because some children with an immigrant background may not exhibit difficulties at the beginning, but might progressively fall behind due to a lack of language practice and support at home. Poor measures of assessment upon entrance into the school system can have a detrimental impact on immigrant children because these children are more likely to be allocated to special education and lower-ability tracks (OECD, 2018[14]). This will not enable them to realise their ambitions and capitalise on their high motivation.

Some countries have practices in place to provide support to students with an immigrant background. The Finnish model of integrating newly arrived students into mainstream education provides that within the first year, an individual curriculum is designed for each student, tailored to his/her needs and based on his/her previous school history, age and other factors that affect school work. The individual curriculum is set in cooperation between the teacher, the student and the family (Dervin, Simpson and Matikainen, 2017[15]). The Finnish model can serve as an example on how other countries could implement an early assessment of skills and individual learning plan for all newly arrived students so that they are able to capitalise on their motivation to achieve.

Beyond the educational level, it is important to provide skills support to immigrants entering the labour market. Such support could boost growth and reduce welfare expenditures on immigrants (Zorlu, 2011[16]). Integrating immigrants more effectively into the labour market could also facilitate social integration and reduce the social costs of exclusion. International experience suggests that strengthening social connections and
improving language proficiency can have strong positive effects on immigrants’ labour market outcomes in terms of employment, earnings and occupational status (Chiswick and Wang, 2016[17]).

One example is the job-related language courses for immigrants in Germany (OECD, 2017[18]). The programme combines language courses with employment, vocational and educational training and active labour market programmes. The courses provide German language and skills building with employment services. They start by assessing the participant’s proficiency in German, what kind of professional qualifications they hold, and what more they need to learn from the courses (European Commission, 2016[19]). German lessons cover general language skills (vocabulary and grammar) and workplace language skills. For skills building, participants learn about general and specialised career-related knowledge, job application training, and mathematics and information technology. The modules are well connected to facilitate the transition into the German labour market (European Commission, 2016[19]).

**Offer specific educational and career guidance to students with an immigrant background**

Students with an immigrant background are often highly motivated, but it is crucial that they are able to capitalise on their motivation and have realistic expectations to achieve their goals. Information on education and career opportunities and on the requirements of different pathways should be made available so that students with an immigrant background can fully benefit from education and training services (OECD, 2012[20]). Individual career counselling to provide specific advice on career decisions and direct contact with the professional world are also components of career guidance (Musset and Mytna Kurekova, 2018[21]).

Guidance is crucial in countries with differentiated schooling and education sectors, where students and their families are expected to make important decisions on which school a student will attend and/or where there are few second-chance opportunities for students. Education and career guidance is thus particularly important for students with an immigrant background, given the limited knowledge students and their parents might have about career opportunities, and how best to prepare for them.

Career guidance can include providing information about careers, using assessment and self-assessment tools, interviews, career-education programmes, taster programmes, work-search programmes and transition services. Young people in all levels of education often face obstacles to obtaining the guidance they need, because of a lack of access, poor quality of services, or limited resources that are not always dedicated to career guidance (OECD, 2018[14]). Furthermore, studies on career guidance (Sawyer, 2006[22]; Resh and Erhard, 2002[23]; Yogev and Roditi, 1987[24]) suggest that immigrant and/or ethnic-minority students might be advised to temper their career aspirations, implicitly or explicitly, based on low and unfair expectations for immigrant and/or minority students.

Quality career guidance goes hand in hand with education guidance for students with an immigrant background and their families. In Sweden, municipal authorities have a responsibility to inform newly arrived families of their rights with regard to pre-school and school education. Interpreting services should be made available, when required, at the welcome meetings for recently arrived families. These families are also entitled to an interpreter to enable them to participate in the ‘personal development discussion’ held with all parents twice a year. Schools are obliged to communicate with all parents and must therefore adopt the measures necessary (MIPEX, 2015[25]).
Another example stems from **Finland**, which has received an increased number of refugees and immigrants with new demands for education and employment and related services such as guidance and validation of prior learning. A new reform on career guidance services aims to take these new demands into account (ICDPP, 2017). The one-stop guidance centres provide basic support to youth under 30 years going through life transitions. The centres have institutional representation from municipal, education, social and health authorities.

**Guide immigrant families towards realistic expectations and targets as well as work closely with counsellors**

Parent engagement is crucial for students with an immigrant background to achieve positive academic, and social and emotional outcomes. Numerous studies indicate that students are better learners when their parents are involved in their education (Desforges and Abouchaar, 2003; Fan and Chen, 2001; Jeynes, 2007; OECD, 2012; Schofield, 2006).

However, there are a number of challenges regarding the involvement of immigrant parents in the educational and career choices of their children. For instance, parents might face language difficulties as well as cultural bias (e.g. specific stereotypes linked to certain education pathways) and barriers regarding their involvement with school staff (Musset and Mytna Kurekova, 2018, p. 65). Furthermore, immigrant parents might lack sufficient information about the education system (including policies, rules, means of test taking and learning) and career paths in a new institutional context. This may prevent them from advising their children outside traditional family career pathways (Gonzalez and al., 2013; Mitchell and Bryan, 2007; Musset and Mytna Kurekova, 2018). Studies show that family roles, expectations and values tend to differ across cultures, and are projected into career decisions of immigrant students (Ma and Yeh, 2010; Mitchell and Bryan, 2007; Bimrose and McNair, 2011).

Due to the difficulties associated with immigration, immigrant parents may believe that the best way for their children to succeed in the new country is to thrive academically in their new schools, graduate from high school, and pursue postsecondary education (Fuligni and Fuligni, 2007; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco and Todorova, 2008). Other studies find an association between parents’ expectations and students’ academic achievement which might reflect both that parents whose children attain baseline academic proficiency tend to hold more ambitious expectations for them, but also that parents’ expectations and their encouragement and support have a positive impact on students’ achievement (OECD, 2018; Areepattamannil and Lee, 2014).

More specifically, Roysircar, Carey and Koroma (2010) studied United States college major preferences among Asian Indian students and found that parents’ preferences for science and math significantly shaped preferences as well as actual choices of first and second-generation students. Ma and Yeh (2010) analysed how individual and family factors affected educational and career aspirations of Chinese immigrant youth in New York and found a key importance of English fluency. Higher English fluency combined with career-related support from parents led to higher career and educational aspirations, while lower fluency predicted plans to work immediately after high school (Musset and Mytna Kurekova, 2018).

Whatever the parents’ educational background, parents who value education and are able to provide their children with strategic direction and support can help their children’s integration into the host country school system. These efforts also promote a climate at
school and at home, that supports the academic, social and emotional development of their children.

Visiting homes, recruiting culturally appropriate and trained specialists, providing learning resources and information to families, launching awareness campaigns, and training teachers and staff to work with culturally and linguistically diverse children are all ways that education systems can support immigrant parents in their efforts to help their children succeed (OECD, 2014[39]).

Furthermore, it is important for school counsellors to work closely with families and educate them about different types of educational and career opportunities available in the host country. For instance, parent-teacher meetings could be used for distributing information on university admissions and financial support so that parents can be involved in the career development process and provide assistance for their children. Additionally, providing this information in the immigrant’s mother tongue and during hours convenient for working parents could be a helpful measure for guiding immigrant families towards realistic expectations concerning their children (Ma and Yeh, 2010[33]).
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Chapter 6. Provide comprehensive language support

This chapter uses data from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) to illustrate the important role that language plays in the social, academic and economic integration of immigrant students and adults. While factors beyond language may sometimes prevent immigrants from thriving in their host communities, this chapter argues that tailored language support – which are personalised to an individual’s characteristics and contexts – can help facilitate integration processes. This chapter also discusses a selection of policies and practices that countries have used to support the linguistic integration of immigrants.
The ability to use language has an immediate impact on the lives of individuals because people primarily communicate by speaking, reading and writing. For immigrant children and adults, proficiency in the host country’s language can be a key driver for their integration. At school, language fluency enables children to fully benefit from learning opportunities, participate in the social life of their school and develop a sense of belonging in their new environment (Coll and Magnusson, 1997[1]; Zhou and Xiong, 2005[2]; Dawson and Williams, 2008[3]). For immigrant adults, good language skills can facilitate access to job opportunities, job retention and career progression. Adults who are fluent in the host country’s language are also more likely to participate in the social life of their communities, access public services and contribute to local activities (Dustmann and Van Soest, 2001[4]; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003[5]; Bleakley and Chin, 2004[6]; Bleakley and Chin, 2010[7]). In short, being fluent in the host country’s language allows immigrants to thrive.

On the other hand, lack of language skills can have a negative impact on the lives and integration of immigrants. Children with an immigrant background who face language barriers are more likely to experience bullying, discrimination and emotional problems like depression and low self-esteem (Gil, Vega and Dimas, 1994[8]; Padilla and Perez, 2003[9]; Romero and Roberts, 2003[10]; Smart and Smart, 1995[11]). Adults who lack language fluency may face similar social and emotional risks but they may also experience economic hardship, find it difficult to access information in the host country and struggle to advocate for themselves or their families. As a result, the sooner immigrants become fluent in the host country’s language, the faster these risks diminish and the more individuals can benefit from new opportunities. These findings explain why many countries emphasise language-training policies to support people with an immigrant background.

This chapter will demonstrate the importance of language in immigrants’ integration process while emphasising the need for language support as a key policy concern. However, it is important to note that factors beyond language may sometimes prevent immigrants from thriving in their host communities. This section will also highlight OECD evidence suggesting that while language support is important, a one-size fits-all approach is not effective and immigrants may have a greater need for different support to thrive. Finally, the chapter will examine a set of principles that could guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to ensure that immigrants receive relevant language support to facilitate their integration.

Language barriers and the academic and well-being outcomes of immigrant students

Language fluency is associated with students’ proficiency in all academic domains, even those with less language content like mathematics. It also explains much of the difference in academic performance between native students and students with an immigrant background.

Figure 6.1 compares the percentage of immigrant students who are academically resilient among those who speak and those who do not speak the language of assessment at home with the percentage of native students who attain the same level of academic proficiency. It reveals that on average across OECD countries, immigrant students who do not speak the language of assessment at home are around eight percentage points less likely to be academically resilient than native-speaking immigrant students. However, the size of this gap varies across countries and economies.
Figure 6.1. Students attaining baseline academic proficiency, by immigrant background and language spoken at home

After accounting for socio-economic status

In some cases, linguistic proficiency explains almost the entire gap in academic achievement between immigrant and native students. For example, non-native-speaking immigrant students tend to perform below native students in Macao and Hong Kong (China), Ireland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Jordan, Malta, the Netherlands, Croatia, Russia, and Latvia. By contrast, these countries and economies reveal no statistically significant difference in the academic achievement between native students and immigrant students who are native speakers of the host country’s language. This difference is largest in Latvia, where native-speaking immigrant students demonstrate a similar academic performance as native students but non-native-speaking immigrant students are 31 percentage points less likely to attain baseline academic proficiency than native students are.
Proficiency in the host country’s language also affects the well-being of students with an immigrant background. In a large number of countries and economies, non-native-speaking immigrant students were less likely to feel they belong at school than both native speakers born in the country and immigrant students who are native speakers (OECD, 2018[12]). Non-native-speaking immigrant students were also less likely to be socially resilient. On average across OECD countries, the share of students who reported a sense of belonging was five percentage points smaller among non-native-speaking immigrant students than among native-speaking immigrant students and nine percentage points smaller than among native students.

In several countries and economies, native-speaking immigrant students had equal or higher chances of reporting a sense of belonging at school compared to native students and had significantly greater chances compared to non-native-speaking immigrant students. This is the case in Greece, Italy, Macao (China) and Sweden, while in Norway and the United Kingdom, native-speaking immigrant students were more likely to report that they feel like they belong at school, even compared to native students.

