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Migration, Adult Education and Learning

People have always been on the move, but the scale and speed of transnational migration is unprecedented in today’s world. It is estimated that in 2015 there were around 244 million international migrants in the world, which accounted for about 3.3 per cent of the global population. Around 157 million of the migrants resided in high-income countries, and nearly half of all international migrants originated in Asia, particular in China and India (IOM 2017). There are multiple reasons for individuals to move: we move for marriage and family reasons, for education, for work and for humanitarian reasons. Migration might be voluntary; or it can be forced, for example, refugees fleeing persecution, displacement caused by environmental disasters, climate change, prolonged conflict, grinding poverty and dispossession of land. The transnational flow of people however tells a larger historical tale than individual stories. It speaks of the global trend for nation states to use preferential immigration policies to appeal to educated people and skilled workers. OECD countries have clearly benefited from this global competition for talents by attracting an increasing number of permanent migrants over the years amongst all the OECD countries, with a dipping of migration flows in 2016 only in the United Kingdom, Israel and Denmark (OECD 2017). The flow of transnational migration is also a manifestation of growing global inequalities and the scale of humanitarian crises in the twenty first century. There are an estimated 65.6 million forcibly displaced people worldwide, amongst them 22.5 million refugees and 2.8 million asylum-seekers. The vast majority remain in countries in the geographical south, and in particular countries neighbouring conflict-affected areas. Just 17% of all refugees are hosted in European countries with the largest number, almost 3 million, in Turkey (UNHCR 2017). The complex mix of reasons for migration, coupled with intersecting differences of race, ethnicity, gender, social class and educational background shape the opportunities and outcomes of migrants in the country of destination.

Transnational migration poses challenges for adult education, not least because it exposes a terrain of new language, not all of which are shared and some of which are contested. It is useful therefore to start with a clarification and provide a rationale for the terminology we have used in this editorial. We have used migrant as opposed to immigrant (or emigrant) as this captures the greater complexity, fluidity and temporaneous nature of migration which can include, for example, return/circular/serial migration. We have used the concept of transnationalism and transnational migrants, rather than international as it encourages an understanding of the way that migrants are simultaneously embedded in multiple societies. Not only does it recognise the ongoing links between migrants and their country of origin, it also draws attention to the way that migration is experienced by those who have never physically moved, for example, the communities in which migrants come to live (Morrice 2018). Integration and inclusion are both critical terms in migration and education, and both beg questions: Inclusion/integration into what? To what extent should social institutions such as education adapt and change to accommodate the multifaceted challenges resulting from transnational migration? Integration and inclusion strategies often implicitly assume a deficit model in which migrants require intervention in order to be included or integrated, while the institutions and broader society remains largely unchanged. We have used the concept of integration here which we understand to be a two-way process involving mutual accommodation and change on the part of both the migrant and host society (e.g. Council of Europe 2004; Ager and Strang 2008). Finally, over the past decade and a half there has been a growing backlash against multiculturalism in public discourses across Europe (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010). Critics have argued that multiculturalism has failed to address enduring inequalities between different ethnic groups, that it assumes essentialised notions of ‘culture’, and that there has been too much emphasis on celebrating cultural difference at the expense of addressing concerns about integration and community cohesion. Partly in response to some of the criticisms of multiculturalism adult
education commentators have pointed to ‘intercultural’ learning. They have underscored the importance of cultural dialogue and exchange (Morrice 2018), and pedagogical practices which open educative spaces for challenging fixed and binary notions of cultural groups (e.g. Roets, Vandenabeele, Bouverne-De Bie 2011, Wildemeersch 2011). However, the concepts of ‘culture’, ‘multicultural’ and ‘intercultural’ remain contested and are imbued with different meanings in different contexts and languages. This editorial does not attempt to provide definitive answers, or to be prescriptive, but to open up debate on how we use language and how we might move towards shared understandings.

This special issue is based on the observation that in the context of such high levels of transnational migration adult education and learning has a key role to play. State funded education for migrants has been narrowly framed and often limited to language, culture and employment training, while the education needs of the longer term settled population in relation to transnational migration have been largely ignored. In the face of such neglect, civil society and community organisations are opening spaces for welcoming migrants and developing anti-racist initiatives geared towards challenging the marginalization, segregation, and racism that migrants experience in their everyday work and lives. It is also an invitation to turn the gaze within so that we become reflective of how policies and practices in adult education can be implicated (often complicit) in the (re)production of the dominant social and cultural order (Kukovetz & Sprung 2014; Shan, 2015a). This special issue brings together a collection of articles that explore both actions and reflections in the field of transnational migration, education and learning. It contains eight papers from three continents that address issues ranging from prior learning recognition, subject formation, learning through mobile technology, multiculturalism, everyday multiculturalism and intercultural learning.

