The Reception of New Migrants in French Urban and Rural Schools: Comparing the Cases of Bulgarian Roma and Syrian Refugees

Claire Schiff
University of Bordeaux

Alexandra Clavé-Mercier
University of Bordeaux

This article examines the ways in which schools in France face the challenges posed by new types of migrant and refugee pupils. It is based on comparative ethnographic fieldwork carried out in various localities of a French department and on interviews with school personnel confronted with the arrival of children from two groups who embody the perceived distinction between undesirable economic migrants and deserving refugees. The first are children of isolated families of resettled Syrian refugees welcomed in rural localities by groups of engaged citizens. The second are Bulgarian Roma children living in precarious conditions in a large metropolitan city where they tend to be segregated within certain schools and classes. The comparison shows that special provisions for such students do not necessarily contribute to their inclusion, while the concerted mobilization of various actors, even in the absence of special services, favors their educational and social inclusion. When support for these children becomes everyone's business, it encourages educational innovation and the acceptance of cultural and linguistic differences.

Keywords: migrant and refugee reception, minority schooling, French educational policy and practice, rural versus urban contexts, resettled Syrians, Bulgarian Roma

INTRODUCTION

The French school system represents what Mons (2007) calls "the uniform integration model". This model hinders individualized teaching practices when dealing with student heterogeneity. It tends to manage differences in performance and progress between pupils by grouping students into classes with varying levels or by making the weakest students repeat a year (Mons, 2007). In such a system, the treatment of newly arrived pupils, especially if they are non-French speakers, often oscillates between on the one hand pressure in favor of "academic assimilation" through rapid immersion into regular classes and on the other a reflex of "segregation" into specific programs and tracks that are usually not articulated with general education (Schiff & Zoïa 2004; Schiff & Fouquet-Chauprade, 2011).

However, over the past ten years or so, French schools have been making increasing efforts to take into account what they call "pupils with special educational needs", in particular through attempts to present their differences as enriching. This is evidenced by the shift from the designation of migrants as "non-French speakers" to "foreign language speakers *(allophones)",* as well as the replacement of "reception

classes" by "pedagogical units for newcomer foreign language pupils" (UPE2A), which are supposed to offer greater flexibility in the management of school inclusion (Mendonça-Dias, 2016). Nevertheless, the support offered to migrant pupils continues to pose a problem for a school system that remains standardized in its content and evaluation methods and for teachers with little training in taking linguistic and cultural diversity into account (Schiff, 2011).

Based on a study conducted in different localities of the same French region[1], this article focuses on the adjustments made by the educational establishment in order to deal with the difficulties posed by the arrival of children from migrant populations who were not previously present in France. These are, on the one hand, Bulgarian Roma living in disadvantaged urban neighborhoods, who fall under the category of "economic" migration and, on the other hand, "resettled" Syrian refugees who have been granted asylum due to the war in their country.

Although the analysis of these categories from a critical perspective is necessary in a society that constructs and over-publicizes the "migration crisis" (and will be carried out in the first part), the difference in the contexts of departure and of reception of these migrants must also be taken into consideration. The Syrians in question constitute a controlled and over-selected migration via the resettlement program of the High Commission for Refugees[2], with an initial settlement in rural areas. As for the Bulgarians, they constitute de facto an uncontrolled intra-European migration who chooses mainly to settle in urban areas.

The field research was carried out in three schools located in a neighborhood heavily marked by the presence of Bulgarian pupils in a city of about 245,000 inhabitants on the one hand, and on the other hand in the schools of six communes (with populations ranging from 1.000 to 30.000 residents) of a neighboring rural department in which a number of Syrian families have been individually "resettled". The spatio-temporal frameworks of the migration and settlement of these two populations differ markedly and we shall see that this has an impact on the practices and representations of the "hosts". When we undertook our study the Syrian refugees had only recently arrived in France (between 6 and 12 months earlier), whereas the Bulgarians had been living in the city for several years. The reception offered to Syrian refugees is based on the principle that they will remain in France in the medium or long term, given the situation in their country and their legal status, whereas Bulgarians have benefitted from freedom of movement and employment in Europe since 2013.

As far as their settlement patterns are concerned, we can therefore note that while the refugees are isolated and immersed in the surrounding society, the Bulgarian Roma are concentrated in certain neighborhoods. Generally speaking, we shall see that depending on whether the Other is viewed in singular or collective terms the hosts either tend to perceive the newcomers as representatives of a shared humanity (Simmel, 1908) or, conversely, as members of a group with its own culture and organization far removed from the norms of the host society (Park, 1924). Thus, regardless of the characteristics of the newcomers, the logic of exclusion or inclusion unfolds in local contexts which need to be analyzed (Elias & Scotson, 1997).

By comparing two situations which are a priori very different, this article addresses several questions concerning the place of migrant pupils within the French educational establishment. How are they perceived and dealt with by the various actors? How can we explain that the schooling of these children "works" or "does not work" in the eyes of educators? How can we justify the links or discrepancies between the school's demands and the children's investment or progress? This is an exploratory article, based on an ethnographic approach favoring data collected through observations and interviews with school and out-of-school actors such as teachers, supervisory staff, parents, local elected officials, and volunteers who have been accompanying these children[3].

Our approach began by analyzing the specific situations (starting from a school or a municipality involved in the reception of a family), by way of collective discussions followed by individual interviews with the main actors involved, in order to collect and contrast different points of view on the same situation[4]. The fieldwork concerning the Bulgarians is an extension of previous research work on their migratory dynamics and the reception policies to which they were subjected (Clavé-Mercier, 2014).

The article will show that these new migratory and new educational challenges which involve either dispersion or concentration of migrants generate contrasting types of care and specific arrangements, be they educational or extra-curricular. Thus, we can distinguish between the opening of classes called UPE2A NSA[5] (Pedagogical Unit for Allophone Pupils Arriving Without Previous Schooling) intended for Bulgarians living in poor conditions on the one hand, and a global objective of rapid immersion of the Syrian children participating in the resettlement program on the other.

We will see that these different arrangements function more or less well - at least, neither one nor the other seems to work in an obvious way *a priori*. Although one might think that a privileged support network, with many different actors working with the family, would facilitate school integration, we will see that for this to happen, there must exist a minimum of coherence and consultation between the different participants concerning the objectives and the distribution of roles, as well as a willingness on the part of the migrants to profit from the available resources and to answer the demands that are addressed to them.

Contrasting Initial Terms of Reception and Differing Local Contexts

The following ethnographic vignettes aim at illustrating how the two types of new migrants are viewed through situations that highlight the particularities of each of them and make it possible to understand the issues raised by their presence in school.