**Language barriers for adult immigrants**

Language fluency not only has an impact on the resilience of students with an immigrant background, it is also a key driver of integration for adult immigrants. As with PISA data, the OECD Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC) reveals that a person’s mother tongue language is an important determinant of differences in literacy between native adults and adult immigrants. Figure 6.2 illustrates, among participating countries, differences in the average literacy performance among natives, immigrants whose mother tongue is the same as the language in which they sat the PIAAC test and immigrants whose mother tongue is different from the language of the PIAAC test. The average difference between foreign-born and native-born individuals in PIAAC participating countries is 22 points. However, while the difference in the PIAAC scores of immigrants who are native speakers and of non-immigrant native speakers is 10 points, this difference is as large as 27 points between natives and immigrants whose mother tongue is different from the language in which the PIAAC test was conducted.
Figure 6.2. Gap in literacy performance between natives and immigrants, in PIAAC participating countries

Unadjusted and adjusted differences in literacy score between immigrants and natives (Natives minus immigrants)

Note: Statistically significant differences are marked in a darker tone. Proficiency in literacy ranges between 0 and 500 score points. Adjusted differences are based on a regression model and take account of differences associated with all or some of the following variables: age, gender, education, and language background. Estimates based on a sample size less than 30 are not shown. Estimates for Russia are missing due to the lack of language variables.
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Figure 6.2 also reveals significant variations across countries. In Lithuania, Estonia and the Czech Republic there are no significant differences in the literacy proficiency of immigrants whose mother tongue is the same as the language of the PIAAC assessment and those with a different mother tongue. For a different group of countries, the fact that immigrants speak a language other than the language of the PIAAC assessment largely explains the immigrant gap. For example, in Australia, Austria, Greece, Finland, the Netherlands and Singapore, a language penalty can explain over 70% of the immigrant gap in literacy scores, after controlling for the influence of age, gender and the level of education attained.
**Differences in language barriers across student profiles and host countries**

While language fluency is important, immigrants may face other sources of disadvantage that affect their ability to thrive. For example, PISA 2015 results suggest that in addition to language, socio-economic disadvantage is one of the greatest obstacles to the successful integration of students with an immigrant background. However, the relative importance these factors have on the academic and social resilience of students affects them differently depending on the host country and student’s profile.

On average across OECD countries, native-speaking immigrant students with at least one foreign-born parent are two percentage points less likely than native students to attain baseline levels of proficiency in the core PISA subjects, while non-native-speaking immigrant students (with at least one foreign-born parent) are about 17 percentage points less likely to do so (OECD, 2018[12]). In Bulgaria, Finland, France, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia, the difference compared to native students is more than 25 percentage points for non-native speakers, and it is not statistically significant for native speakers. These results suggest that fluency in the language of assessment links to academic resilience among immigrant students with at least one foreign-born parent.

Table 6.1 and Table 6.2 further show that, in some countries, language fluency is relatively more important in explaining disparities in academic performance and sense of belonging between native and immigrant students. In these countries, offering language-specific training for immigrant students can be an essential element of policies aimed at fostering their academic and social resilience. In other countries, socio-economic background plays a more important role than language in promoting academic proficiency and sense of belonging. This can mean policy trade-offs between targeting language versus targeting other sources of disadvantage.
### Table 6.1. Key risk factors for the academic resilience of immigrant students

Targeting efforts on key risk factors for the academic resilience of immigrant students: the relative importance of language and socio-economic background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic status relatively important</th>
<th>Language relatively important</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Language relatively not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia, Hong Kong (China), Luxembourg</td>
<td>Greece, Netherlands</td>
<td>Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (Argentina), France, United States,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Jordan, Switzerland</td>
<td>Austria, Belgium, Germany, Slovenia, Sweden</td>
<td>Italy, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status relatively not important</td>
<td>Estonia, Latvia, Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Denmark, Finland</td>
<td>Czech Republic, Portugal, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Dimension 1 (rows) sorts countries into three equally-sized groups based on the share of the difference between native and immigrant students (first- and second-generation) in the likelihood of attaining baseline academic proficiency that is explained by differences in socio-economic status. The share is larger for countries in the top row and smaller for those in the one below. Dimension 2 (columns) sorts countries into three equally-sized groups based on the difference between native-speaking and non-native-speaking immigrant students in the likelihood of attaining baseline academic proficiency. The positive gap is larger for countries in the left column and smaller for those in the right one. Students who attain baseline academic proficiency are those who reach at least PISA proficiency Level 2 in all three core PISA subjects: science, reading and mathematics. Socio-economic status is measured through the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS). Native-speaking students are students who speak most frequently at home the language of the PISA assessment. Non-native-speaking students are those who reported that the language they most frequently speak at home is different from the language of the PISA assessment. **Source:** OECD, PISA 2015 Database.
Table 6.2. Key risk factors for the social resilience of immigrant students

Targeting efforts on key risk factors for the social resilience of immigrant students: the relative importance of language and socio-economic background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic status relatively important</th>
<th>Language relatively important</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Language relatively not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (Argentina), Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>Austria, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (Argentina), Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece, Italy, Spain, Sweden</td>
<td>Greece, Italy, Spain, Sweden</td>
<td>New Zealand, Slovenia, Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia, Jordan, Latvia, Montenegro</td>
<td>Estonia, Jordan, Latvia, Montenegro</td>
<td>Czech Republic, Portugal, Ireland, Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dimension 1 (rows) sorts countries into three equally-sized groups based on the share of the difference between native and immigrant students (first- and second-generation) in the likelihood of reporting a sense of belonging at school that is explained by differences in socio-economic status. The share is larger for countries in the top row and smaller for those in the one below. Dimension 2 (columns) sorts countries into three equally-sized groups based on the difference between native-speaking and non-native-speaking immigrant students in the likelihood of attaining baseline academic proficiency. The positive gap is larger for countries in the left column and smaller for those in the right one. Students who reported a sense of belonging at school are those who reported that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I feel like I belong at school” and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statement “I feel like an outsider at school”. Socio-economic status is measured through the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS). Native-speaking students are students who speak most frequently at home the language of the PISA assessment. Non-native-speaking students are those who reported that the language they most frequently speak at home is different from the language of the PISA assessment. *Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.*

Tailor-made programmes: the importance of the proximity between the origin and host languages

A range of factors can influence an immigrant’s fluency and ability to learn the host country’s language. Examples of such factors include age of arrival in the host country, how different a person’s mother tongue is from the language of the host country (linguistic distance), levels of exposure to the host language (for example in school interactions) and the expected time of stay in the host country. The diversity of factors that can shape an immigrant’s language proficiency, and thus their integration into the host community, suggest that tailor-made language programmes could be more effective than one-size-fits-all approaches in helping immigrants develop the language skills they need to thrive.

Although language support receives a lot of attention in the policy debate, many language programmes employ a dichotomous distinction between same and different language speakers. This prevents programmes from considering the wide spectrum of languages spoken by individuals with an immigrant background. This is an important limitation since the degree of similarity between an immigrant’s mother tongue and host language affects the ease with which they can become fluent in the host language (Ispahording, 2014[13]). For example, the language barrier that immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries face when settling in Italy is not the same that Spanish-speaking immigrants face when they settle in Finland. The language penalty gap that some immigrants suffer in terms of social, academic
or economic integration is also related to how similar or dissimilar their mother tongue is from the host country language.

The OECD (2018) *Skills on the Move* report quantifies the degree of linguistic proximity between individuals’ mother tongue and the language in which they sat the PIAAC assessment. This builds on previous work from (Isphording, 2014[13]) that uses data from the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS). The report then analyses the association between linguistic proximity and literacy, numeracy and wage levels.

Figure 6.3 displays the level of language diversity that exists within immigrant populations and the extent to which, on average, the languages that immigrant communities speak are very similar or very different from the language in which they sat the PIAAC test. It also displays the additional literacy gap expected given the level of linguistic distance among immigrants, after controlling for individual characteristics. Results show that the greater the linguistic dissimilarity between the mother tongue of an individual and the language in which that person sat the PIAAC test, the lower his or her proficiency in literacy will be. Results were similar for numeracy proficiency.

**Figure 6.3. Language distance and related additional gap in literacy among foreign-born populations in PIAAC participating countries**

The dissimilarity (distance) between the mother tongue of foreign-born populations and the language of the PIACC test, and its implication for literacy proficiency

*Note:* Estimates for Australia, Germany and Russia are missing due to the lack of language variables. Countries are ranked in descending order of the score point difference.

The diversity of languages spoken by immigrants and the degree to which, on average, such languages differ from the host country’s language is an important consideration when assessing the potential language training needs of immigrant communities. The greater the distance between the languages spoken by minorities and the official language spoken in the host country, the more intense and long-term language training needs are likely to be. It will also likely be more difficult for immigrant communities to obtain fluency in the host country’s language. The greater the diversity of languages spoken by immigrants, the more difficult it may be to find trainers who will be able to cater to a large variety of needs. However, in the absence of large communities of immigrants who speak the same language, the greater the incentive is for immigrants to learn the official language in the country. This is because opportunities for communication within the immigrant community will be lower.

From evidence to action: Lessons from the field including examples of policies and practices to promote long-term well-being through integrated language support

This chapter has shown the importance of language proficiency on the social, academic and economic integration of immigrant students and adults. However, the evidence also reveals that addressing language barriers requires a nuanced approach. This means tailoring the time and intensity of language support to meet the specific needs of language learners. Support should consider individual factors, such as a person’s age of arrival and how dissimilar an immigrant’s mother tongue is from the host country’s language. Policy makers should also consider the context of immigrants living in the host community, such as their socio-economic background. Together, this can help determine if different or additional support is required to help immigrants thrive. Over the years, countries have used a range of policies and practices to address the language barriers facing immigrant communities. This section highlights some of these efforts, which can be tested and evaluated to facilitate the linguistic integration of immigrants.

Promote plurilingualism and consider offering mother tongue tuition

Plurilingualism refers to individuals or societies that can speak and switch between several languages according to the circumstances (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 168[14]). When people speak multiple languages, they tend to become autonomous learners and are motivated to learn other languages (OECD, 2019). In the classroom, promoting the flexible use of code switching across languages can ease the transfer of knowledge from one language to another (Garcia, 2009, p. 140[15]). Some research suggests that this practice can “facilitate metalinguistic awareness and promote the development of the school language, as well as the content learning of the subject” (Herzog-Punzenberger, Pichon-Vorstman and Siarova, 2017, p. 61[16]).

In France, newly arrived students can benefit from plurilingualism. At the national level, some language classes seek to help newly arrived students discover French by leveraging and comparing the variety of languages used by students in the classroom. This approach stimulates student thinking about how language is structured and used, offering learners a deeper understanding of their own languages/cultures and that of their peers (European Commission, 2018[17]).

In communities that have a large number of immigrants who speak the same language (other than the host country’s language) developing students’ mother tongue can be beneficial. Promoting a student’s mother tongue has the potential not only to help secure the self-esteem and identity of immigrant students and their families (Benson and Kosonen, 2013[18]; Dolson and Mayer, 1992[19]; Bühmann and Trudell, 2008[20]; IDRC, 1997[21];
European Commission, 2015[22]; Eurydice, 2009[23]), it also can be important to supporting the overall integration of immigrant students.

In **Sweden**, mother tongue instruction is a right for all students with a legal guardian whose mother tongue is not Swedish (Cerna et al., 2019[24]). This provision is offered if (1) the language in question is used for daily communication in the student’s home, and (2) the student has basic knowledge of the language in question (Ganuza and Hedman, 2015[25]; Utbildningsdepartementet (Ministry of Education and Research), 2016[26]).