The difficulties that migrants face in transferring existing skills, qualifications and competences to new contexts is the subject of a growing body of scholarship (e.g. Andersson and Guo 2009; Guo and Shan 2013; Sprung 2013). Finding ways of validating prior learning (both formal and non-formal learning) has been recognised as a tool for facilitating and promoting migrant inclusion in the labour market. However, attention to how such processes are enacted has shown that it is also a process which can reinforce inequalities by entrenching migrants’ weaker position in the labour market and placing them in lower status categories (Diedrich 2013), and it does not overcome prejudice against overseas qualifications, which is particularly a problem facing migrants from low-income countries (Guo 2015; Morrice 2011). Drawing on a sociology of translation approach, Rita Bencivenga’s paper contributes to this literature by bringing a critical lens to the context in which recognition of prior learning takes place. Her paper explores how informal initial assessment procedures shape the employment pathways of migrants in Italy well before formal validation or recognition of prior learning takes place. She describes how migrants become ‘formatted’, reinventing themselves to fit the employment market of the different organisations providing employment services. In the process migrants’ prior knowledge, skills and their aspirations become disregarded as they present themselves as flexible and pliable subjects. Her research highlights how processes of recognising prior learning are situated in local realities which shape practices, and consequently the outcomes for migrants.

Sue Webb’s paper also examines the way that migrants learn to adapt and reposition themselves in response to the employment market. She explores the informal learning of migrants in the workplace and in volunteering contexts. Framing her analysis with Mezirow’s transformative learning theory she draws attention to how social networks and learning communities are integral to
how migrants manage the self in order to become accepted by others and accepted into the workforce. Her paper identifies the difference between learning communities in the workplace, where a hierarchy of the value of experiences/skills from different cultural contexts is established and where migrants were often expected to relinquish previous identities and practices; and learning communities which enable opportunities for two-way intercultural learning and where relationships were more equal and voluntary. Migrants, who had learned that their former identities or habits were devalued, developed a strategy to show an ‘assimilated’ public face in some contexts, whilst presenting themselves in different ways in communities where they felt their previous experiences were recognised and seen as adding value to the work environment. While this strategy may be functional Webb points out that it can at the same time be experienced as injurious. Like Bencivenga’s paper, this study draws attention to the importance of understanding the context in which learning and social practices take place.

Most Western states have been tightening control of their national borders, either through stricter immigration rules, or through points based entry systems which assess the skills and qualifications of those wishing to enter. Adult education has been given an increasing role in these immigration regimes, witnessed for example, in the proliferation of language and cultural knowledge-related requirements for migrants wishing to enter some countries, and to gain citizenship. Such policies have been criticised for the assumptions of deficit on which they are based, for their sifting and assimilative role rather than a concern to integrate migrants on an equal basis (Morrice 2017). Three papers in this special issue examine state-run programmes for migrants, and explore in particular the processes of ‘subject making’ which more or less explicitly underpin different programmes. Alisha Heinemann’s paper provides a critique of citizenship and language classes for migrants in Austria and Germany. Drawing on postcolonial theory, and in particular the idea of classrooms as ‘contact zones’ Heinemann argues that language classes in Austria and Germany have a ‘civilising mission’, stabilising and reproducing hegemonic Eurocentric norms and values. She argues that three linked subject types are produced through these classes: the economic, the submissive and the othered subject; although these subjects might appear to be included in society they are in fact located in the outer margins of society, a space Heinemann calls ‘inside-outside’. Her paper also draws attention to the way that staff in colleges are increasingly required to check entitlement and control access to classes; an example of everyday policing which has quietly crept into the life of educational and other public institutions.