A School Overwhelmed by Bulgarians

The elementary school B. is located in the center of a large city. It has seven classes for a total of 176 pupils and is not classified as a REP (Priority Educational Network)[6], as the district is not listed as an "urban policy" area due to its proximity to a more upper middle-class sector from which it receives few pupils. The director has regularly made requests to the National Education Department in order to obtain this label and the accompagnying extra ressources, but without success. The school's student body is very polarized between disadvantaged and problem children and middle-class children from (what the French call) *bobos* (*bourgeois-bohème)* families, which, as he emphasizes, represents a real "pedagogical challenge". There is also a particularly high concentration of foreign language pupils in the school because the neighboring schools do not want them: "I have ten foreign language speakers who should have been elsewhere" stated the school head.

According to him, the heads of neighboring schools use strategies to plan limited enrollment of new pupils according to what suits them or argue that they are taking in other groups deemed "difficult" in order to justify rejecting the Roma children. This school thus thirty Bulgarian Turkish-speaking pupils, one non Turkish-speaking Bulgarian and two Romanian pupils, which represent in total about 20% of the school's population. Not all of them are newcomers, "but even those who are not newcomers often do not master the French language: some N0s (about eight or nine), N1s and N2s. Some are NSA (previously unschooled)"[7].

The large influx of Bulgarian pupils into the school dates back to two years before our study. Many of these pupils live in dilapidated apartments and some reside in squats or slums. With more than 25 pupils per class, there are about five non-French speaking Bulgarian pupils in each class. This creates major difficulties for the teachers, who worry about how to deal with these pupils without neglecting the others. The teachers also face problems of communication with the families, as well as with the social services, as they do not benefit from translators, and because they generally have "zero means"[8].

A Year Long Preparation for the Arrival of One Syrian Family

> "It is simply beautiful. Six children smiling broadly. Their parents happy to see them roaming around in a big house that the neighbors helped to furnish. Classmates concerned about the proper understanding of the newcomers who, five months ago, could not speak a word of French. And a caring city councilor godmother who accompanies them in their new life"[9].

This is the picture of the situation drawn up by a journalist after her meeting with this family and the elected representative of the commune of U., who proudly welcomed them. Indeed, this large village of 2500 inhabitants was the first in this rural department to respond to the call of the French government relayed by the association of Mayors of this rural department to welcome a family of refugees who had fled from Syria, within the framework of the resettlement program of the High Commission for Refugees.

In this commune, the willingness to welcome was acted upon by the Municipal Council in September 2015, shortly after the French government's call. This was followed by the requisition of a municipal dwelling furnished by a team of a dozen volunteers brought together for the occasion, and who waited for almost a year for the family to arrive. "When we launched an appeal, we did not imagine the generosity that could exist, we realized that people went out of their way to help. It triggered a beautiful surge of solidarity!"[10] stressed the local elected official in charge of the reception committee.

The commitment was indeed total for the municipality as well as for the volunteers hosting this family who had previously lived for three years in a refugee camp of a neighboring country of Syria before obtaining asylum in France: "For the municipality, this is a real political choice. The commitment was: we house them, we shelter them, we clothe them, we feed them, until they are financially autonomous, that is to say until the administrative procedures are completed." Beyond these commitments, these volunteers offer the family members support and guidance in various aspects of their daily lives during the first year, particularly with regard to the children's schooling.

Varying Degrees of Deservingness

Who are these migrants? Why are they here? It is important to take into consideration the national and international social and political context in order to understand the reception of these people. In particular, the perceptions of the hosts towards these new migrants play a determining role in the way schooling and other forms of care are envisioned and implemented.

Two terms are often used to describe the newcomers. The first one: "migrant", refers to anyone who has left his or her country, and the second: "refugee", refers to those who have had to flee from their country in order to escape danger, persecution, war, etc. The latter term has an additional meaning from a legal point of view, since a refugee is someone who has filed a successful asylum application in France. The Bulgarians are identified as migrants, while the Syrians are refugees. Although the distinction lies in the conditions which fuelled their departure from their home country, the distinction is not solely an objective or administrative one (Crawley & Skleparis, 2017), especially since it has taken on a political, even an emotional dimension, in a context of debates and tensions concerning the reception of foreigners in France.

As Scalettaris (2016) pointed out, "the debate is structured around a divided approach. Refugees are seen as people who migrate under duress or constraint and for political reasons, while migrants are seen as people who move voluntarily in order to improve their economic situation". This categorization is driven by an underlying logic, that of sorting between "good" and "bad" migrants, between those whose presence on the territory is accepted and those who have "a vocation to remain in their countries"[11] (p. 88).

Thus, if we refer to the different perceptions of the "merit" of migrants, depending on whether they are perceived as "victims" or "profiteers" (Chauvin & Garcés-Mascarenas, 2014), there is a priori a strong contrast between Syrians and Bulgarians regarding the legitimacy of their presence in France. The former, especially when they have been resettled, are recognized, and protected by the law, whereas as economic migrants are barely tolerated, *a fortiori* when they are Roma, with all the negative stereotypical representations that this identification evokes. In addition, some of the latter make regular trips back and forth between France and their country of origin, which reinforces the already existing suspicion about their "unwillingness to integrate".

The reception of Syrian refugees in France, and particularly within the framework of the resettlement program orchestrated by the High Commission for Refugees and relayed by the State (via the DIHAL [12]), is marked by the perceived legitimacy of their presence. The sense is that every territory, at every level (State, Department, municipality, institution, etc.) must "do its part" in welcoming them, precisely because of the way their situation is viewed, through compassion and the moral obligation of hospitality (Fassin,

2005; Bessone, 2015). The vocabulary of compassion is often used by the hosts to talk about these families "with a difficult past"[13].

For example, one municipality decided to host a refugee family and chose to announce the family's imminent arrival in the village newspaper presenting the situation in these terms: "We sincerely hope that our municipality will be able to take part in the appeasement of these refugees who are and have been subjected to complex, serious and risky living conditions in the midst of a civil war"[14]. In the face of these past living conditions, we have responded by proposing that this family "joins our safe and welcoming home"[15]. We find this idea at work in the school establishment, a mirror of society. The pupils in the classes hosting Syrian children have generally been informed by the teachers about the "situation in Syria", and particularly about the ongoing war.

While for the teachers, it is a question of preparing the arrival of the Syrian children as well as possible, this situation also implies an underlying expectation vis-à-vis the other pupils i.e. that they be particularly welcoming with their new friends arriving from a country at war. "They are so warm with her", said an elementary school teacher, when we asked her about the reactions of the other children to the arrival of a little girl[16]. In another situation concerning a three-year-old child in kindergarten, the hosts explained that "at the beginning they all mothered her"[17].

The Bulgarians in question here are sometimes identified as Roma, sometimes as Turkish speakers. Without going into the details of the considerations revealed by these designations and their links (or not) with endo-identifications, it should be noted that the Bulgarian migrants present in the city come from poor urban or rural territories, enclaved and socially stigmatized because they are Turks and Roma, the first two "national minorities" of the home country, who are often disparaged.