**Offer targeted language support, especially to late arrivals**

Immigrant students who arrive late in their adolescence without the language skills of the host country are especially vulnerable to falling behind in school and struggling to develop a sense of belonging. Late-arrival penalties vary across countries, but they are usually more pronounced for immigrant students who do not speak the assessment language at home (OECD, 2012[27]; OECD, 2015[28]). While most countries provide some form of language training to first-generation immigrants and new arrivals, it is also important to offer targeted language training to returning students and students from mixed-heritage households when proficiency in the host language is markedly lower than that among native students.

Countries can develop targeted language support programmes in several ways. Support might include offering second language courses; providing a special curriculum for language learners in mainstream classes (that are appropriate for the student’s age and grade level); or leveraging innovative practices such as dual language learning, pluralilingualism or online programmes. The latter can be especially useful when there are only a small number of non-native-speaking students in a particular school. When appropriate and feasible, countries can also offer intensive induction classes for language learners with little or no knowledge of the language of instruction. This can help students quickly develop the language skills they need to access mainstream curriculum content. However, the goal of induction or preparatory classes should be to mainstream students as soon as possible to avoid segregating them from native-speaking peers and to facilitate inclusion.

In **Sweden**, immigrant students (aged 7-18) who arrive with little or no knowledge of the Swedish language are considered “new arrivals” for up to four years starting from the time they enrol in school. Within two months of starting school in Sweden, new arrivals have their level of literacy and numeracy skills assessed (see below) and then assigned to an appropriate class. Newly arrived students can also benefit from separate introductory classes but are included in mainstream classes to the extent that their language proficiency allows. In **Slovenia**, newly arrived immigrant and refugee children benefit from both induction classes and continuing or advanced classes to support their language development during the school year. The continuing classes consist of an individual programme or plan of activities (before or after school) that may include remedial or supplementary classes in Slovenian with the aim of integrating students into mainstream classes with their native-born peers (OECD, 2018[29]).

**Support opportunities for informal language learning**

Providing opportunities to learn and practice the target language outside of schools and training centres can help learners improve their language skills and become more confident. For children, (language) summer camps are one example of supporting language learning in an informal setting. Other examples of informal language learning might include participation in leisure centres and after-school programmes, like sports, music, dance,
drama and the visual arts. These activities can help increase participants’ self-confidence, self-esteem and positive behaviours (Bungay and Vella-Burrows, 2013[30]). After-school activities also appear to improve immigrant high school students’ sense of belonging, motivation and academic achievement (Camacho and Fulgini, 2015[31]). In **Austria**, the cities of Vienna and Linz offer free summer language camps for any student who is struggling with German in school, including immigrants who arrived late in the school year and need additional support. The summer camps offer students an opportunity to learn German through sports, games, and other activities (Das Institut Interkulturelle Pädagogik (The Institute of Intercultural Education), 2012[32]; Lindner, 2017[33]).

### Make use of assessments to monitor and improve language skills

Many countries have developed initial assessments of language and other competencies that target students with an immigrant background (OECD, 2018[12]). These assessments can be administered in either the language of instruction or the student’s mother tongue. The latter can help teachers and schools distinguish between language barriers and other learning needs. Assessments can ensure that newly arrived students who struggle with the language of the host country are identified and results are used as a basis for distributing additional funding to schools or as a formative tool to identify the type of language support individual children need along their educational trajectory. However, poorly designed assessments can have a detrimental impact as immigrant children are more likely to be allocated to special education classes and lower-ability tracks (OECD, 2018[12]). In **Sweden**, diagnostic tests provided through the **Build Swedish (Bygga svenska)** programme determine the language ability and level of academic knowledge of newly arrived students. Initial tests are conducted within two months of the student’s arrival at school and subsequent tests can be used to measure the student’s competencies in different school subjects over time (Cerna et al., 2019[24]). Language assessment is not only a valuable tool for first-generation immigrant students; it can also benefit students with other types of immigrant profiles. For example, native students born to immigrant parents (second-generation) may lack exposure to the language of instruction at home, which could have consequences for their school achievement. In these cases, interventions that address the language proficiency gaps of immigrant students should be implemented as early as possible (OECD, 2018[29]). As such, some countries use non-targeted initiatives to diagnose children with language difficulties at a young age. However, research from the United States suggests that early language assessments should be monitored to ensure they are psychometrically sound and combined with other strategies such as teacher observation or reports from parents or guardians to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of young students’ knowledge and abilities (Ackerman, 2018[34]). It is important that any information about a young child’s learning in pre-primary is transmitted to primary school teachers to facilitate a smooth transition.

### Prepare and support teachers for linguistically diverse classrooms

Supporting children and adults from immigrant communities to learn the language of a host country requires specialised language teachers. However, research shows that multilingualism in teacher education is lacking (Carlson, 2009[35]) despite the fact that many national reports have pointed to the importance of teachers’ language knowledge as an integral part of core content teaching (Skolinspektionen (The Swedish Schools Inspectorate), 2010[36]; Skolverket (National Agency for Education), 2012[37]). Many countries offer courses on teaching second-languages as part of initial teacher education or professional development programmes. Preparing a cohort of teachers who specialise in
language teaching can be important for countries facing inflows of immigrants. However, including learners who are not fluent in the language of instruction requires that all teachers, from across all content areas, are familiar with language acquisition pedagogies that can help them accommodate language learners into mainstream classrooms.

In the United States, the state of California has several initiatives to ensure that teachers are equipped with the skills and knowledge to support English language learners to work in linguistically diverse classrooms. Californian teachers with at least one English Learner (EL) student in their class are required to have an EL Authorisation to provide English language development and specialised instruction (California Department of Education, 2018[38]).

As discussed above, students can benefit from mother tongue tuition. However, this requires teachers who reflect the linguistic diversity of students. As such, some countries have adopted initiatives to facilitate the hiring of teachers from immigrant or minority backgrounds who may have unrecognised foreign qualifications or lack the training to practice teaching in a host country (European Commission, 2016[39]). In Sweden, for example, the Fast Track for Migrant Teachers (Snabbspår) programme offers a 26-week course that incorporates Swedish language learning with a condensed teacher education programme (Cerna et al., 2019[24]). Participants are required to have some teaching experience but the extent varies considerably. Most participants are from Syria and Iraq, therefore the programme uses both Swedish and Arabic (Hajer and Economou, 2017[40]). The programme aims to familiarise teachers who have an immigrant background with Swedish pedagogical norms and develop the language skills needed to work in a Swedish classroom.
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Chapter 7. Organise resources to reduce the influence of socio-economic status on the outcomes of immigrants

This chapter identifies the extent to which socio-economic status determines the academic performance and general well-being of individuals with an immigrant background in different OECD countries. The extent to which socio-economic status exacerbates other forms of disadvantage associated with having an immigrant background is also examined. The chapter illustrates principles that could guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to ensure that immigrants are not held back by a relatively disadvantaged socio-economic condition. The role of institutional and governance aspects of education policy (including the implementation of market mechanisms, resource allocation criteria and curricular guidelines) and how they can be used to reduce the influence of socio-economic status on the outcomes of immigrant groups is discussed.
Socio-economic status is one of the strongest determinants of students’ academic performance and general well-being (OECD, 2016[1]; OECD, 2017[2]) and has been widely examined in the case of immigrant students (Marks, 2005[3]; Martin, 1998[4]; Portes and MacLeod, 1996[5]).

Socio-economic status affects individual outcomes through a variety of channels, at the individual, school and system levels. A family’s socio-economic status can determine parents’ ability to provide for their children’s needs, to be involved in their education and to effectively guide them during the transition from education and training into the labour market. It can also influence the socio-economic composition of the school that students attend, which has an impact on the school’s resources and environment and the social networks children are exposed to. Parents with high educational attainment are also better able to choose the school that best meets the needs of their children, and in which their children will meet stimulating peers. At the system level, socio-economic status is related to spending on education, which affects children’s ability to perform and enjoy a sense of well-being. Parental socio-economic status is also associated with the ability of individuals to engage in unpaid or poorly paid internships, which promote skill accumulation and guarantee access to highly coveted jobs. Parental socio-economic status also acts as a safety net, which enables individuals to make riskier career decisions (OECD, 2018[6]).

Individuals with an immigrant background tend to have more disadvantaged socio-economic status: they generally have parents with lower educational attainment, parents in less prestigious occupations and fewer economic resources in the household. Immigrants also tend to have fewer social networks established in their host country and have social networks composed of individuals who are equally disadvantaged, limiting their ability to network within their social circles to improve their long-term outcomes.

This chapter compares the socio-economic status of native students and students with an immigrant background, while also exploring the link between differences in socio-economic status and differences in well-being outcomes. It will stress the importance of observing different aspects of the socio-economic status of students with an immigrant background instead of focusing on a single one or composite measures. It will also highlight that, despite the fact that socio-economic status is a major risk factor for students with an immigrant background, it has a limited role for certain groups of non-native students and other factors may prevent immigrant integration. Finally, this section will detail some policies and practices designed to address barriers related to socio-economic status.

The socio-economic status of students with an immigrant background

PISA measures socio-economic status through a composite indicator called the index of economic, social and cultural capital (ESCS). It summarises information on parental level of education and occupational status, as well as the availability of a set of household items including consumer durables, and educational and cultural resources. The index is designed to have a value of zero for the average OECD student and a standard deviation of one across equally weighted OECD countries.

Although both thorough and simple (one number summarises a complex phenomenon such as socio-economic status), the ESCS index also has some important drawbacks. The most notable is that it does not allow for the examination of whether the roots of socio-economic disparities in different countries and between different groups of students stem from different mechanisms and processes.
The socio-economic status of students, as measured by their values on the ESCS index, differs greatly across students with a different immigrant background and between countries. Figure 7.1 suggests that, on average across OECD countries, first-generation immigrant students are the most socio-economically disadvantaged compared to native students. In 2015, on average across OECD countries, the ESCS of first-generation immigrant students was about one-third of a standard deviation below the average OECD students, while the ESCS of second-generation immigrant students was about one-third of a standard deviation below.

In as many as 22 out of 49 countries with available data, the ESCS of first-generation immigrant students was lower than those of their native peers, while the opposite was true only in 10 countries. The gap was above 0.5 (one half of a standard deviation) in 17 countries and economies, including Austria, Belgium, France, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden, while it was above 0.8 in Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires (Argentina), Greece, Hong Kong (China), Mexico and the United States. The ESCS of second-generation immigrant students was below that of native students in as many as 29 countries and economies out of 58 with available data.
Data from PISA 2015 shows that in the majority of countries, immigrant students with at least one native-born parent (returning foreign-born students and native students of mixed heritage) are more advantaged than native students. On average across OECD countries, native students of mixed heritage and returning foreign-born students had values on the index that were 0.10 and 0.28 point higher, respectively, than that of native students. These results suggest that having at least one native-born parent crucially influences the socio-economic status of students with migration in their background, and therefore it might not represent a risk factor for their successful integration.

Although the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) is designed to have the highest possible correlation with its three components (parents’ education, parents’ occupational status and household possessions) and to capture the greatest amount of information, the three components might not be completely aligned in all instances. For example, high skilled immigrants might have to go through a period of adjustment before they attain an occupational status that matches their education level. Also, an immigrant
who has recently entered the host country is likely to own fewer household possessions than a native who has lived in the host country throughout his or her life.

Results from looking at the individual components of ESCS in PISA 2015 show that “socio-economic disadvantage” can stem from various sources, and not necessarily all of them simultaneously. Compared to native students, immigrant students (first and second-generation immigrant students) tend to have lower economic and social status, but similar cultural status. In the vast majority of countries and economies with available data, the parents of immigrant students have fewer household possessions; in about half of the participating countries/economies, they have lower occupational status; and in slightly less than half of the countries/economies, they had completed fewer years of education.