Srabani Maitra’s paper also addresses the process of subject making within educational settings, this time through employment-related training programmes offered by Canadian Government funded resettlement agencies. Maitra examines career training programs for female South Asian professional migrants to show how individuals are not only trained to internalize an ‘entrepreneurial self’ (Bröckling 2015), but also to adapt to a certain hegemonic (white) enterprise culture in which racialised migrants seem not to fit in – for example in terms of dressing, moving, talking, etc. Like Heinemann, she problematizes the underlying (Eurocentric) notion of ‘citizenship’ underpinning these courses, and shows how learners experience constant devaluation of their former skills, habits and ways of living. While many women tried their best to adapt to the demands, some learners also remained critical about the trainings and rejected certain requirements.

Subject formation is not merely about the kind of citizens desired in the host societies, it is essentially a means of governance, both governance of the bodies of migrants, and governance of migrant training services. Andres Fejes and Magnus Dahlstedt’s study of policy and program-related documents of a language training program in Sweden makes this point clear. Specifically, using Foucault-inspired discourse analysis, Fejes and Dahlstedt identify two notions of inclusion operating
through the program in converging but also conflicting ways. One is a narrow and instrumentalist focus on inclusion based on employability, and the other a broader notion about becoming participating members of the larger society. Together, these discourses produce migrants as ‘deficit, as ignorant and unhealthy’ subjects. The paper also notes that through mobilizing the notion of philanthropy in the program documents, the state also manages to shift responsibility of training to private and civil society organisations, which constitute a form of governing associated with the neoliberal regime.

Anna Jones and colleagues’ paper takes us from the classroom to learning in informal settings. This paper builds on relatively recent initiatives which deploy mobile technologies to assist migrants’ language learning and social integration (Kukulska-Hulme et al. 2012; Pearson 2011; Ruge 2012). It reports on a UK field trial of the MASELTOV project: Mobile assistance for social inclusion and empowerment of migrants with persuasive learning technologies and social network services, which aims to develop information technologies to help migrants’ language learning and social inclusion. This trial involves the development of mobile devices and tools that offer language lessons designed to meet migrants’ situational language needs in everyday life, as well as a social forum for peer support and learning through interactions. While these mobile devices are designed to be used out and about in the city, the authors find that these learning tools are often not used “on the go” in public spaces, but in more private spaces such as home, on long journeys or at work. Additionally the study also suggests that the program contributed to social justice in that it enabled migrants to participate in local activities and helped migrants develop practical language skills, which may have led to the enhancement of their confidence. Meanwhile the authors also caution that mobile learning cannot replace social support and resources such as mentors or volunteers to facilitate the use of such technologies.

Debate around the ideological underpinning of multiculturalism abounds in Canada (Li 1999, Ng 1991). Nevertheless, Shibao Guo’s historical overview shows, multiculturalism remains firmly embedded in policy and has a role in supporting successful migrant integration. Anchoring his discussion in a case study of a Chinese cultural centre, Guo draws attention to the important informal and formal learning opportunities afforded by cultural spaces and the role of community activism in initiating and maintaining them. However, the paper ends on a less optimistic note when he argues that multiculturalism is also evoking anxieties about ethno-specific organisations and that Canada too is moving towards more assimilative policies and practices.

There is also a growing critique of the way that adult education interventions focus on the perceived needs of migrants, while ignoring the learning that might be helpful and necessary to the host society if integration of migrants is to be successful (Morrice 2018, Shan 2015b). Rick Flowers and Elaine Swan’s paper reports on an Australian project designed to open up such educative spaces and to provide learning opportunities for both migrants and members of the host community. ‘The Welcome Diner’ brings together newcomers and “established Austrians” over a potluck in “the comfort of their own home”. During the process, a trained facilitator supports the sharing of stories about the food that participants bring. Influenced by the ethnographic tradition, the study focuses on the micro-contexts of the dinners and the minute activities and techniques that facilitators use in hosting. Theoretically, the authors frame these potluck meetings as “embodied and cognitive experimentation” that enable the rise of new knowledge and new social relations. The Welcome Dinners is an exemplar case of “designed everyday multiculturalism” as it aims to facilitate convivial intercultural contacts, attachments and commensal relationship. The authors also coined the term of ‘food hospitality activism’ and it is hoped that by facilitating connections between people of diverse racial backgrounds, the program can help address issues related to social injustice and racism. The
paper speaks to a larger interest in, and a dynamic of possibilities that may arise from everyday multiculturalism (see for example, Shan & Walter 2014, Wise 2011, Wise & Velayutham 2014).