In France, social representations of Roma migrants reflect various images that are sometimes clearly negative and contribute to their stigmatization, sometimes simply "exotic" (Clavé-Mercier & Olivera, 2016). In any case, both contribute to locking these families into a collective identity perceived as problematic. Often, these two registers blend to ultimately construct the figure of the Roma migrant as undesirable and illegitimate. This construction is therefore based on an essentialization and naturalization of the cultural differences attributed to these migrants, as well as on the moral disqualification of these differences.

Coupled with visible ways of living (housing in shantytowns or poor housing, begging, etc.) and singular migratory patterns (part of the family here, the other there, a daily life organized in a transnational manner and numerous trips back and forth between the country of origin and the host country), the difficulties of the educational establishment to include these migrants are explained by these cultural and migratory specificities that are seen to compromise the care or support offered to these pupils (Clavé-Mercier, 2014a). The Bulgarians thus become a sort of "hot potato" for many actors in the educational establishment, as with other institutions.

Tensions exist, especially between schools, regarding the reception of these Bulgarians. According to the principal of school B., "As far as allophones are concerned, the other schools around were not supportive. The principal of [R.] did not want to deal with foreigners, citing the school's overcrowding. The principal of [E.] put forward the fact that they already had a CLIS (class for handicapped children) and kids from the [neighboring] city"[18]. This resulted in "tensions" at school B., which was the only one in the area to accommodate these children, who were relatively numerous at the time. A former teacher at this school recalls the words of a colleague on this issue: "I am fed up with the Turks!" and also remembers a question from the parents' representatives on the School Council: "How long will the school continue to take in foreigners?"[19].

These statements, which she still remembers several years later, testify for her to the deleterious climate caused by the concentration of these pupils, which no one seemed to want. The school director thus found that there was no "political will" from the municipality to consider the difficulties encountered in the school and to act accordingly. Having tried many times to make the situation of the school known, he is referred to as one who is "into politics". For him, there exists a real problem of communication between the different

structures (National Education, Municipality, social services...): He deplores that "we (all the actors) have never sat around a table together"[20].

By contrast, the consultations organized around a few Syrian families are sometimes over-invested and become a rare opportunity for actors who do not usually speak to each other to meet, get to know each other and exchange about issues well beyond the support of refugee families. We were able to observe this in a municipality in which, one year after the arrival of a resettled family, local representatives decided to bring together all the actors from both institutional and grassroots groups in order to take stock of the "progress" and "resistances" regarding the support system put in place. At this meeting, more than twenty people were present, representing about ten different types of local organizations[21].

If we consider the perceptions and attitudes towards these two groups, the distinction between Syrians and Bulgarians reflect opposite positions, ranging from the willingness to welcome to a sense of forced reception. The contrast between these two very different figures of otherness, the "refugees" and the "Roma", are accentuated in the present case by the individual or collective dimension of their presence.

Are These Newcomers so Different?

Despite this apparent contrast in the perception of these new migrants, there are nevertheless common features between these groups, both of which call into question the way in which the French educational institution deals with foreign pupils.

Language and Communication Barriers

"The problem is that of language and the relationship to school, which we have difficulties in resolving"[22]. The difficulty of communicating with and about the children and their parents is a recurrent issue in the discourse on "the Bulgarians". This fact is systematically linked to that of their numbers : "The difficulty arises when there are a lot of children who all speak the same language"[23]. The means for translation which are virtually non-existent is the main issue mentioned when members of the school establishment speak about this group. A budget for translation is allocated to schools concerned by Urban Policy measures, yet it is used mainly for educational teams, for situations defined as "problematic" and it is not sufficient to ensure day-to-day communication. Schools that do not benefit from this budget but are faced with the same needs must deal with limited communications between parents, teachers and pupils.

"With the Syrians, the problem is the language. The most complicated thing has been to communicate"[24]. All of the educational and non-educational actors welcoming Syrians first point out this difficulty. The head of the resettlement program in the department described translation as a "major problem in the municipalities"[25]. While, for Syrian families, the school has the possibility of having recourse to makeshift interpreters found by volunteers (often former immigrants or descendants of immigrants who may speak literary Arabic), few schools resort to them, beyond an initial meeting aimed at explaining to parents how the school operates. Subsequently, teachers tend to use the French speaking volunteers in order to transmit messages to the family, until the children themselves have acquired a sufficient level of French to be able to act as interpreters with their own parents.

More than the language barriers, it is intercomprehension as a whole, which is perceived by the hosts as the crux of the problem with these pupils: "Without knowing that culture, the question is how to explain our system to them, in relation to their knowledge of what school is. I have yet to find a solution to that."[26].

Chaotic Previous Schooling

Many Syrian and Bulgarian children have experienced chaotic or non-existent previous schooling, although the reasons may be different for each group. During the many years they spent in Jordan, Turkey, or Lebanon, whether in refugee camps or in the homes of local people, Syrian children were rarely able to attend school. No schooling was available in some camps, racism and violence was experienced in Lebanese schools, or they needed to occupy odd jobs in order to contribute to the survival of their families. This is the case of a sibling group of five brothers aged between 10 and 19 who were unschooled during their five-year stay in a camp in Jordan[27]. Indeed, according to several studies, it appears that more than

half of Syrian children were not enrolled in school in 2015, with their enrollment rates limited to 20% in Lebanon and 30% in Turkey (Sirin & Roger-Sirin, 2015).

Mustafa Aslan and Kuvvet Lordoglu's (2017) survey of Syrian refugees in Turkey in two border cities with Syria (Urfa and Mardin) provides some interesting insights. Out of 80 children surveyed, only a few attended school. The others worked or combined odd jobs and partial schooling, in a context of great insecurity. They have difficulty finding work, which is usually temporary and underpaid (50% less than the local population). There are many reasons why Syrian minors are forced to work, including the difficult economic conditions of their families, the fact that adults cannot find work, and the discrimination suffered by Syrians in school.

For these reasons and depending on the age of the children at the time of their arrival in France and the time they spent in a transit country, they may have either experienced a major break in their schooling (several years) or may have never attended school. For example, Haya, who was 12 years old when she arrived in the municipality of R. with her family, was only able to enter school directly at the secondary level, after spending four years unschooled in a Jordanian camp. The specialized teacher who followed her stated when talking about the results of Haya's competency assessments: "it is nil, nothing at all"[28]. This was also the case for her eight-year-old sister and her four-year-old brother.

Like the Syrian children, the Bulgarian children in question here have generally had limited previous experience of school, either from a quantitative or qualitative standpoint. This is often cited as a problem because it complicates the schooling of these children in the host country: "This huge majority of Turkish or Roma Bulgarians were a problem in the classroom, as was the fact that they had had little or no schooling in their country (of origin)"[29], noted one experienced teacher. Our previous fieldwork in Bulgaria (Clavé-Mercier, 2014b) provided insight into the schooling experience of these children living in Roma and/or Turkish neighborhoods, which are isolated and run-down neighborhoods often referred to as *mahala*.