In the United Kingdom, the parents of immigrant and native students completed the same number of years of education and hold the same occupational status; however, immigrant students have fewer household possessions (a difference in the index of one-third of a standard deviation). In Italy and Spain, parents completed the same number of years of education across immigrant backgrounds, but the economic and social status of immigrant and native students differ widely. In both countries, the difference in the index of household possessions between native and immigrant students is around two-thirds of a standard deviation, which corresponds to the difference between the average student in Norway and Portugal. When it comes to occupational status, differences are also well above OECD average (7 points): 14 points in Italy and 10 points in Spain.

These results show that the type of socio-economic disadvantage experienced by immigrant students changes across groups and countries. Therefore, policies and practices aiming to reduce the disadvantages experienced by immigrant students should reflect the specific needs of targeted individuals.

**Socio-economic status and the academic resilience of students with an immigrant background**

PISA reveals that socio-economic status is an important mediating factor in the relationship between immigrant background and academic resilience. Figure 7.2 shows differences between native and immigrant students in the percentage of students who attained baseline levels of proficiency in the core PISA subjects, before and after accounting for socio-economic status in PISA 2015. In 25 countries and economies, the gap between the two groups was considerably smaller after socio-economic differences were considered. This means that gaps in academic proficiency between the two groups of students were at least partly due to immigrant students being more socio-economically disadvantaged than native students.

Being disadvantaged is a risk factor for failing to attain baseline levels of academic performance in the three core PISA subjects. On average across OECD countries, the share of native students who attained such levels was 18 percentage points larger than the share of immigrant students who did so, before accounting for socio-economic status. The difference narrows to 14 percentage points when comparing native and immigrant students of similar socio-economic status. In Ciudad Autonoma de Buenos Aires (CABA) (Argentina), France, Luxembourg and the United States, the difference between the two groups before and after accounting for socio-economic status was larger than 10 percentage points. In the United States, socio-economic status was particularly influential since the gap between the two groups becomes statistically non-significant after accounting for ESCS.
In the majority of countries and economies, the native-immigrant gap in the percentage of students attaining baseline academic proficiency remains statistically significant and large even after accounting for socio-economic status. In 18 countries and economies the gap adjusted for socio-economic status is still larger than 15 percentage points. Results show that, while socio-economic status accounts for a remarkably large share of the differences in academic achievement between the two groups of students, the largest portion of the disparities remains unexplained in most countries and economies.

Figure 7.2. Difference between immigrant and native students in attaining baseline academic proficiency

Notes: Statistically significant differences are marked in a darker tone. Only countries/economies with valid data on the immigrant-native gap in attaining baseline academic proficiency are shown. Only students with non-missing values on PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) index are considered. Statistically significant differences in the immigrant-native gap after and before accounting for socio-economic status are shown next to country/economy names. For the OECD and EU averages, this number refers only to the subset of countries/economies with valid information on both groups of students. Students who attain baseline academic proficiency are students who reach at least PISA proficiency level 2 in all three PISA core subjects – math, reading and science. Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage point difference between immigrant and native students in the percentage of students attaining baseline academic proficiency after accounting for socio-economic status.

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.
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As discussed earlier, immigrant students with at least one native-born parent tend to have a higher socio-economic status than native students, yet they lag behind in academic performance. In 2015, in 35 countries and economies, the difference between native students and immigrant students with at least one native-born parent in the probability of attaining baseline levels of performance in the core PISA subjects widened after accounting for socio-economic status. In Canada, Denmark, Estonia, France, Latvia, Lithuania,
Montenegro, the Netherlands, Peru, Spain and Tunisia, the gap became negative and statistically significant after accounting for socio-economic status.

Results indicate that the socio-economic advantage observed in immigrant students with at least one native-born parent mitigates the adverse effects of an immigrant background on academic performance, and thus reduces the difference in performance compared with native students. This implies that policies aiming to improve the integration of immigrant students with at least one native-born parent should target factors other than socio-economic status.

Socio-economic status and the social and emotional resilience of students with an immigrant background

PISA shows that socio-economic disadvantage is related to native-immigrant gaps in social, emotional and motivational well-being. Nevertheless, the correlation is markedly weaker than that between socio-economic status and academic performance gaps.

Figure 7.3 shows that socio-economic disadvantage is one of the factors that explain the gap between native and immigrant students in the percentage of students who report a sense of belonging at school. In 20 countries and economies, this gap narrowed after accounting for socio-economic status. Across OECD countries, the gap narrowed by around 1 percentage point (from approximately 7% to 6%); in Belgium, CABA (Argentina), Denmark, France, Hong Kong (China), Luxembourg and the United States, the gap narrowed by more than three percentage points. In CABA (Argentina) and France, the reduction was such that the gap between native and immigrant students was not statistically significant, while in Belgium, Denmark and Luxembourg, the decrease of about 3 percentage points represented only a small part of the gaps observed before accounting for socio-economic status, all of which were considerably larger than 10 percentage points.

Results show that the relationship between socio-economic gaps and native-immigrant gaps in other well-being outcomes, such as schoolwork-related anxiety and life satisfaction, is even weaker than with sense of belonging. Overall, evidence shows that the socio-economic status of immigrant students does not play a major role in explaining their disadvantage in well-being measures. Policies aiming to reduce such gaps should focus on other risk factors more strongly related to the well-being of students with an immigrant background.
Figure 7.3. Difference between immigrant and native students in reporting a sense of belonging at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>After accounting for students’ socio-economic status</th>
<th>Before accounting for students’ socio-economic status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana (A-St)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (China)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea (South)</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (A-St)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam (R-St)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Statistically significant differences are marked in a darker tone. Only countries/economies with valid data on the immigrant-native gap in reporting a sense of belonging at school are shown. Students who reported a sense of belonging at school are those who reported that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the statement “I feel like I belong at school” and “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statement “I feel like an outsider at school”. Only students with non-missing values on the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) index are considered. Statistically significant differences in the immigrant-native gap after and before accounting for socio-economic status are shown next to country/economy names. Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage-point difference between immigrant and native students in the percentage of students reporting a sense of belonging at school after accounting for socio-economic status. Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.
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From evidence to action: Lessons from the field including examples of policies and practices to limit barriers related to socio-economic status

This section highlights policies and practices that countries and schools have used to reduce the negative effects of the socio-economic disadvantage experienced by some groups of students with an immigrant background. It describes policy responses that can limit barriers related to socio-economic status, and best practices from various countries at different levels of governance.
Understand the role of socio-economic disadvantage

Socio-economic status is a strong determinant of students’ academic performance and general well-being (OECD, 2016[1]; OECD, 2017[2]) and the relevance of socio-economic status in shaping the outcomes of students with an immigrant background has been widely examined (Marks, 2005[3]; Martin, 1998[4]; Portes and MacLeod, 1996[5]). It affects student outcomes in a variety of ways, at the individual, school and system levels.

A family’s socio-economic status can determine parents’ ability to provide for their child’s needs and to be involved in their education. It can also influence the socio-economic composition of the school that students attend, which has an impact on the school’s resources and environment. For example, wealthy parents can afford private schooling when local public schools are not considered to be of high quality. Students from different backgrounds may have varying degrees of exposure to specific content in the classroom because of the instructional time school systems and teachers allocate to them. Research using PISA data suggests that up to one-third of the relationship between socio-economic status and student performance is accounted for by measures of opportunity to learn (Schmidt et al., 2015[6]).

The design of education systems can mediate the relationship between parents’ resources and learning outcomes. Sorting and selecting policies used by schools and education systems, such as early tracking or grade repetition, can lead to differences in academic and well-being outcomes across students from different socio-economic backgrounds. While the selection of students for certain grades or programmes should be based primarily on performance, research shows that students’ background characteristics also influence those decisions (Agasisti and Cordero, 2017[8]; Van de Werfhorst and Mijs, 2010[9]). Other characteristics of education systems, such as the level of resources available to public or private schools, or to urban and rural schools, can strengthen or weaken the relationship between socio-economic status and academic performance (Greenwald, Hedges and Laine, 1996[10]; OECD, 2016[11]; Rivkin, Hanushek and Kain, 2005[12]).

Countries also alleviate students’ and schools’ socio-economic disadvantage with additional support in the form of greater resources. Countries typically use one of the following two approaches to promote equity: provide additional resources through targeted programmes (external to the main allocation mechanism) or include additional funding in the main allocation mechanism (e.g. through weightings in a funding formula) (OECD, 2017[13]).

Provide greater support to disadvantaged students and schools

Immigrant students are a key focus of resource allocations both because of migration-related needs (such as language difficulties) and socio-economic disadvantage (immigrant students tend to be socio-economically disadvantaged and live in disadvantaged communities). They can also be targeted through funding directed to certain geographical areas or to the actual population in each school. Area-based funding aims to address the additional negative impact of a concentration of disadvantage; student-based funding aims to adapt funding levels to the needs of the actual population in each school. Providing additional resources to students or areas that have greater need to promote equity in outcomes assumes that data on students’ level of needs is both available and accurate. Designing funding formulas to account for individual or area-based need also involves a trade-off between simplicity and accuracy (OECD, 2017[13]).
Many countries provide additional resources to schools to overcome language difficulties among newly arrived students, with funding provided to promote second-language teaching and learning and to support the creation of innovative teaching modules. For example, in Estonia, the Multicultural School project covering 2017-20 aims to reform the structure of financial support available to schools with a diverse student population and change school-level approaches to multiculturalism.

In the Flemish Community of Belgium, schools receive additional funding to target socio-economic disadvantage and have discretion over how to use this funding. The funding is mostly used to provide necessary material for teachers, and to cover expenditures to address the needs of disadvantaged students, such as specific teaching materials, in-service training or community-school activities (OECD, 2017[13]).

Extra funding can also be targeted to immigrant students facing a transition into a new education system. In Canada, for example, the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador has a funding programme for before- and after-school activities for “new Canadians”. This immigration strategy funding can support initiatives such as the provision of additional English Second Language (ESL) materials to school districts and funding to community groups such as the Association for New Canadians to support after school activities.

**Limit the concentration of disadvantaged students**

The concentration of disadvantage in schools is another risk factor that can affect the resilience of immigrant students. PISA data shows that most of the differences in student outcomes that appear to be associated with the concentration of students with an immigrant background in specific schools reflect the fact that these schools are socio-economically disadvantaged, rather than that these schools are disadvantaged because of a concentration of students with an immigration background (OECD, 2018[6]).

Schools that struggle to provide quality education for native students might struggle even more with a large population of children who cannot speak or understand the language of instruction. Countries that distribute immigrant students across a mix of schools and classrooms achieve better outcomes for these students. A more even distribution also relieves the pressure on schools and teachers when large numbers of immigrant students arrive over a short period of time (OECD, 2015[14]).

Some countries have measures designed to counter the concentration of students with an immigrant background and promote integration. Countries have used three principal strategies to address the concentration of immigrant and other disadvantaged students in particular schools. The first is to attract and retain other students, including more advantaged students. The second is to better equip immigrant parents with information on how to select the best school for their child. The third is to limit the extent to which advantaged schools can select students on the basis of their family background (OECD, 2015[14]). Brunello and De Paola (2017[15]) suggest that desegregation policies are both equitable – they provide better opportunities to individuals from relatively disadvantaged backgrounds – and efficient.

Language barriers, resource constraints, lower levels of education or lack of knowledge of the host country’s school system could hinder immigrant parents’ capacity to enrol their children in the most appropriate schools (OECD, 2015[14]). To overcome these barriers, the municipality of Rotterdam in the Netherlands offers bus tours to take parents around to visit local schools. The purpose of the tour is to allow parents to discuss enrolment options,
encourage them to use their local schools and provide more information on student-exchange projects available at schools with very different profiles. These projects, which include team sports, after-school child care and excursions, attempt to bring together students from diverse cultural backgrounds (Brunello and De Paola, 2017[15]).