An uncomfortable narrative of new modes of exclusion, new hierarchies and new forms of racism runs through some of the submissions in this Special Issue; these processes are often masked by neo-liberal meritocratic discourses and populist tropes of shared cultural values and threats to national identity. With an estimated 2.7 million refugees arriving in the European Union in 2015 and 2016, and increasing numbers of refugees being resettled to countries such as Australia and Canada, the need for education research and practices which explicitly addresses inequalities and challenges these new modalities of racism has never been more urgent.

The special issue also offers some pointers for the future development of the field of adult education and migration. First of all, this collection of papers highlights the need for adult educators and researchers to become highly reflexive of how educational and training programs have been implicated in the production of a racial contract (Mills, 1997) that sets the conditions for migrants’ integration. There is a need for critical and innovative efforts to interrogate if not to disrupt the dominant Eurocentric cultural and social order that shape the subject positions of the cultural others. Secondly, the special issue points to the rich potentials in the use of new and mobile technologies and the role of informal educative spaces whether in multicultural centres or created through food hospitality and similar initiatives that may foster alternative politics and social relations. Finally, there is scope for further research into practice which embraces the learning of both migrants and longer term settled communities, and into practices which enable migrants to determine their own learning needs and set their own goals.

While this special issues brings together diverse theoretical traditions and paradigms – notably critical theories, postcolonial theories, post structural theories, and other constructivist approaches, and experiences from three different continents, there are some important omissions in this Special Issue. We hope that this issue should not conjure a (binary) image that migrant newcomers and the hosts as the only subjects and voices in adult education and learning in the context of mobility and diversity. In settler colonial countries such as Australia, Canada and US, there is an ethical imperative to engage the perspectives of indigenous communities, who have suffered from the damaging impact of a colonial history, on issues related to migration, education and integration. Also of note, we are missing the perspective from the ‘sending’ countries in the global south – the low-income countries, the countries caught up in prolonged conflict, poverty and environmental disasters, and the transit countries through which migrants pass. That is, the focus of adult education and migration has tended to be from Western perspective from the global north. To explore innovative policy, pedagogies and practices, and to engage in bold social imagination, we may start learning from non-Western ontologies and epistemologies.
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People have always been on the move, but the scale and speed of transnational migration is unprecedented in today’s world. It is estimated that in 2015 there were around 244 million international migrants in the world, which accounted for about 3.3 per cent of the global population. Around 157 million of the migrants resided in high-income countries, and nearly half of all international migrants originated in Asia, particular in China and India (IOM 2017). There are multiple reasons for individuals to move: we move for marriage and family reasons, for education, for work and for humanitarian reasons. Migration might be voluntary; or it can be forced, for example, refugees fleeing persecution, displacement caused by environmental disasters, climate change, prolonged conflict, grinding poverty and dispossession of land. The transnational flow of people however tells a larger historical tale than individual stories. It speaks of the global trend for nation states to use preferential immigration policies to appeal to educated people and skilled workers. OECD countries have clearly benefited from this global competition for talents by attracting an increasing number of permanent migrants over the years amongst all the OECD countries, with a dipping of migration flows in 2016 only in the United Kingdom, Israel and Denmark (OECD 2017). The flow of transnational migration is also a manifestation of growing global inequalities and the scale of humanitarian crises in the twenty first century. There are an estimated 65.6 million forcibly displaced people worldwide, amongst them 22.5 million refugees and 2.8 million asylum-seekers. The vast majority remain in countries in the geographical south, and in particular countries neighbouring conflict-affected areas. Just 17% of all refugees are hosted in European countries with the largest number, almost 3 million, in Turkey (UNHCR 2017). The complex mix of reasons for migration, coupled with intersecting differences of race, ethnicity, gender, social class and educational background shape the opportunities and outcomes of migrants in the country of destination.