The schools in these neighborhoods have few resources, the equipment is often inadequate, and the teachers are not very motivated because their pupils are Roma and are therefore perceived as not being "interested in school", as the teachers of a village in the Pazardzhik region[30] often repeated. Whether they are in the majority or in the minority, depending on the locality, these children are considered by teachers as less worthy of interest than non-Roma Bulgarian children. In these schools, the dropout rate for the Roma is very high (Tomova, 2009). The quality of the education offered to these children and the meaning of school to them explain why parents and children both lose interest in schooling quite early on.

They point to the discrimination they feel, to the school being of poor quality, to their poverty, and to the disengagement of the State, as compared to the communist period, which no longer helps them with school supplies. Kindergarten is no longer free, so few children from these neighborhoods are enrolled at a young age. This increases their difficulties and their lack of interest when they enter elementary school, since the majority of these children practice Turkish or Romanes as their mother tongue. These multiple barriers result in the majority of Roma spending roughly between four and eight years in school and leaving with low literacy skills (Tomova, 2009), and this is the case in most Central and Eastern European countries (Szalai & Schiff, 2014).

In both cases, it is often emphasized by French teaching staff that the schooling of both Bulgarian and Syrian children is made more complex by their need to learn the simplest of skills about how to act as a proper student[31].

Salient Gender Identities

Concerning the Syrians, gender differences are seen by the volunteers as having a strong impact, especially as far as extracurricular activities are concerned, but also concernaing the tasks to be carried out at home, as well as in terms of behavior between children. These gender identities are perceived by the volunteers as a hindrance to proper schooling and to the desired "individual development" of these children - and thus, by extension, to their "integration into society". This was the case, for example, for Reem, a 14-year-old Syrian girl, whose volunteers deplored her role in the family and her involvement in domestic chores, going so far as to say that "it will end badly because she will not be able to stand it for long"[32]. The

school actors clearly share this vision concerning the young girl and her younger sister noting unfavorably that : “Haya and Reem are not very involved in their schooling. There are more important things to do at home: cooking, taking care of the children....”[33] In another family of six children, a volunteer who was very involved with the children noted with some disapproval that “The older one had sprained her knee, but it was still her who made the coffee. That is the way the family works... The other day [a brother] said to the little one who was jumping around, "Come and sit down, when there are a lot of people, you boys need to sit down!” It is a mark of education. The girls stand. The boys sit down to welcome the guests”[34].

When the issue of Bulgarians in schools is discussed problems with violence are often raised, especially by other pupils’ parents [35]. The principal of school B. provided details aimed at minimizing this impression of the parents, acknowledging this problem but offering a contextual explanation: “The Bulgarians this year are grown-ups and are boys”[36]. In doing so, he made a clear link between violence and gender identity, highlighting the highly gendered behaviors of these children. Bulgarian girls, on the other hand, seem to be less noticed, to the point of being seen as “little wallflower girls, whether they are there, or they are not there, it’s the same”[37].

We see therefore that there exists a strong contrast between the stereotype of the Bulgarian boys perceived as “troublemakers” and therefore potential dropouts, and the image of Syrian girls as potential “victims” of gender inequalities and therefore most likely to benefit from schooling, which is viewed as a means for these children to become emancipated from their families.

Experiences of Residential Insecurity

Both Syrian and Bulgarian migrants have encountered similar experiences of residential insecurity, whether in the past or present.

Most of the Syrians have lived in refugee camps in Jordan, Lebanon, or Turkey for several years before arriving in France. This experience, although perceived differently depending on the camp and/or the family, necessarily marks the children - as well as the adults who live there - in their relationship to the world around them and to their living space (Agier, 2002). An extreme case is that of young children whose existence was essentially confined to their home “tent”, the outsidearea having been considered too unsafe by their parents[38]. More frequently, Syrian children seem to have benefited in the camps from a degree of freedom deemed harmful to their education by the hosts. Their hosts emphasize the fact that life in the camps has an impact on the children’s relationship to space and time. When they arrive at school in France, the children are confronted with a very coded and standardized system, with schedules and various rules : “At the beginning it was difficult for them, because in the camps they were completely left to themselves, and now they have to get up, they have to go to school, they have to do this, that...”[39].

These remarks, which are expressed in various forms about all of the resettled Syrian families, and which point to the importance of the change of life and rhythm through schooling, testify to the volunteers’ perception of the children’s presence in France as a transition from an entirely unstructured life, to the (re)structuring of a new life through school attendance.

The Bulgarian children in our research experience different forms of residential insecurity: some live in squats or shanty towns, while others live in dilapidated and overcrowded apartments. Similarly to the Syrians when they were living in refugee camps, this type of housing is linked to their relatively recent migration and not to a transient lifestyle since both the Syrians and the Bulgarian lived in individual houses or apartments in their country of origin.

Indeed it is important to note that these families had regular, and in some cases quite comfortable, housing arrangements before leaving their country, and that the deterioration of their housing conditions is caused by their migration, a situation which can lasts for months or years depending on the family’s background. The host society tends to perceive precarious housing and promiscuity as inseparable from their migrant or refugee status.

In the case of both Bulgarians and Syrians, it is interesting to note the unanimity of the testimonies of the hosts about the lack of “structure” in the families, concerning meals, sleeping habits (sleeping late, sharing beds with parents, getting up late), and the relative autonomy and freedom left to the children, even

very young ones. These lifestyle habits are at times interpreted as a consequence of residential precariousness, at others as problematic cultural norms.

From Vulnerability to Suspicion

Syrian families who are resettled in France are administratively defined by the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees as "vulnerable". This identification based on different criteria is what allows them to benefit from the resettlement program. These criteria may include having been a victim of violence, the number of children or health problems. Knowing this, the host actors then globally view them as "vulnerable", in addition to the fact that they come from a country at war. They therefore imagine that they have necessarily experienced great hardship. As far as past living conditions are concerned, the hosts have a fertile imagination, especially since professionals and volunteers are asked not to ask any questions on this subject, in order to avoid awakening possible "traumas". It should also be emphasized that the idea that these families are highly vulnerable is deeply engrained in the perceptions of the hosts, institutional representatives and volunteers alike. This tends to obscure concerns about their motivation to migrate and their lack of choice about their country and city of destination which are rarely discussed as such[40].

The Bulgarian migrants are also perceived through the prism of vulnerability, but not to the same degree, since in their case this vulnerability can be more easily seen as instrumentalized on their part. This is linked to the often negative or at least suspicious representations that most of the welcoming actors have concerning them (Stewart, 2012). Why did they come to France? What do they want? These are questions that often remain unanswered for representatives of French institutions. Their identification as Roma or Gypsies and the associated stereotypes take precedence over their apprehension as simply precarious migrants. This perception of extreme otherness affects the ways in which different members of French society act towards them - and the school is no exception.