In the Flemish Community of Belgium, in regions with many immigrant communities, a platform of local organisations linked with education has been established to design regulations that aim to avoid high concentrations of immigrants or natives in particular schools. The project School in zicht encourages parents of native children to enrol their child in local schools that have many students with an immigrant background (MIPEX, 2015[16]).

In Denmark, the 2006 school act permits municipalities to refer students with an immigrant background to other schools. Different measures to promote integration are developed at the municipality level. Some municipalities, such as Aarhus, practice forced desegregation; others, including Copenhagen, encourage ethnic-minority parents to choose a school with fewer ethnic minorities, and majority native parents to choose schools with a large number of ethnic-minority students. A report from the municipality of Copenhagen concluded that such measures seem to improve societal integration to a certain extent, but they can create new problems for the targeted minority students (MIPEX, 2015[16]).

The Education Territories of Priority Intervention Programme for clustered and non-clustered schools in Portugal is largely implemented in disadvantaged contexts, where the risk of school failure and dropout is high. Schools involved in the programme (17% of all Portuguese school clusters) are invited to develop specific improvement plans based on an agreement, between the school and school authorities, on measures, targets, evaluation and additional resources. The specific improvement plan covers four areas: support to improve learning; management and organisation of the cluster’s programmes; prevention of dropout, absenteeism and indiscipline; and relations among the school, families and community.

Studies have shown that it is mostly advantaged, non-immigrant families who exercise school choice. Therefore, it is important to make schools attractive to students from these families. One example is Qualität in multikulturellen Schulen (Quality in multicultural schools-QUIMS) in Switzerland that is obligatory when more than 40% of a school’s student population are multilingual. The school administration supports QUIMS-schools with extra financial resources and professional help, so that the school can adapt the programme as required in the areas of language, attainment and integration. Language support includes promoting literacy for all students using language-competence assessments, and creative work for oral and written proficiency, and supporting integrated “native language and culture lessons”. Attainment support includes a variety of learning methods to encourage co-operative learning and problem solving. Integration support is based on building a shared culture of appreciation, respect and understanding by using intercultural mediators to develop connections between parents and teachers, including the establishment of parent councils (Gomolla, 2006[17]; Herzog-Punzenberger, Pichon-Vorstman and Siarova, 2017[18]).

As school places are limited, the schools that are perceived to be of the highest quality are likely to attract more applicants than they have places available. Several studies suggest that school-choice plans should use simple lotteries to select among the applicants for oversubscribed schools in order to promote more diverse student populations (Godwin et al., 2006[19]). Education systems can also consider providing financial incentives for oversubscribed schools to enrol immigrant students (Field, Kuczera and Pont, 2007[20]).
For example, in the French Community of Belgium, differentiated funding is provided to schools based on the socio-economic background of its students. The 2004 Contract for School and the 2007 Enrolment Decree seek to fight against segregated schools. The 2005 Report on Intercultural Dialogue identified the problem of concentration of disadvantage in ghetto schools and recommended using funds to increase socio-cultural diversity (MIPEX, 2015[16]).
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Chapter 8. Build the capacity of teachers to deal with diversity

Teachers are considered key actors in schools and training institutions in supporting immigrant students reach their full potential. However, increasingly diverse schools and classrooms require a strong capacity from teachers. Teachers might be aware of the importance of supporting immigrant students and are willing to do so, however, many may lack the necessary skills to offer effective support. Therefore, teachers need to receive initial teacher training and professional development opportunities to respond to the specific needs of immigrants, and adapt their teaching practices to more diverse classrooms. This chapter examines policies and practices that can help build the capacity of teachers to manage diverse classrooms. Examples include: hiring professionals that reflect the student body, integrating diversity and inter-cultural topics into initial teacher education, offering continuous professional development in diversity, supporting teachers in diverse classrooms and preparing school principals for diversity in schools.
The growing number of immigrants and their diverse learning needs place considerable pressure on education and training systems to serve as vehicles of integration. Teachers are key actors in schools and training institutions in helping immigrants reach their full potential. Teachers can promote the cognitive and social-emotional development of immigrants, support students and adults who are not proficient in the language of instruction, and act as a bridge between schools and parents or the wider community. However, increasingly diverse schools and classrooms require a higher capacity from teachers. Teachers might be aware of the importance of supporting immigrant students and are willing to do so, however, many lack the knowledge and necessary skills to offer effective support.

Therefore, it is important that teachers receive initial teacher training and professional development opportunities, as well as systemic support to respond to the specific needs of immigrants and adapt their teaching practices to more diverse classrooms. This chapter will examine a set of principles that can guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to build the capacity of teachers to manage diverse classrooms. Examples include: integrating diversity and intercultural topics into initial teacher education, offering continuous professional development in diversity, hiring professionals that reflect the student body, supporting teachers in diverse classrooms and preparing school principals for diversity in schools.

**Student-teacher interactions**

All efforts to integrate children with an immigrant background depend on well-skilled and well-supported teachers who incorporate the diversity of their student populations in their instructional approaches to help all students achieve (OECD, 2018[1]). Positive student-teacher interactions play an important role in integrating students with an immigrant background.

**Unfair treatment by teachers**

Immigrant students need support from teachers in order to fully benefit from the learning opportunities that are available to them. Students with an immigrant background have more positive attitudes and higher academic motivation if teachers care about them and support their learning.

However, Figure 8.1 shows that students report frequent unfair treatment by teachers. In 16 countries, the percentage of students who reported that teachers frequently treated them unfairly in the previous 12 months was higher among immigrant students than native students. On average across OECD countries, the difference was approximately 6 percentage points, with significant differences across countries. In most countries, first- and second-generation immigrant students were equally likely to report frequent unfair treatment by teachers (OECD, 2018[1]).

Unfair treatment by teachers can decrease both the academic and social resilience of immigrant students. In the majority of OECD countries, the percentage of students who attained baseline levels of academic proficiency was lower among students who perceived unfairness by their teachers compared to other students. On average across OECD countries, the difference was about 8 percentage points (OECD, 2018[1]).

When considering students’ emotional and social well-being, the correlation is more pronounced. On average across OECD countries, students who reported that their teachers
had frequently treated them unfairly during the previous 12 months were 11 percentage points less likely to feel a sense of belonging at school, 10 percentage points less likely to report feeling satisfied with life, and eight percentage points less likely to report low levels of schoolwork related anxiety. Evidence shows that poor student-teacher relations have a strong impact on several aspects of students’ well-being as well as their academic performance.

Figure 8.1. Students reporting unfair treatment by teachers, by immigrant background

Notes: Students who reported frequent unfair treatment by their teachers are those who answered “a few times a month” or “once a week or more” to at least one of the questions of how often, during the previous 12 months: “Teachers called me less often than they called on other students”; “Teachers graded me harder than they graded other students”; “Teachers gave me the impression that they think I am less smart than I really am”; “Teachers disciplined me more harshly than other students”; “Teachers ridiculed me in front of others”; and “teachers said something insulting me in front of others”.

Statistically significant differences between immigrant and native students are shown next to country/economy names. For the OECD average, this number refers only to the subset of countries/economies with valid data on both groups of students.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrant students who reported unfair treatment by teachers.

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939923

Teacher feedback

While students with an immigrant background might feel unfairly treated by their teachers, Figure 8.2 shows that they were more likely to report receiving frequent feedback from their teachers than native students. On average across OECD countries the percentage of students that reported receiving frequent feedback from their teachers was six percentage
points higher among immigrant students compared to native students. After accounting for science performance, the differences were reduced; however, most differences remained statistically significant, indicating that immigrant students did not receive more feedback just because their science performance was worse.

When considering well-being outcomes, students were more likely to report a sense of belonging at school if they received academic feedback from their science teachers. On average across OECD countries, the effect was a two percentage-point increase in the likelihood of feeling a sense of belonging at school and five percentage-point increase in the likelihood of being satisfied with life (OECD, 2018[1]).

Receiving regular feedback from teachers can improve the academic and social resilience of immigrant students. Teacher feedback also has a strong motivating effect on students. On average across OECD countries, students who reported receiving frequent feedback from their science teachers were three percentage points more likely to report high achievement motivation. Teacher feedback tends to increase the likelihood that students will report low levels of schoolwork-related anxiety (OECD, 2018[1]).

Evidence shows that greater teacher support for immigrant students can significantly improve their well-being outcomes and moderate the effect of poor academic performance on their well-being.
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Figure 8.2. Immigrant-native differences in receiving teachers' feedback

Differences in the percentage of immigrant and native students who reported that they receive frequent feedback from their science teacher

Notes: Only countries with valid estimates of immigrant-native gaps before and after accounting for science performance are displayed. Statistically significant differences are marked in a darker tone. Students who reported receiving frequent feedback from their science teacher are those who answered “many lessons” or “every lesson or almost every lesson” to at least one of the statements: “The teacher tells me how I am performing in this course”; “The teacher gives me feedback on my strength in this subject”; “The teacher tells me in which areas I can improve”; “The teacher tells me how I can improve my performance”; and “The teacher advises me on how to reach my learning goals”.

Countries and economies are ranked in descending order of the percentage of immigrant students who reported that they receive frequent feedback from their science teacher, after accounting for their science performance. Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.

StatLink  http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939942

Teachers’ need for professional development

The previous findings reflect that even though teachers often seek to help immigrant students succeed in school (by giving them frequent feedback on their work), they may lack the skills to do so in a way that is effective and well received by immigrant students.

Figure 8.3 shows the interaction between student feedback and perceived unfair treatment by teachers. In countries and economies in the top left quadrant (Costa Rica, Finland, Lithuania, Macao [China], Norway and Singapore), immigrant students appear to be relatively supported by their teachers: they reported receiving additional feedback compared to native students and reported being treated fairly by their teachers. Immigrant students in countries and economies in the bottom right quadrant (Brazil, Croatia, the Netherlands and Turkey) reported receiving little additional feedback from their teachers.

StatLink  http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933939942
compared to native students, and reported feeling that they are treated unfairly by their teachers. These countries might consider implementing policies that support teacher-training initiatives designed to improve teachers’ ability to support and assist immigrant students.

In countries listed in the top right quadrant (Belgium, Denmark, the Slovak Republic and Sweden), teachers appear to be aware of the importance of supporting immigrant students, since these students reported receiving more feedback than native students. But teachers in these countries appear to need additional training in how to provide assistance to immigrant students without stigmatising them.

Figure 8.3. Interaction between feedback and perceived unfair treatment by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large gap in feedback (immigrant - native)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Large gap in perceived unfair treatment (immigrant - native)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica, Finland, Lithuania, Macao (China), Norway, Singapore</td>
<td>Chile, Estonia, Luxembourg, Slovenia</td>
<td>Belgium, Denmark, Slovak Republic, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria, Mexico, Portugal</td>
<td>Czech Republic, Ireland, United Kingdom, United States</td>
<td>Austria, Dominican Republic, Germany, Mexico, Portugal, Switzerland, Tunisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing-Shanghai-Jiangsu-Guangdong (China), Bulgaria, Hong Kong (China), Montenegro, Russia, Spain</td>
<td>Colombia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Thailand</td>
<td>Brazil, Croatia, Netherlands, Turkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Dimension 1 (rows) sorts countries into three equally-sized groups based on the difference in the percentage of immigrant and native students who reported receiving frequent feedback from their science teacher, after accounting for their science performance. Immigrant students tended to report more frequent feedback, so a large gap favours immigrant students. Dimension 2 (columns) places countries into three equally-sized groups based on the difference in the percentage of immigrant and native students who reported frequent unfair treatment by their teachers. Immigrant students were more likely to report unfair treatment, which is a “negative” outcome.