Transnational migration poses challenges for adult education, not least because it exposes a terrain of new language, not all of which are shared and some of which are contested. It is useful therefore to start with a clarification and provide a rationale for the terminology we have used in this editorial. We have used migrant as opposed to immigrant (or emigrant) as this captures the greater complexity, fluidity and temporaneous nature of migration which can include, for example, return/circular/serial migration. We have used the concept of transnationalism and transnational migrants, rather than international as it encourages an understanding of the way that migrants are simultaneously embedded in multiple societies. Not only does it recognise the ongoing links between migrants and their country of origin, it also draws attention to the way that migration is experienced by those who have never physically moved, for example, the communities in which migrants come to live (Morrice 2018). Integration and inclusion are both critical terms in migration and education, and both beg questions: Inclusion/integration into what? To what extent should social institutions such as education adapt and change to accommodate the multifaceted challenges resulting from transnational migration? Integration and inclusion strategies often implicitly assume a deficit model in which migrants require intervention in order to be included or integrated, while the institutions and broader society remains largely unchanged. We have used the concept of integration here which we understand to be a two-way process involving mutual accommodation and change on the part of both the migrant and host society (e.g. Council of Europe 2004; Ager and Strang 2008). Finally, over the past decade and a half there has been a growing backlash against multiculturalism in public discourses across Europe (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010). Critics have argued that multiculturalism has failed to address enduring inequalities between different ethnic groups, that it assumes essentialised notions of ‘culture’, and that there has been too much
emphasis on celebrating cultural difference at the expense of addressing concerns about integration and community cohesion. Partly in response to some of the criticisms of multiculturalism adult education commentators have pointed to ‘intercultural’ learning. They have underscored the importance of cultural dialogue and exchange (Morrice 2018), and pedagogical practices which open educative spaces for challenging fixed and binary notions of cultural groups (e.g. Roets, Vandenabeele, Bouverne-De Bie 2011, Wildemeersch 2011). However, the concepts of ‘culture’, ‘multicultural’ and ‘intercultural’ remain contested and are imbued with different meanings in different contexts and languages. This editorial does not attempt to provide definitive answers, or to be prescriptive, but to open up debate on how we use language and how we might move towards shared understandings.

This special issue is based on the observation that in the context of such high levels of transnational migration adult education and learning has a key role to play. State funded education for migrants has been narrowly framed and often limited to language, culture and employment training, while the education needs of the longer term settled population in relation to transnational migration have been largely ignored. In the face of such neglect, civil society and community organisations are opening spaces for welcoming migrants and developing anti-racist initiatives geared towards challenging the marginalization, segregation, and racism that migrants experience in their everyday work and lives. It is also an invitation to turn the gaze within so that we become reflective of how policies and practices in adult education can be implicated (often complicit) in the (re)production of the dominant social and cultural order (Kukovetz & Sprung 2014; Shan, 2015a). This special issue brings together a collection of articles that explore both actions and reflections in the field of transnational migration, education and learning. It contains eight papers from three continents that address issues ranging from prior learning recognition, subject formation, learning through mobile technology, multiculturalism, everyday multiculturalism and intercultural learning.

The difficulties that migrants face in transferring existing skills, qualifications and competences to new contexts is the subject of a growing body of scholarship (e.g. Andersson and Guo 2009; Guo and Shan 2013; Sprung 2013). Finding ways of validating prior learning (both formal and non-formal learning) has been recognised as a tool for facilitating and promoting migrant inclusion in the labour market. However, attention to how such processes are enacted has shown that it is also a process which can reinforce inequalities by entrenching migrants’ weaker position in the labour market and placing them in lower status categories (Diedrich 2013), and it does not overcome prejudice against overseas qualifications, which is particularly a problem facing migrants from low-income countries (Guo 2015; Morrice 2011). Drawing on a sociology of translation approach, Rita Bencivenga’s paper contributes to this literature by bringing a critical lens to the context in which recognition of prior learning takes place. Her paper explores how informal initial assessment procedures shape the employment pathways of migrants in Italy well before formal validation or recognition of prior learning takes place. She describes how migrants become ‘formatted’, reinventing themselves to fit the employment market of the different organisations providing employment services. In the process migrants’ prior knowledge, skills and their aspirations become disregarded as they present themselves as flexible and pliable subjects. Her research highlights how processes of recognising prior learning are situated in local realities which shape practices, and consequently the outcomes for migrants.