It is interesting to note this shift from the apprehension of vulnerability to the economy of suspicion (Linhardt, 2001). This illustrates the existing tension between an assessment of the migrant based on his or her status as a victim and an evaluation of his or her legitimacy based on the measure of his or her (good) will (Casati, 2017). One can observe this with respect to these two "groups", especially when the reactions and demands of the "welcomed" do not fit the expected behavior of gratitude, thus undermining the idea of "vulnerability".

This was the case when a newly arrived Syrian woman complained about the lack of a washing machine and internet connection when she discovered her accommodation upon arrival in the host town where she and her large family were to settle. By contrast the referent social worker, believing that the first priority was the family's safety and shelter, was concerned with reassuring her about the noise caused by the regular passage of planes from a nearby military base, prioritizing possible traumas from bombings in Syria rather than concerns with household comforts [41].

What Kind of School Support?

In this last part, the point of view of the hosts concerning the different provisions for the schooling of Syrian and Bulgarian children will be at the heart of the discussion. In concrete terms, we shall see what support is offered to these pupils inside and outside of school, by whom and in what way these provisions are implemented.

Concentration Versus Dispersion and Implications for School Integration

Before entering the school, a detour through the spatial dimension of the settlement of these migrants is important since this clearly guides the school and out-of-school care which is offered to them. Indeed, these new groups have different settlement patterns, in line with their migration patterns: the Bulgarian families are concentrated in certain urban areas, while the Syrian families are scattered in rural areas. These elements are fundamental because of their impact on an "integration", which is always desired by the hosts, although it is difficult to objectively determine because it is subject to different expectations and interpretations on their part. In the first case the grouping of migrants is viewed as undermining the welcome they are offered, while in the second case the individual migrant family is alone surrounded by a

group of hosts. We will therefore first analyze what this spatial dimension implies in terms of representations of the other and what the school personnel believe they can expect from them.

Immersion as a Necessity for Syrians

Above and beyond the reception and accommodation offered to them many things are expected of the Syrian families who are welcomed under the resettlement program. As the mayor of one of the municipalities concerned explicitly stated, "We offer support for their integration which we want to be as rapid as possible"[42]. From then on, everything that is put in place in terms of support and care is aimed first and foremost at "integrating them into French society", in an active and sometimes even authoritative manner, as this elected official from another municipality pointed out:

> "When they arrived, [the departmental representative] wanted the children to be intensively immersed in French culture, through school and extracurricular activities"[43]; "Given the instructions we had received from [the representative], we said to ourselves, 'We do not have a choice. This had to happen quickly, otherwise things would be complicated. She also wanted them to go to the recreation center, but we saw right away that it would be too complicated, as it was already too complicated at school, so we put the brakes on that, we said to ourselves that we should not force things too much, given the context and the way they were"[44].

In the manner of thinking and organizing this reception, we noted, from the outset, a multiplicity of interventions and a strong will to totally immerse the children in a maximum amount of educational and extra-curricular activities (leisure center, sports, support for schooling, ...). This is most often supported by the volunteers who in some cases go so far as to state that "removing" these children from their families could be beneficial to them, such as this volunteer who wanted a teenage girl to go to boarding school so that she could "continue to progress"[45].

We can see here how the reception process quickly shifts from the initial objective of providing safety to the imperative of integration with a view to permanent settlement. The implementation of this resettlement program is in some ways akin to an adoption process, which Syrians will often follow by addressing the hosts with terms of kinship ("mama", "tati"...). This is also due to the fact that, unlike the Bulgarians, the stay of these Syrian families is seen from the outset to be permanent - hence the disappointment of the hosts when they realize that the families do not necessarily want to stay in the municipality or in the country in the medium or long term.

However, it should be noted that the idea that these families need to immerse themselves quickly is not always shared by all actors outside of the local system. This is what the referent of one family reported about the schooling of the children as soon as they arrived, just one month before the end of the school year. When the question arose, two points of view clashed: the departmental representative was in favor of rapid schooling, favoring "the choice of immersion", while the PASS doctor[46] was not in favor of schooling from the start, claiming that "it is too hard", "we need to preserve them"[47].

The Impossible Inclusion of Bulgarian Roma

The Bulgarians living in France arrived by their own means, via networks of acquaintances. Many of them come from the same towns and villages in the same region in their country of origin. They group together in the host country in order to be able to rely on their peers in this unfamiliar society as is often the case with other newcomer groups (Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino & Taylor, 1998). However, this deliberate concentration, sometimes coupled with their identification as Roma or Turkish speakers, is regarded by the hosts to pose a problem for their "integration", with the "group" blocking the individual's absorption into society. As one primary school teacher noted: "Our problem, and that is why it is difficult to talk about it, our problem is not that they are Bulgarians, whether they are Roma or not, we don't care, it is the concentration of a community in which switching to the French language does not necessarily happen all day long, including in class"[48].

Thus, the parents of pupils at school B., where Bulgarian children have represented about 20% of the total number of pupils for several years, unanimously agree with a mother who deplored the fact that "the children at the school say, 'the Bulgarians'. They do not have a first name!" One father stated that in the past, when there were not "so many" Bulgarians in the school, "they had first names and were identified by their first names, whereas today they form a group with whom it is difficult to communicate"[49].

This Bulgarians' concentration in one neighbourhood and one school exacerbates the tendency to extend to all what is observed in one. During an interview in which the issue of absenteeism was raised one teacher thus realized that there was a discrepancy between perception and reality. Although she starting by saying that absenteeism was THE problem with the Bulgarians, she then realized that it only concerns a few families, but that she and her colleagues tended to see all Bulgarians in this way because "for those [families] not concerned, we somehow no longer talk about them, we no longer see them..."[50].

Paradoxically the salient features of the two populations (cf. previous section) are put forward to explain the failure of the Bulgarians while they are not used in this manner for the Syrians. In other words, the host actors are generally driven by the underlying idea that for the Bulgarians "inclusion cannot work" while for the Syrians "we need to make it work"[51].

These differential assessments appear surprising, since beyond their differences, the Roma and the Syrians are in fact very similar in the eyes of those who welcome them: they are precarious foreigners and, beyond that, child-victims who are far removed from school and who must be "integrated" or even rehabilitated. Yet some of them are too numerous (and autonomous as they are "migrants"), so it is a priori very difficult to propose forms of support that works, in the eyes of the school actors; while the others are isolated (and totally dependent - they are "refugees"), which seems a priori to greatly facilitate their reception. This now leads us to analyze how the different types of care that Bulgarians and Syrians receive in the French educational institution are actually implemented in these contexts.

An Ongoing Partnership Among a Variety of Actors in the Case of Isolated Syrian Families

In the rural department in question, the majority of Syrian children attend schools which do not have specific programs for non native speakers, and where these programs occasionally exist, the children receive very little support from them. This is linked to the rural nature of the area, as well as to the low proportion of French as a second language pupils[52]. Thus, in this department, only four mobile Pedagogical Units for Foreign Language Newcomers (UPE2A in French) exist at the primary level. The teachers only visit the schools that request them following the reception of these pupils, which implies a high degree of mobility in order to intervene in approximately ten schools dispersed over a very large geographical area.