Students who reported frequent unfair treatment by their teachers are those who answered “a few times a month” or “once a week or more” to at least one of the questions about how often, during the previous 12 months: “Teachers called me less often than they called on other students”; “Teachers graded me harder than they graded other students”; “Teachers gave me the impression that they think I am less smart than I really am”; “Teachers disciplined me more harshly than other students”; “Teachers ridiculed me in front of others”; and “teachers said something insulting me in front of others”. Students who reported receiving frequent feedback from their science teacher are those who answered “many lessons” or “every lesson or almost every lesson” to at least one of the questions about how often: “The teacher tells me how I am performing in this course”; “The teacher gives me feedback on my strength in this subject”; “The teacher tells me in which areas I can improve”; “The teacher tells me how I can improve my performance”; and “The teacher advises me on how to reach my learning goals”.


Data results indicate that teachers adapt their behaviours when teaching students with an immigrant background. This could occur because teachers understand the specific needs of immigrant students and try to provide them with adequate support. It can also result from implicit expectations teachers hold for the students and their academic potential and career
possibilities. Moreover, teachers might hold stereotypical notions about different immigrant groups, which can lead them to treat students differently within this group. Figure 8.4 shows that, on average, one in ten teachers participating in the 2013 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) reported the need for additional professional development when teaching in multicultural settings. Thus, when it comes to immigrant students and students who do not speak the language of assessment, teachers often feel the need for additional systemic support. For example, in Brazil, Italy and Mexico, over 25% of teachers reported that they feel they need more assistance in understanding how to address and support their students’ needs in multicultural classrooms. This could be a sign that either teachers in these countries wish to continue improving their skills or that they are not satisfied with the training they received (OECD, 2017[2]).

**Figure 8.4. Teacher’s need for professional development in a multicultural setting**

![Image showing teacher's need for professional development in a multicultural setting](image)

*Note: The data from the United States should be interpreted carefully because the United States did not meet the international standards for participation rates.*


### Knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for diverse classrooms

To be able to manage diverse classrooms, teachers need to be equipped with relevant knowledge, capabilities, dispositions, values and skills. Examples include knowledge and understanding of diversity issues, reflectivity about identities, perspectives and practices, as well as teacher agency and autonomy, empathy, and pedagogical judgement and tact (Forghani-Arani, Cerna and Bannon, 2019[3]).

Furthermore, strong communication and listening skills, creativity and problem solving are crucial for teachers when working in diverse classrooms. Some knowledge of cultural anthropology, social psychology, child cognitive development, Content and Language Integrated Learning and second language acquisition are desirable knowledge areas that should be developed during initial teacher training. Teachers would also benefit from being encouraged to develop attitudes such as curiosity, open-mindedness, awareness of others, tolerance and having high expectations for students (OECD, 2017[2]).
Evidence from the field including examples of policy and practices to ensure immigrant students are well supported by teachers

This section highlights efforts to improve teaching capacity for pre-service and existing teachers, as well as efforts aimed at other members of the school community for managing diversity. The policy responses described, as well as country examples at various levels (individual, school and system), provide possible opportunities and practical applications that can be tested and evaluated to ensure the successful integration for all.

**Integrate diversity and intercultural topics into initial teacher education programmes**

Teachers require certain knowledge, skills and attitudes to be effective in diverse classrooms, which can be developed in initial teacher training. This can happen by integrating diversity into the curriculum, approaching diversity as an asset, linking theory and practice, creating spaces for action, reflection, study and anticipation in handling diversity, and incorporating relevant technologies for innovative teaching (Forghani-Arani, Cerna and Bannon, 2019[3]).

Effective teacher education programmes for diversity integrate diversity directly into the curriculum rather than as *ad hoc* or separate courses. Examples of effective programmes in Europe that specialise in educating teachers for diverse classrooms include: Master of Intercultural Education (Marino Institute of Education, Ireland), Master of Educational Treatment of Diversity (University of Latvia, Charles University in Prague, Ludwigsburg University of Education, and National University of Distance Education), and Master of Multicultural and International Education (Oslo and Akershus University College for Applied Sciences, Norway) (European Commission, 2017[4]).

Pre-service teachers also require training that integrates theory and practice, and helps relate conceptual knowledge to practical experience in diverse classrooms. Service learning and cultural immersion can provide relevant field experience in teacher education (Boyle-Baise and McIntyre, 2008, p. 310[5]). Cultural immersion experiences help educators venture outside their cultural “comfort zone” and transform their understanding of others (Yuan H., 2018[6]).

For example, the Indiana University School of Education in the *United States* offers a cultural immersion experience to its student teachers through the “Global Gateway for Teachers” programme. The programme provides pre-service teachers with opportunities to prepare for teaching diverse groups of students by placing them in schools located in the Navajo Nation American Indian Reservation, urban settings in Indianapolis and Chicago, and multiple international locations in South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa. Since its inception in 1970, many studies have highlighted the positive impact of the programme on pre-service teachers’ professional and personal development. Positive effects include a more empathetic understanding of the world and its people, an appreciation for other cultures and an awareness of both global and domestic diversity (Kirkwood-Tucker, 2009[7]).

Another example is the Canadian programme “Éveil aux langues et ouverture à la diversité linguistique” (ELODIL) [Awareness of English and openness to linguistic diversity], facilitated by the University of Montreal, *Canada*, which offers training programmes and support plans focused on language and communication for current and future teachers in Montreal, Quebec, Canada and in rural regions (Armand, 2014[8]). The programme enables teachers to adopt good practices that facilitate student learning and promotes their
commitment to recognise students’ linguistic and cultural background as a resource, not as an obstacle. The programme increased the likelihood teachers develop and experiment with efficient teaching practices, which in turn helped student teachers develop positive attitudes towards diversity as well as metalinguistic abilities. The training facilitated the recognition and legitimisation of the different immigrant children’s languages of origin in creating multi-ethnic environments, and in the specific context of Quebec, helped the learning of French and the awareness of the social and identity role of French as a common language (Armand, 2014[8]).

Innovative teacher education programmes for diversity use technology to facilitate learning about diversity and help increase the cultural awareness of prospective teachers (Davis, Cho and Hagenson, 2005[9]; Bowser, 2008[10]). For example, the eTutor programme in Australia promotes a greater understanding of other cultures among pre-service teachers. Introduced by the RMIT School of Education in Melbourne, the programme creates an online environment using technology where pre-service teachers can interact with students from different countries on a virtual teaching platform through blog posts, comments and videos. The programme aims to increase the intercultural and technological capacities of teachers by allowing them to explore different cultures in ways that are safe, supportive, inclusive, challenging, and engaging (Carr, 2016[11]). A majority of the participants underwent a positive attitudinal shift; the pre-service teachers, many of whom had started with an ethnocentric view, finished with an ethno-relative view, demonstrating empathy and caring for children of different cultures (Carr, 2016[11]).

Offer continuous professional development focused on diversity and facilitate peer-learning between teachers in the workforce

Collaboration and exchange of good practices are important aspects of teacher professional development and can have positive effects on capacity building (Burns and al., 2016[12]). Continuous professional development programmes can help student teachers manage diversity as they transition to the teaching workforce and once they are in the profession by providing opportunities to learn and practice new strategies.

For example, the National Agency for Education in Sweden offers professional development courses in collaboration with various Swedish universities. The courses allow teachers to become certified for teaching additional subjects, such as teaching Swedish as a Second Language. There is also a professional development course called “The Global Classroom” that targets all teachers regardless of subject matter to strengthen teaching methods in multilingual classrooms and interactions with newly arrived students (Skolverket (National Agency for Education), 2018[13]).

Another example is the Intercultural Learning in the Classroom Project in the Netherlands, launched by the Dutch Ministry of Education to develop the intercultural skills of teachers across all education sectors. Teacher educators and teachers collaborated in workshops to develop intercultural activities and to implement them in real classrooms. The Intercultural Learning in the Classroom Project successfully helped teachers move away from culturalism in the classroom. Additionally, teachers began to view intercultural education as a pedagogy of tolerance that requires empathy, communication skills and a safe classroom environment (Leeman and Reid, 2006[14]).

A third example stems from the European Federation for Intercultural Learning (EFIL), which offers condensed professional development to teachers, educators and school principals on intercultural competences to teachers. Participants are empowered to deliver
the training themselves, which allows the knowledge to spread through a multiplier effect. Participants are also introduced to a toolbox that was designed especially to help teachers integrate intercultural learning in their own curricula. The toolbox is developed in four sessions: tools based on the whole-school approach, cross-curricular tools, specific subject activities and tools to support international mobility (OECD, 2017[2]). More information can be found at: http://intercultural-learning.eu/teacher-training/.

Besides professional development, peer-learning can also help teachers prepare for managing diverse classrooms. Evidence shows that mentoring and being mentored provide important benefits (OECD, 2005[15]).

For instance, New Zealand has induction and mentorship arrangements for new teachers. The mentorship arrangement has clearly established guidelines and regulations that explain the role of the mentor, mentee, and the school for the teacher’s first two years. Detailed information is also provided for teachers who serve New Zealand’s Indigenous population. The Induction and Mentoring in Māori-medium Settings (Te Hāpai Ō – Ko te Whakangungu me te Aratak i i ngā wāhi Mātauranga Māori) aims to help teachers support Māori students, a historically disadvantaged group in New Zealand (Marie, Fergusson and Boden, 2008[16]). An important feature is that the induction and mentoring programme in New Zealand is built into the schedule of all new teachers. In addition to reducing total teaching time for all teachers in 2015-2016, the ‘Teachers Collective Agreement’ affords first and second year beginning teachers an extra 5 and 2.5 hours of time, respectively, to be used for induction and mentoring (Ministry of Education of New Zealand, 2015[17]; Ministry of Education of New Zealand, 2016[18]; OECD, 2012[19]). This time allotment, which is highly valued, provides more opportunities for new teachers to learn from their mentor. However, regulation mechanisms are needed as researchers have found that many teachers use the extra time for daily teaching tasks rather than professional development activities (Anthony et al., 2007[20]).

Recruit professionals that reflect the student body

Having teachers with an immigrant or minority background can be beneficial not only for students with immigrant, ethnic or racial minority backgrounds, but also for all students. Diverse teachers can serve as role models and provide greater understanding for students with different needs and backgrounds. However, the qualifications of teachers with an immigrant or minority background are often not recognised by host countries, which prevents them from working in schools there (OECD, 2017[22]).

Several programmes exist that facilitate overcoming the barriers for teachers with an immigrant or minority background. In Europe, R/EQUAL, a project initiated in September 2018 and co-ordinated by the University of Cologne, Germany, focuses on international networking and the exchange of expertise in the field of higher education activities concerning recently immigrated and refugee teachers in Europe. Collaborating on the European level, R/EQUAL supports existing programmes at the Universities of Stockholm (Sweden), Vienna (Austria), Cologne and the University of Education Weingarten (both in Germany). At the same time, expertise gained from running a programme is shared with other institutions in higher education in Europe. Some examples of recommendations for building capacity with respect to a diverse teacher workforce include the involvement of ethnically diverse teachers in the recruitment of new hires to ensure a diverse representation in these selection pools and a greater attention to anti-oppression and social justice courses at the in-service level. Additional recommendations include: recognising that all students benefit from a diverse teacher workforce; a closer examination of policies...
and practices that limit or thwart hiring a diverse representation of teachers; ensuring opportunities for teachers to develop supportive communities of practice; and recognising the insider/outsider position of many historically marginalised teachers (Carter Andrews et al., 2019[21]).