Sue Webb’s paper also examines the way that migrants learn to adapt and reposition themselves in response to the employment market. She explores the informal learning of migrants in the
workplace and in volunteering contexts. Framing her analysis with Mezirow’s transformative learning theory she draws attention to how social networks and learning communities are integral to how migrants manage the self in order to become accepted by others and accepted into the workforce. Her paper identifies the difference between learning communities in the workplace, where a hierarchy of the value of experiences/skills from different cultural contexts is established and where migrants were often expected to relinquish previous identities and practices; and learning communities which enable opportunities for two-way intercultural learning and where relationships were more equal and voluntary. Migrants, who had learned that their former identities or habits were devalued, developed a strategy to show an ‘assimilated’ public face in some contexts, whilst presenting themselves in different ways in communities where they felt their previous experiences were recognised and seen as adding value to the work environment. While this strategy may be functional Webb points out that it can at the same time be experienced as injurious. Like Bencivenga’s paper, this study draws attention to the importance of understanding the context in which learning and social practices take place.

Most Western states have been tightening control of their national borders, either through stricter immigration rules, or through points based entry systems which assess the skills and qualifications of those wishing to enter. Adult education has been given an increasing role in these immigration regimes, witnessed for example, in the proliferation of language and cultural knowledge-related requirements for migrants wishing to enter some countries, and to gain citizenship. Such policies have been criticised for the assumptions of deficit on which they are based, for their sifting and assimilative role rather than a concern to integrate migrants on an equal basis (Morrice 2017). Three papers in this special issue examine state-run programmes for migrants, and explore in particular the processes of ‘subject making’ which more or less explicitly underpin different programmes. Alisha Heinemann’s paper provides a critique of citizenship and language classes for migrants in Austria and Germany. Drawing on postcolonial theory, and in particular the idea of classrooms as ‘contact zones’ Heinemann argues that language classes in Austria and Germany have a ‘civilising mission’, stabilising and reproducing hegemonic Eurocentric norms and values. She argues that three linked subject types are produced through these classes: the economic, the submissive and the othered subject; although these subjects might appear to be included in society they are in fact located in the outer margins of society, a space Heinemann calls ‘inside-outside’. Her paper also draws attention to the way that staff in colleges are increasingly required to check entitlement and control access to classes; an example of everyday policing which has quietly crept into the life of educational and other public institutions.

Srabani Maitra’s paper also addresses the process of subject making within educational settings, this time through employment-related training programmes offered by Canadian Government funded resettlement agencies. Maitra examines career training programs for female South Asian professional migrants to show how individuals are not only trained to internalize an ‘entrepreneurial self’ (Bröckling 2015), but also to adapt to a certain hegemonic (white) enterprise culture in which racialised migrants seem not to fit in – for example in terms of dressing, moving, talking, etc. Like Heinemann, she problematizes the underlying (Eurocentric) notion of ‘citizenship’ underpinning these courses, and shows how learners experience constant devaluation of their former skills, habits and ways of living. While many women tried their best to adapt to the demands, some learners also remained critical about the trainings and rejected certain requirements.

Subject formation is not merely about the kind of citizens desired in the host societies, it is essentially a means of governance, both governance of the bodies of migrants, and governance of migrant training services. Andres Fejes and Magnus Dahlstedt’s study of policy and program-related
documents of a language training program in Sweden makes this point clear. Specifically, using Foucault-inspired discourse analysis, Fejes and Dahlstedt identify two notions of inclusion operating through the program in converging but also conflicting ways. One is a narrow and instrumentalist focus on inclusion based on employability, and the other a broader notion about becoming participating members of the larger society. Together, these discourses produce migrants as ‘deficit, as ignorant and unhealthy’ subjects. The paper also notes that through mobilizing the notion of philanthropy in the program documents, the state also manages to shift responsibility of training to private and civil society organisations, which constitute a form of governing associated with the neoliberal regime.

Anna Jones and colleagues’ paper takes us from the classroom to learning in informal settings. This paper builds on relatively recent initiatives which deploy mobile technologies to assist migrants’ language learning and social integration (Kukulska-Hulme et al. 2012; Pearson 2011; Ruge 2012). It reports on a UK field trail of the MASELTOV project: Mobile assistance for social inclusion and empowerment of migrants with persuasive learning technologies and social network services, which aims to develop information technologies to help migrants’ language learning and social inclusion.

This trial involves the development of mobile devices and tools that offer language lessons designed to meet migrants’ situational language needs in everyday life, as well as a social forum for peer support and learning through interactions. While these mobile devices are designed to be used out and about in the city, the authors find that these learning tools are often not used “on the go” in public spaces, but in more private spaces such as home, on long journeys or at work. Additionally the study also suggests that the program contributed to social justice in that it enabled migrants to participate in local activities and helped migrants develop practical language skills, which may have led to the enhancement of their confidence. Meanwhile the authors also caution that mobile learning cannot replace social support and resources such as mentors or volunteers to facilitate the use of such technologies.