As a result, they can only devote a limited amount of time to the pupils in question: in one school located in a town of over 10.000 residents, a ten-year-old pupil may benefit from individual support to learn French for 1hour and 15 minutes, twice a week[53]. In another more rural municipality, a brother and sister aged seven and ten are enrolled in a CP/CE1 class (Foundation course, elementary class 1) where they learn to read and write, except for one half-day per week dedicated to the intervention of the UPE2A teacher who encourages work on phonetics, as well as individualized work (on an identified difficulty or on a subject addressed in the ordinary class)[54]. An older brother and sister of the pair were enrolled in the local secondary school, which does not have a specific program.

After consultation between the teaching staff of the different establishments, it was decided that the special aid teacher working with the younger ones would also take the middle school pupils during the same half-day. The librarian of the middle school also offered them individualized support on multiple occasions. The rest of the time, the two pupils attended regular classes in their respective age groups. We can thus see that this support for the Syrians is implemented in a piecemeal fashion based on the good will of people who are often untrained but who find, here, an opportunity to experiment with new forms of pedagogy. "It is a success in terms of their integration!" claimed the school director, adding that "there is no problem with religion because nothing is visible, for example their clothes are no different from others."[55] So the Syrian pupils blend in, despite being the only "children of color"[56], because they are only one or two per school and appear very "motivated".

In the municipality of S., following the assessment of one family by the Information and Orientation Center the initial option proposed was to enroll the two eldest children in a secondary school that had a fixed UPE2A. However, this school was located in the neighboring town and the journey from the family's home lasted an hour and a half by bus, which was considered too complicated by the reception team. It was therefore decided that they would be sent to the local secondary school, which would offer the advantage of "encouraging their sociability", according to the elected representative of the municipality[57]. A UPE2A teacher intervened in this school from time to time as it was used to receiving newcomers, because of the existence of a nearby MECS[58] that receives unaccompanied minors. The establishment was located 50 meters from the family's home. The choice made was thus in favor of the nearby schools which do not offer specific support for foreign language speakers.

If this type of arrangement works favorably, it is because the absence of specific support is in some way compensated for by the important mobilization of very diverse actors around the families and particularly in favor of the children. For example, the family hosted in the municipality of R. had five children in school, from kindergarten to high school. Four volunteers provided individualized educational support on a weekly basis and helped all of them except for the youngest to learn the French language. The departmental representative explained the previous school situation of this family's children as follows:

> "The last four have never ever set foot in a school. They spent four and a half years in a refugee camp in Jordan, without schooling. (...) The twelve-year-old child cannot read or write in her native language, she is illiterate. The Academic Inspector[59], after the appointment at the Centre for Information and Orientation, has just directed her to a 6th grade, refusing to put her into CM2 (5th grade)! This is a 6th grade with support for newcomers, French classes, and a specific class for newcomers. But in spite of this, she will drop out if she is not directly taught to read and write in French. So the municipality's host team made an emergency call for volunteers to teach her how to read and write"[60].

Such manifold involvement of volunteers in favor of educational support for these Syrian children are not uncommon. In the municipality of N., four volunteers worked with all nine members of the family for two hours each week in groups of two. In the municipality of S., five volunteers were responsible for accompanying one or two children to school and in learning French on a weekly basis. The same organization was found in the municipality of U. for the four eldest members of the family.

These volunteers, who often hold positions in the municipal councils or local public services or who are often retired from the teaching profession, play an essential role in communication between these families and the schools, since teaching and administrative staff usually refer to them in order to establish contact with the families. In addition to the volunteers, there is a mobilization of various professional actors (elected officials, social workers, etc.) who work together for these pupils. One UPE2A teacher expressed his astonishment at this strong mobilization around the schooling of these children, which seemed to be specific to the resettled Syrian families: "I have held meetings for two secondary school pupils where there were eight to ten of us around the table. This never happens!"[61].

However, this strong investment of volunteers around the same family can sometimes lead to the undermining of the place and role of the parents of these pupils. This was noted by a head teacher of an elementary school who welcomed two Syrian children for whom a large group of volunteers were highly involved in the follow-up of their schooling: "We wanted to be as close as possible to the parents. It is not for us to decide in their place"[62].

Thus, we can see that the integration of Syrian families, and in particular the children's schooling, is regarded as a real collective project in which many local actors participate, and who have relatively close links with each other, but who are not specialized in the support of migrants. Conversely, the schooling of Bulgarian children in the urban schools observed is approached in very different manner.

> "What poses a problem with the Bulgarians is that there is a lack of understanding on both sides: the families do not understand the essence of school, nor how it works, which needs to be made more explicit, especially orally. The teachers, for their part, suffer from the fact that they come and then stop coming, that they do not follow the rules of the school - which have not always been explained to them. After an initial period of revolt, both stop caring. And it becomes very complicated"[63].

In order to deal with this type of difficulty experienced by various institutional actors, two social mediator were nominated by the municipality in 2011 specifically for Roma migrants living in squats or shanty towns. In order to facilitate these migrants' access to common law their interventions were varied, ranging from social, educational, economic, administrative issues.

The educational support they offer consists mainly of a follow-up of the registration of the children in school (registration at the Town Hall, support for passing tests in the language of origin at the CASNAV[64], support during the enrollment process in the school). Thereafter, they do not intervene during the children's schooling - except in the case of a major problem for which the teacher may request their intervention.

At the same time in 2013, with the support of the French Ministry of Education together with a nationwide program for urban policy, the municipality created three new programs for pupils who were not previously enrolled in secondary schools, in response to the arrival of a large number of Bulgarian migrants and the increase in the number of squats in which many of them live, as well as in answer to the more general difficulties these children have in attending school. These measures resemble a form of palliative care aimed at providing "customized support" for these children, but which seems to have perverse effects, particularly in terms of categorization and stigmatization. Indeed, these measures were specifically designed for this population, which is mainly made up of Roma and/or Turkish-speaking Bulgarians, yet without it being explicitly presented in this way.

Although such measures are officially intended for non French speaking pupils who have recently arrived in France (*Elèves Allophones Nouvellement Arrivés-EANA*) and who have not previously attended school (*Non Scolarisés Antérieurement-NSA*), many of these Bulgarian pupils who attend school as "NSA" are neither newly arrived nor are they previously unschooled. The official regulation specifies that these measures also concern children with "little previous schooling", which is often the case since they have generally been enrolled in school but with partial attendance for a variety of reasons, including their economic and residential precariousness, the periods of migration back and forth from their country of origin, and their lack of involvement in schooling. Some of these children's schooling has none the less been described as "successful" by school staff. Learning in UPE2A NSA consists of "basic" learning: reading, writing, counting, with a strong emphasis on "social behaviour". This last dimension is of particularly importance in these new arrangements which also involve the presence of an educational assistant.