The Education Science Foundations for Refugee Teachers (Bildungswissenschaftliche Grundlagen für Lehrkräfte mit Fluchthintergrund) is an innovative education programme specifically for refugee teachers at the University of Vienna, Austria. The programme allows refugees to re-enter their profession through an alternative certification with the aim to create a heterogeneous teaching workforce that better reflects the diversity in the Austrian student body (Biewer and Frey, 2017[22]). In addition to educational theory classes, the participants are enrolled in practical training at schools across Vienna, under close supervision of a mentor (Biewer and Frey, 2017[22]). Graduates are considered qualified under the Austrian educational system by means of a special contract to teach one subject in the secondary or upper secondary level on the condition that they hold a bachelor’s degree, B2 level of German and prior teaching experience (with the possibility of a full contract if additional requirements are fulfilled). The programme has already attracted international attention, winning the SozialMarie prize for social innovation in 2018 (Unruhe Privatstiftung [Unrest Private Foundation], 2018[23]).

Support for teachers and school administration in diverse classrooms (social workers, psychologists, language aides or other professionals)

Different sets of vulnerabilities that accompany direct and indirect displacement might affect students’ sense of self. Social workers and psychologists who also have experience working with immigrant students can provide extra support to teachers who teach in diverse classrooms.

For example, the Ministry of Education in Austria has employed Mobile Intercultural Teams (mobile interkulturelle Teams, MIT) since April 2016 to provide schools that have high percentages of immigrant students with extra support. Often a psychologist qualified to help children who have experienced trauma or difficulty in their lives accompanies the team (Scholten et al., 2017[24]). Support can include advice for teachers, individual casework with immigrant students, and workshops to improve class climate. Importantly, the MITs help parents of immigrant students integrate into the school community (Felder-Puig, Maier and Teutsch, 2016[25]) and often serve as a language bridge between students, parents, and the school (teachers, administrators, etc.) (Eurydice, 2018[26]). They go through two full days of training on the following topics: asylum and migration movements, school law and administration, trauma and trauma coping with children and adolescents, and psychosocial support systems at and for school (Felder-Puig, Maier and Teutsch, 2016[25]).

School leaders can offer teachers with support to deal with diversity in classrooms and schools. However, these professionals also require effective training for diversity. For example, in the United States, the Urban School Leaders Collaborative (USLC) is a cohort-based principal preparation programme dedicated to developing leadership capacity within the San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD), which serves a diverse population of families, the majority of whom are Hispanic and low income (http://education.utsa.edu/educational_leadership_and_policy_studies/). The goal of the programme is to prepare leaders who can work effectively in ethnically, racially, socially, and linguistically diverse educational environments. Through partnerships with local school districts and institutions of higher education, the participants have the opportunity
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to apply leadership theories and practices in real-world settings (Murakami and Kearney, 2016[27]).
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Chapter 9. Break down barriers to social cohesion while ensuring effective service delivery

This chapter examines the challenges related to designing and implementing policies and practices that ensure that immigrants receive adequate support which responds to their unique needs, whilst also allowing for integration into their new communities. Furthermore, this chapter identifies the importance of ensuring that individuals without an immigrant background hold the capacity to welcome immigrants as a crucial goal for education policy in response to international migration flows.
Students with an immigrant background have individual needs specific to their situation, as evidenced in previous chapters of this report. A challenge for education and training systems in responding to these needs is to develop effective service delivery that is financially viable and sustainable in the long term. Effective service delivery should also equip immigrants with adequate support to develop skills and competencies but also thrive socially and psychologically. This often results in a tension between the efficiency of grouping immigrants in specific schools and the ability to ensure that they are not concentrated in particular schools with few opportunities to develop emotionally and socially. Important opportunities include learning about their new communities, forming friendship networks and undergoing acculturation processes that will eventually lead these students to develop new feelings of belonging towards their new community.

Organising effective service delivery is necessary in order to ensure the academic and broader well-being of individuals with an immigrant background, their long-term integration prospects, and also to promote positive public attitudes towards migration.

Although evidence from PISA suggests that the number of students with an immigrant background is not associated with the quality of the education provided, resident populations where the quality of the education is low might blame new arrivals for poor educational standards. Figure 9.1 shows that many of the highest performing education systems, as measured by the percentage of students who attain at least baseline levels of proficiency in the three core PISA subjects, reading, mathematics and science, have large populations of students with an immigrant background. However, Figure 9.2 suggests that in countries where residents express concern about the state of the education system, immigrants are regarded as a potential threat to the cultural life of the country.
Figure 9.1. The relationship between the share of immigrant students and the quality of education systems

The percentage of students with an immigrant background and the high performance of education systems, by country

Source: OECD, PISA 2015 Database.
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This chapter examines principles that can guide the design and implementation of policies and practices to ensure that immigrants receive adequate support but are also able to integrate in their new communities. Education systems, in parallel, can foster social cohesion by ensuring that native individuals have the capacity to welcome newcomers.

**Trust towards others is a key driver of social cohesion**

A key indicator of social cohesion is the extent to which individuals express feelings of trust towards others. Evidence from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills indicates that OECD countries differ greatly in average levels of generalised trust expressed by residents, with large disparities also found within countries. Better educated individuals reported higher levels of trust compared to individuals with fewer educational qualifications. For example, individuals in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and Norway reported the highest levels of trust while individuals in Italy, Greece, the Slovak Republic and Chile reported the lowest levels of trust (Borgonovi and Pokropek, 2017[1]). The only countries with available data in which education was not positively associated with trust are Singapore and Chile. Differences by level of education in reported levels of trust are due to three key factors. Individuals who achieve a higher level of education tend to enjoy a higher social status and command a higher income than individuals with fewer qualifications. Social status and labour market performance is strongly associated with trusting others. Education also leads
to the acquisition of skills, which enable individuals to reliably identify situations in which it is possible to trust and not be taken advantage of. Finally, because better educated (and more trusting) parents tend to have better educated children, better educated individuals tend to be exposed to a household environment that promotes trust (Borgonovi and Pokropek, 2017[1]).

On average, around 50% of the overall association between education and trust is due to direct socialisation mechanisms, while the remaining 50% can be traced to the greater social status and cognitive abilities that better educated individuals possess. However, the overall association between education and trust as well as the relative importance of different mechanisms varies widely across countries. For example, in Japan, Spain and Finland social stratification and cognitive mechanisms account for approximately a quarter of the total association between education and trust. However, in Sweden, Norway and France, more than 60% of the association can be attributed to these mechanisms. The cognitive channel in particular appears to be highly context dependent.

Evidence from the OECD Survey of Adult Skills reveals that between country differences in the size of immigrant populations and the diversity of countries of origins of immigrant populations are important to explain why the association between literacy proficiency and trust is higher in some countries than in others. More specifically, Figure 9.3 indicates that in countries where birthplace diversity is greater (birthplace diversity is a summary measure of the size and diversity of immigrant populations), literacy proficiency is more strongly associated with trust than in countries where birthplace diversity is smaller. These results suggest that the relationship between literacy and trust is particularly strong in countries where diversity is high, such as Canada, Australia and Singapore. By contrast, the relationship is positive but weak in countries with little birthplace diversity, such as Chile, Japan and Poland.
International migration flows do not always lead to prejudice and increased negative attitudes towards immigrants among native populations

Another way in which international migration flows could challenge social cohesion is by increasing prejudice among native populations and by increasing negative attitudes towards immigrants among native populations. When the size of foreign-born populations is large, prejudicial feelings or feelings of economic and cultural threat among native populations are likely to lead to tensions within communities. These tensions can weaken collaboration, cooperation and the willingness to contribute to public goods and community resources.

Evidence from the European Social Survey, a survey designed to map the attitudes and dispositions in Europe, reveals that resident populations did not express greater opposition towards migration following the large influx of immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees in European countries that occurred in 2014 and 2015. In fact, in many of the countries surveyed, resident populations expressed more positive attitudes towards immigrants in 2016 than they did in either 2012 or 2014, just before the peak in arrivals. Moreover, between 2014 and 2016 education became a less important demographic factor in predicting opposition to migration in nine countries, it became more important in three countries and it remained stable in the remaining six countries (Borgonovi and Pokropek, 2018[2]).
Figure 9.4. Opposition to migration in Europe did not increase between 2012 and 2016
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Overall, individuals who attended school for longer report a lower sense of economic threat from immigrants, lower feelings of cultural threat and less prejudice - three factors that are strongly associated with individuals’ level of opposition to migration (Borgonovi and Pokropek, 2018[2]). In fact, over three-quarters of the overall association between education and opposition to migration can be attributed to lower perceived economic and cultural threat and lower levels of prejudice experienced by individuals who attended school for longer.

Education systems can play an important role in mediating new cultural consensus

Finally, social cohesion can be promoted by building social consensus on the importance of a set of values and the endorsement of specific attitudes and dispositions, in other words by a shared culture. While cultures change over time and there is no complete cultural homogeneity in any society, different societies reward or, rather, sanction deviations from accepted social norms. Cultural traditions and values are transmitted by families but also by other institutions such as schools, local community groups and regular social exchanges.
Evidence indicates that the values and attitudes expressed by those foreign-born individuals who are highly educated tend to resemble the values and attitudes expressed by populations in the societies they migrate to more than the values and attitudes expressed by poorly educated foreign-born individuals. Furthermore, while all foreign-born individuals undergo an acculturation process, defined as the change in culture that results from continuous, first-hand contact between two distinct cultural groups (Redfield, Linton and Herskovits, 1936[3]), the process is faster among better educated individuals. Although it was not possible to analyse in detail the acculturation process undergone by native populations, over time the influx of large numbers of individuals with a different cultural background is likely to lead to overall changes in the attitudes and values that characterise a society.

The process through which a new cultural consensus could emerge is likely to take time and lead to conflict between different views over the legitimacy of different cultural identities. Education systems can play a crucial role in the process both by socialising new generations once a consensus emerges, and by ensuring that all individuals have the ability to argue and debate with others who hold different positions in open and constructive ways.

Birthplace diversity per se does not have to pose challenges to social cohesion by lowering the overall levels of trust expressed by residents or by creating high levels of prejudice and feelings of threat among native communities. The extent to which birthplace diversity reduces social cohesion depends on the readiness of both foreign-born and native populations to learn about one another, respect one another and change to accommodate differences. While there is ample evidence that shows education is positively associated with the factors that enable individuals to build cohesive societies, the role of education and skills appears to be even more important in globalised societies, marked by the presence of large groups of foreign-born individuals with very different countries of origin.

The role of skills and competencies is likely to be crucial in the presence of high levels of birthplace diversity because without the power of rationalisation, in-group bias and the stereotyping of out of group members can lead to feelings of fear, threat and disgust towards out of group members. Stereotyping operates at a subconscious, emotional level, so much so that individuals are often unaware of their own biases. However, previous work suggests that education can reduce the weight such feelings have on individuals’ choices and behaviours by improving information processing abilities and content knowledge, skills to interpret political communication and by shaping critical thinking, decision making, and civic competences (OECD, 2010[4]).

From evidence to action: Lessons from the field including examples of policies and practices to promote social cohesion in an age of migration

This section highlights policies and practices that countries and schools have implemented to foster social cohesion through interventions by teachers, school leaders and outside professionals. Policy responses and country examples offer ways to effectively provide service delivery so that immigrant students have the support and skills necessary to overcome adversity. In particular, education and training systems can:

1. support the acquisition of skills and competences among immigrant communities
2. promote the overall social and emotional well-being of immigrants
3. recognise differences in migration-related experiences
4. build the skills that are necessary to deal with psychological and behavioural challenges arising from acculturation (among both immigrant and natives).
Support the acquisition of skills and competences among immigrant communities

Education needs to prepare young people to be globally competent. Global competence can be defined as the capacity and disposition to examine intercultural issues at the local and global levels, to understand and appreciate the perspectives and world views of others, to engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions with people from different cultures, and to act for collective well-being and sustainable development. Students can benefit from encouragement to ask questions and consider different perspectives. Learning should be focused on relevant issues that are deep, long-lasting and inscribed in a narrative about the world.

Additionally, education needs to foster cohesive social relations. Ensuring that all young people have the necessary competencies for a fulfilling work life is necessary in enhancing integration and societal cohesion through education, including fostering common values.