Debate around the ideological underpinning of multiculturalism abounds in Canada (Li 1999, Ng 1991). Nevertheless, Shibao Guo’s historical overview shows, multiculturalism remains firmly embedded in policy and has a role in supporting successful migrant integration. Anchoring his discussion in a case study of a Chinese cultural centre, Guo draws attention to the important informal and formal learning opportunities afforded by cultural spaces and the role of community activism in initiating and maintaining them. However, the paper ends on a less optimistic note when he argues that multiculturalism is also evoking anxieties about ethno-specific organisations and that Canada too is moving towards more assimilative policies and practices.

There is also a growing critique of the way that adult education interventions focus on the perceived needs of migrants, while ignoring the learning that might be helpful and necessary to the host society if integration of migrants is to be successful (Morrice 2018, Shan 2015b). Rick Flowers and Elaine Swan’s paper reports on an Australian project designed to open up such educative spaces and to provide learning opportunities for both migrants and members of the host community. ‘The Welcome Diner’ brings together newcomers and “established Austrians” over a potluck in “the comfort of their own home”. During the process, a trained facilitator supports the sharing of stories about the food that participants bring. Influenced by the ethnographic tradition, the study focuses on the micro-contexts of the dinners and the minute activities and techniques that facilitators use in hosting. Theoretically, the authors frame these potluck meetings as “embodied and cognitive experimentation” that enable the rise of new knowledge and new social relations. The Welcome Dinners is an exemplar case of “designed everyday multiculturalism” as it aims to facilitate convivial intercultural contacts, attachments and commensal relationship. The authors also coined the term of
‘food hospitality activism’ and it is hoped that by facilitating connections between people of diverse racial backgrounds, the program can help address issues related to social injustice and racism. The paper speaks to a larger interest in, and a dynamic of possibilities that may arise from everyday multiculturalism (see for example, Shan & Walter 2014, Wise 2011, Wise & Velayutham 2014).

An uncomfortable narrative of new modes of exclusion, new hierarchies and new forms of racism runs through some of the submissions in this Special Issue; these processes are often masked by neo-liberal meritocratic discourses and populist tropes of shared cultural values and threats to national identity. With an estimated 2.7 million refugees arriving in the European Union in 2015 and 2016, and increasing numbers of refugees being resettled to countries such as Australia and Canada, the need for education research and practices which explicitly addresses inequalities and challenges these new modalities of racism has never been more urgent.

The special issue also offers some pointers for the future development of the field of adult education and migration. First of all, this collection of papers highlights the need for adult educators and researchers to become highly reflexive of how educational and training programs have been implicated in the production of a racial contract (Mills, 1997) that sets the conditions for migrants’ integration. There is a need for critical and innovative efforts to interrogate if not to disrupt the dominant Eurocentric cultural and social order that shape the subject positions of the cultural others. Secondly, the special issue points to the rich potentials in the use of new and mobile technologies and the role of informal educative spaces whether in multicultural centres or created through food hospitality and similar initiatives that may foster alternative politics and social relations. Finally, there is scope for further research into practice which embraces the learning of both migrants and longer term settled communities, and into practices which enable migrants to determine their own learning needs and set their own goals.

While this special issues brings together diverse theoretical traditions and paradigms – notably critical theories, postcolonial theories, post structural theories, and other constructivist approaches, and experiences from three different continents, there are some important omissions in this Special Issue. We hope that this issue should not conjure a (binary) image that migrant newcomers and the hosts as the only subjects and voices in adult education and learning in the context of mobility and diversity. In settler colonial countries such as Australia, Canada and US, there is an ethical imperative to engage the perspectives of indigenous communities, who have suffered from the damaging impact of a colonial history, on issues related to migration, education and integration. Also of note, we are missing the perspective from the ‘sending’ countries in the global south – the low-income countries, the countries caught up in prolonged conflict, poverty and environmental disasters, and the transit countries through which migrants pass. That is, the focus of adult education and migration has tended to be from Western perspective from the global north. To explore innovative policy, pedagogies and practices, and to engage in bold social imagination, we may start learning from non-Western ontologies and epistemologies.
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