These "adapted" programs, to which middle-school age Bulgarians are almost systematically referred, reinforce the specific care addressed to this group by "specialized" teachers. This also leads to a concentration of these pupils within certain classes or establishments, thus extending the concentration at primary level due to their residential segregation.

> "In the playground, most Bulgarians stayed together. When they left school, it was the same thing: you see, there is no integration. In addition to the "bourgeois-bohemians" who were flooding into the neighborhood... On one side, the Bulgarians, and on the other, the others. No mixing"[65].

The attempt at concerted action by the town hall and by certain actors in the national education system to systematically distribute Bulgarian primary school pupils into different schools only lasted a short time, as the institutional decision-makers were constrained - officially, at least - by the laws of the Republic and

school distrincting, which required that registration be based on the area of residence. Therefore this specific support accentuated the concentration of Bulgarians and, in so doing, slowed down the type of "integration" which is usually upheld by the institution.

CONCLUSION

This article questions the role of schools as agents of integration in a context of new migrations characterized by specific statuses and dynamics. A strong contrast appears between the two cases discussed. For the Syrians, the intervention of volunteers who often have strong teaching and pedagogical skills is combined with a relative absence of specific institutionalized support within the school. In the best of cases, when children and parents "play the game" of schooling and when the different protagonists work together effectively, this rapid immersion coupled with highly individualized extracurricular support leads to a virtuous circle that allows the newcomers to progress rapidly.

These children thus become "models of success" for their French classmates and are at times upheld by the teachers in order to stimulate a class dynamic that is conducive to work. However, for some very vulnerable families, this overload of attention and demands generate a form of passive resistance. This may be expressed through repeated lateness and absences, or by children who are "mute" or who seem to do the work mechanically. Such incidences leave the actors distraughted, especially since they have no previous experience of working with refugees. Here, the work of assimilation is aimed above all at the child, considered individually. Depending on the case, this may also involve his or her parents in a dynamic of school investment, or on the contrary it may accentuate a certain distance between the school and the family, especially when the latter seems to resist the expectations of the hosts.

In contrast, Bulgarians are taken care of in "specialized" facilities in schools, in which many of the workers are in fact not well trained and, in general, have little legitimacy in the eyes of ordinary teachers. Thus, the Roma are delegate to "specialists" (i.e., teachers who are perceived as such or who hold this role, such as those in UPE2A). The existence of these specific arrangements can be viewed as a comfort solution, both for the schools, which thus confine the "problem" to dedicated and rather benevolent spaces and actors, and for many families and pupils, who find in this "interphase" a certain preservation from the difficulty of integrating into an unfamiliar and sometimes hostile environment. Here, the grouping together of such pupils appears to be both an obstacle and a solution which aims above all at managing a stigmatized group in a context where the collective and concerted will to individually integrate such pupils in lacking.

The lack of consultation between the hosts thus leads to a concentration of migrant children, whereas ongoing consultation exists when immersion is favored. While for instance the need for translation is a central problem in small rural communities, the hosts have managed to mobilize local resources to answer these needs. The rural context as well as the immersion of these individual families who are located in different places facilitate this kind of reception and informal organization. Moreover, the fact that the Syrian children are supervised outside of school by experienced people with a certain status and notoriety in school matters makes the children "important" in the eyes of the school stakeholders. The opposite is true for the Bulgarians, for whom the professional marginalization of those who take care of them contributes to the sense of second-rate schooling since these teachers often feel that they are relegated to "ghetto schools"[66] or to ad hoc arrangements.

The comparison highlights a number of paradoxes that could be further explored. We can indeed see that the multiplication of specific arrangements and resources dedicated to foreign language pupils does not necessarily lead to inclusion, whereas the reverse may be true, as long as a certain number of stakeholders engage with these children and participate in a project carried out by the host group. When supporting these pupils becomes everyone's business and not just the affair of a few, then their presence acquires a legitimacy that makes it possible to encourage both pedagogical innovation and the normalization of their differences. However, far beyond what happens in school, this is closely linked to the way in which the migrants' "identity" and their presence on the territory are perceived, but also to the extent of their own resources and their capacity to answer to the expectations placed upon them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Translated & edited by American Publishing Services (https://americanpublishingservices.com/).

ENDNOTES

1. The survey was conducted as part of the Alterecole research program in 2016 and 2017. This research program (2016-2019) which focuses globally on the perceptions and management of otherness in school milieus is coordinated by Claire Schiff, Joëlle Perroton, and Isabelle Rigoni, and funded by the Nouvelle-Aquitaine Region.
2. http://www.unhcr.org/fr/reinstallation.html
3. The authors would like to thank Margot Doz, a 2nd year Master student, for her participation in the field survey on Syrian refugees.
4. In total, about thirty people were interviewed.
5. *Unité pédagogique pour allophones arrivants non scolarisés antérieurement*
6. Priority Education Network.
7. The designation "N0" refers to the date of arrival in France: N0 when the arrival is recent (during the school year), N1 when it is one year on, N2 when it is two years on, etc. The acronym "NSA" stands for "Not Previously Schooled".
8. Interview with the principal of school B., City X, 09/11/2016.
9. Excerpts from a radio program discussing the topic in this municipality, accessed on 11/21/2016 (Source not cited due to anonymity).
10. *Ibid.*
11. Excerpt from remarks made by the Minister of Interior, Manuel Valls on BFM TV, September 25, 2013.
12. Inter-ministerial Directorate for Housing and Access to Housing.
13. Interview with the elected family representative, Municipality of O., 04/07/2017.
14. Excerpts from the gazette of the municipality of O., June 2016.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Interview with an elementary school principal teacher, municipality of R., 05/30/2017.
17. Group interview with volunteers in the municipality of O., 05/18/2017.
18. Interview with a former parent representative from school B., town X, 03/31/2017.
19. Interview with a mobile UPE2A primary school teacher, city X, 05/23/2017.
20. Interview with the principal of school B., city X, 11/09/2016.
21. Field notes, one-year review meeting of the family's reception, community of communes of R. (municipality of N.), 05/30/2017.
22. Interview with a primary school teacher, city X, 04/04/2017.
23. Interview with a mobile UPE2A primary school teacher, city X, 05/23/2017.
24. Interview with the director of the leisure center, municipality of U., 05/29/2017.
25. Presentation of the device, University of Bordeaux, 10/04/2016.
26. Interview with the assistant in charge of school affairs, municipality of R., 04/14/2017.
27. Interview with the referent of the family reception, municipality of R. (municipality of N.), 02/21/2017.
28. Interview with the UPE2A middle school teacher, 02/14/2017.
29. Interview with retired primary UPE2A teacher, city X, 04/20/2017.
30. Field notes, February 2012.
31. Interview with the school principal, municipality of U., 29/05/2017.
32. Volunteer's remarks, collective volunteer meeting, commune of R., 3/30/2017.
33. Interview with the UPE2A middle school teacher, municipality of M.M., 02/14/2017.
34. Interview with a volunteer, municipality of U., 30/03/2017.
35. Meeting with parents of students and the principal of school B., town X, 05/22/2017.
36. *Ibid.*
37. Interview with a primary school teacher, L. school, city X, 04/04/2017.
38. Interview with the referents of the host family, municipality of L., 05/18/2017.
39. Interview with a volunteer, municipality of R., 02/14/2017.
40. None of the families were aware of their precise destination in France before their departure, and the hosts had almost no information about those they were to welcome other than the family composition.