Imagine NB is a leadership accelerator programme created by the New Brunswick Multicultural Council (NBMC) and implemented in New Brunswick, Canada. The programme, realising the importance of immigrant youth in local prosperity, provides them the opportunity to study and engage with leaders from the community through monthly weekend workshops. Participants learn about different communities, including their own, and build a sense of belonging and empowerment to participate in their school community and beyond. The programme provides a platform for immigrant youth to grow, excel, and be better positioned to act as influencers, decision-makers and leaders in the future of New Brunswick.

Promote the overall social and emotional well-being of immigrants

Social emotional learning is often an essential component of educating immigrant children. Many of these children have experienced family separation, post-traumatic stress disorder and trauma. Furthermore, they may lack a sense of belonging and feel rejected, excluded, anxious, depressed and lonely. New arrivals can face barriers in making friends due to schools with previously solidified friendships or isolated welcome classes. While specialised classes for new arrivals may be necessary, concrete efforts need to be made by school staff to nurture relationships between students.

In the United States, Project Zero established by the Harvard Graduate School of Education, works with children and youth by placing the arts and humanities at the centre of the educational process to help prepare and develop students for their social, academic and professional lives. An example of an activity that focused on immigrants’ life experiences is from a primary school class that created a book of stories to celebrate diversity and share different perspectives. Children interviewed family members and learned how to compose stories at various workshops. For students with an immigrant background, writing can be an opportunity to share life experiences among peers, foster empathy and to help cope with trauma or difficult experiences.

Recognise differences in migration-related experiences

Immigrant and native students benefit from mutual opportunities to learn from one another. To do this, policies can be developed for existing students to learn the importance of welcoming and supporting newly arrived students. The Reading Tutor programme from New Brunswick, Canada, allows students who are native language speakers in Grade 11 and 12 enrol in a class as a tutor to assist struggling English as an Additional Language.
(EAL) readers. Both tutors and EAL readers receive course credit. This programme allows students to develop different skillsets and to form relationships between peers that continue beyond the classroom. Additionally, policies and programmes that are centred on specific interests of students (e.g. sports, arts, music, theatre, chess, volunteering) can help students develop socio-emotional links in a comfortable and familiar environment.

To encourage the development of socio-emotional links, the Multicultural Association of Fredericton (MCAF) in Canada established the Mosaic Centre to foster learning and friendships in a community setting during the school day for newcomers and native students. Serving as a meeting place, immigrant and Canadian youth socialise, play games and interact with the MCAF staff.

Build the skills that are necessary to deal with psychological and behavioural challenges arising from acculturation (among both immigrant and natives)

Teachers should be empowered to adapt their classrooms to their specific students – by using students’ cultural bases. To do this, negotiable elements of curriculum can be altered so that learning resonates with all students. Additionally, teachers should be encouraged to reflect on their own culture. Culturally sensitive professional development and initial teacher training are also important in preparing teachers for diverse classrooms. Cultural biases, which include personal beliefs and values, can be broken down through teacher education.

Leadership is crucial in accommodating new arrivals. This includes principals and other leaders that implement a school wide approach to integration and have a clear vision of how to support students. Making connections with immigrant families can also help them to remain close in cultural, linguistic and socio-emotional ways. The Canadian federal government funds the Settlement Workers in Schools (SWIS) programme that allows SWIS stakeholders act as liaisons between schools and immigrant communities. Most often, SWIS provides language and cultural translators during meetings with families, schools and teachers, playing a vital role in linking schools, parents and the community. The school workers offer guidance with regard to the school as well as provide the family’s background to schools. Luxembourg similarly employs cultural mediators to interpret and translate conversations in school settings.

Language is a powerful tool for social cohesion. Being able to speak the language that is prevalent in host communities enables immigrants to communicate with others. At the same time, being able to maintain the language of their ancestors enables immigrants to maintain their identity and sense of self. Therefore, while it is important for immigrant children to learn the host country language, education should also provide opportunities for these children to maintain their native languages. In Sweden, for example, every student is entitled to mother tongue instruction. Although finding teachers who are multilingual can be challenging, specific policies such as guaranteeing training and jobs to qualified immigrant adults as language instructors could help integrate the immigrant community and fill shortages for language teachers. Furthermore, schools could work to promote social cohesion by encouraging bilingualism, additional language learning, translanguaging and the use of intercultural mediators and translators. Such schools celebrate the linguistic differences of newcomers rather than thinking of them as a barrier. Through this encouragement and celebration of language, schools create an inclusive and welcoming environment for newcomers and their families.
Finally, to better accommodate and retain newcomers, schools and communities can prepare well in advance. A person welcomed on a daily basis, rather than just for the first few weeks, will be more likely to integrate and feel a part of the community.
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Chapter 10. Conclusions and next steps

This chapter discusses how diversity arising from international migration is just one form of diversity that teaching and support staff in schools, school leaders, education policy makers but also employers, trainers and community members more widely encounter on a daily basis. Migration also often interacts with other forms of diversity. As such, education and training systems should work in coordination with other providers of social, welfare and medical support, but also with the wider civil society to ensure that each and every individual receives the best support to thrive in terms of skills development, as well as socially and emotionally.
This synthesis report presented how the OECD’s Strength through Diversity project can help countries make the most of the OECD’s experience in providing a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems and identify and share good practices. With the lessons gleaned from the work of the Strength through Diversity project, countries have the tools to build strong communities in a context characterised by high levels of international migration. The report identified eight policy pillars that can help actors at different levels of decision making, be it policy makers, local officials, school leaders, teachers, teacher educators or school inspectors, design and implement effective policies and practices.

The report highlights the crucial importance schools, education systems and societies more widely play in ensuring not only that individuals with an immigrant background thrive in their new communities, but also that resident populations are able to process and deal with the social changes that accompany international migration. Identifying the potential risk factors that can prevent individuals from realising their potential is crucial for host countries to be able to provide adequate responses to ensure that individuals are well equipped and supported, so that risk does not translate into disadvantage and that individuals are able to overcome difficulties and thrive. Moreover, it is fundamental for education systems to identify the assets individuals have and can build upon. Strengthening such assets by working with individuals and communities can help to ensure that all individuals are put in a position where they can be of value to their communities.

A key contribution of the report is that it identifies the possible long-term effects that can arise when education systems and societies do not take adequate action to support the integration of individuals with an immigrant background for the well-being of all. These possible long-term effects include poor labour market performance, poor health and low levels of engagement in civic society organisations. Some of the economic and social consequences span more than one generation. This means that providing the tools and resources that heterogeneous communities need can have significant social and economic payoffs; however, social and economic costs of ineffective policies are steep.

For all its relevance and importance, diversity arising from international migration is just one form of diversity that teaching and support staff in schools, school leaders, education policy makers but also employers, trainers and community members more widely encounter on a daily basis. Migration also often interacts with other forms of diversity, such as cultural diversity, religious diversity, linguistic diversity, and special education needs due to disabilities, impairments, poor mental health or giftedness.

As such, education and training systems should work in coordination with other providers of social, welfare and medical support, but also with the wider civil society to ensure that each and every individual receives the best support to thrive in terms of skills development, as well as socially and emotionally.

Moreover, large-scale international migration is only one of the geopolitical and social features that characterise the new realities OECD countries are facing in 2019. Some of the societal factors that shape the demand for education and how it responds to diversity include: increased urbanisation; rising economic inequalities; evolving legal frameworks; recognising the rights of individuals with physical disabilities, learning impairments and who are suffering from poor mental health; evolving societal attitudes towards the rights of LGBTQ+ individuals and of men and women; and the challenges and opportunities offered by digital technologies.
In order for social diversity to become a strength for communities, such diversity should be recognised and taken into account in the formulation and implementation of education policy. The global education landscape has changed radically in the past decades. Anti-discrimination legislations and the momentum created by the millennium development goals means that fewer and fewer children worldwide are excluded from attending school. However, major challenges remain in ensuring that the schooling they receive is of high quality and that different groups and communities feel that education systems are relevant for them. Two non-mutually exclusive approaches to recognising and managing diversity exist: 1) the equity of educational opportunities approach and 2) the inclusive education approach.

The equity of educational opportunities approach aims to ensure that the educational attainment and achievement that an individual can expect to obtain does not depend on the social or demographic group to which he or she belongs. This means that although a large variability of educational outcomes can be observed in the population, the distribution of such outcomes should not differ systematically across individuals belonging to different social and demographic groups. It focuses on how resource allocation, assessment, evaluation, and the organisation and governance of education systems can ensure that the expected academic outcomes of different individuals do not depend on their belonging to different social groups. In practice, OECD work and the work conducted by researchers and national administrations has consistently indicated that education systems tend to be inequitable. Even in education systems that are generally defined as equitable according to this framework, differences in the distribution of education outcomes are generally present. What makes education systems “equitable” is that differences in students’ outcomes tend to be less pronounced than in other systems. For example, immigrant students and individuals who belong to ethnic groups that differ from the majority ethnic group in a country tend to perform less well academically than students without an immigrant background and students from the majority ethnic group (OECD, 2018[1]).

One way in which the equity of educational opportunities approach has traditionally aimed to achieve its goals is by disregarding differences and promoting the assimilation and homogenisation of individuals who differ from the majority. Unfortunately, this has often prompted convergence to the majority’s language, cultural references, educational standards and objectives, where no differences in the expected outcomes of members of different social and demographic groups can exist in the absence of different social and demographic groups. However, this approach negates individuals’ identity and sense of self-worth. It implicitly views diversity as a problem to be eliminated rather than an asset that can lead to positive outcomes with the right levels of recognition and investments.

By contrast, inclusive education is “an on-going process aimed at offering quality education for all, while respecting diversity and the different needs and abilities, characteristics and learning expectations of the students and communities, eliminating all forms of discrimination” (UNESCO, 2009[2]). More than a particular policy or practice related to a specific group of students/individuals, this definition embodies the ethos of inclusion (Rutkowski, Rutkowski and Engel, 2014[3]) and identifies communities of learners, shifting the focus of attention from the individual to the communal (Lynn Boscardin and Jacobson, 1997[4]). The development of inclusive education policies builds on anti-discrimination policies and the identification of compensatory mechanisms in education to create systems that are accessible, acceptable and adaptable to learners’ needs (Osler and Starkey, 2005[5]).
Inclusive education is a long-term, dynamic, and ever-evolving process. By default, it can never be expected to succeed in completely achieving a set of operational objectives because, while principles and goals can remain fixed, the ever-changing landscape of social and demographic diversity will require continuous adjustments in goals and standards. Moreover, the operational objectives and indicators used to measure success will perpetually shift and inevitably reveal imperfections. In this supposed short-coming, we are in fact provided an insight into one of the key strengths of inclusive education systems: its ability to adapt to new changes and needs, and reject rigid structures in favour of innovative responses.
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The OECD is a unique forum where governments work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The European Union takes part in the work of the OECD.

OECD Publishing disseminates widely the results of the Organisation’s statistics gathering and research on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as the conventions, guidelines and standards agreed by its members.
Migration has been at the centre of policy debates across the OECD in recent years. This synthesis report identifies eight pillars of policy-making that the Strength through Diversity project has revealed to be crucial if education systems to effectively support newcomers. For each pillar, the report details a set of principles driving the design and implementation of system-level policies and school-level practices. The eight pillars are: 1. consider the heterogeneity of immigrant populations, 2. develop approaches to promote the overall well-being of immigrants, 3. address the unique needs of refugee students, 4. ensure that motivation translates into a key asset for immigrant communities, 5. organise resources to reduce the influence of socio-economic status on the outcomes of immigrants, 6. provide comprehensive language support, 7. build the capacity of teachers to deal with diversity, and 8. break down barriers to social cohesion while ensuring effective service delivery.