41. Interview with the professional referent, municipality of M.M., 05/22/2017.
42. Interview with the mayor, municipality of S., 02/20/2017.
43. Comment by the Deputy Mayor in charge of school affairs, collective meeting of volunteers, municipality of R., 03/30/2017.
44. Interview with the Deputy Mayor in charge of school affairs, municipality of R., 04/14/2017.
45. Interview with a volunteer, municipality of R., 02/14/2017.
46. Permanent Access to Health Care
47. Interview with the family referent, commune community of R., 02/21/2017.
48. Interview with a primary school teacher, school L., city X, 04/04/2017.
49. Field notes, meeting with parents of school pupils, school B., city X, 05/22/2017.
50. Interview with a primary teacher, school L., city X, 04/04/2017.
51. Interview with professional family advisers, municipality of L., 05/18/2017.
52. According to the CASNAV 2014-2015 report, according to a survey by the DEPP (Evaluation Department, Prospective and Performance information note), 190 allophone students were registered in the department, which is much less than neighboring rural departments.
53. Interview with the UPS / UPE2A mobile primary school teacher, municipality of M.M., 02/14/2017.
54. Interview with the UPE2A mobile primary school teacher, municipality of M.M., 01/24/2017.
55. Interview with the school principal, municipality of U., 05/29/2016.
56. Interview with the director of the recreation center, municipality of U., 05/29/2017.
57. Interview with the Mayor, municipality of S., 02/20/2017.
58. Social Children's Home.
59. Academic Inspection (now DSDEN – Directorate of Departmental Education Services).
60. Presentation of the reception system for families resettled at the University of Bordeaux by the representative of the Association of Mayors of this department, 04/10/2016.
61. Interview with a primary UPE2A teacher, municipality of M.M., 24/01/2017.
62. Interview with the primary school principal, municipality of U., 05/29/2016.
63. Interview with a primary mobile UPE2A teacher, city X, 05/23/2017.
64. Academic Center for the Education of New Arrivals and Travelers (Rectorate service).
65. Interview with a primary UPE2A teacher, city X, 04/20/2017.
66. Term used by the principal and pupil's parents to denote the trend that emerges for school B., city X.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Agier, M. (2002). *Aux bords du monde, les réfugiés*. Paris: Flammarion.

Akoka, K. (2016). Crise des réfugiés ou des politiques d'asile ? *La Vie des idées*, 31 mai 2016. Retrieved from http://www.laviedesidees.fr/Crise-des-refugies-ou-des-politiques-d-asile.html

Aslan, M., & Lordoglu, K. (2017, mai). *Les migrants mineurs syriens en Turquie: Premiers perdants de la guerre civile.* Communication présentée à la journée d'étude Traverser les frontières, traverser les âges : Politiques migratoires et agency enfantine en situation migratoire, Université de Nanterre, Paris.

Bessone, M. (2015). Le vocabulaire de l'hospitalité est-il républicain ? *Éthique publique*, *17*(1). DOI :10.4000/ethiquepublique.1745

Casati, N. (2017). How cities shape refugee centres: « deservingness » and « good aid » in a Sicilian town. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, pp. 1–17. DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2017.1354689

Chauvin, S., & Garces-Mascarenas, B. (2014). Becoming Less Illegal: Deservingness Frames and Undocumented Migrant Incorporation. *Sociology Compass*, *8*(4), 422–432.

Clave-Mercier, A. (2014a). Des spécificités au droit commun. L'institution scolaire face aux "migrants roms" entre hospitalité et raison humanitaire. *Migrations Société*, *2*(152), 119–130.

Clave-Mercier, A. (2014b). *Des Etats et des « Roms ». Une anthropologie du sujet entre transnationalisme et politiques d'intégration de migrants bulgares en France*. Thèse de doctorat en anthropologie, Université de Bordeaux.

Clave-Mercier, A., & Olivera, M. (2016). Une résistance non-résistante ? Ethnographie du malentendu dans les dispositifs d'"integration" pour des migrants roms. *L'Homme*, *3*(219–220), 175–208.

Crawley, H., & Skleparis, D. (2017). Refugees, migrants, neither, both: Categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's « migration crisis ». *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 44*(1), 48–64. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2017.1348224

Elias, N., & Scotson, J.L. (1997). *Logiques de l'exclusion*. Paris: Fayard.

Fassin, D. (2005). Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies in France. *Cultural Anthropology*, *20*(3), 362–387.

Linhardt, D. (2001). L'économie du soupçon. Une contribution pragmatique à la sociologie de la menace. *Genèses*, *44*(3), 76–98.

Massey, D., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J.E. (1998). *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.

Mendonça Dias, C. (2016). Les difficultés institutionnelles pour scolariser les élèves allophones arrivants. *Les Cahiers de la Lutte Contre les Discriminations, 2*, 47–62.

Mons, N. (2007). *Les nouvelles politiques éducatives. La France fait-elle les bons choix ?* Paris : PUF.

Park, R.E. (1924).The Concept of Social Distance As Applied to the Study of Racial Attitudes and Racial Relations. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, *8*, 339–344.

Scalettaris, G. (2016). Réfugiés, migrants, quelle est la différence ? In H. Thiollet (Ed.), *Migrants, migrations* (pp. 87–89). Paris : Armand Colin.

Schiff, C. (2011). En marge du métier. Dispositifs d'intégration scolaire et pratiques enseignantes face aux élèves primo migrants en collège. In C. Crenn & L. Kotobi (Eds.), *Du point de vue de l'ethnicité. Pratiques françaises* (pp. 111–124). Paris: Armand Colin.

Schiff, C., & Fouquet-Chauprade, B. (2011). Parcours scolaires et conditions d'accueil des primo-arrivants. In F. Oeuvrard & D. Glasman (Eds.), *La Déscolarisation* (pp. 181–202). Paris : La Dispute.

Schiff, C., & Zoïa, G. (2004). *L'accueil à l'école des élèves primo-arrivants en France*. Paris : La Documentation française, Collection « Etudes et recherches du FASILD ».

Simmel, G. (2009). Digressions sur l'étranger. In I. Joseph & Y. Grafmeyer (Eds.), *L'Ecole de Chicago. Naissance de l'Ecologie urbaine* (pp. 53–61). Paris: Aubier.

Sirin, S.R., & Roger-Sirin, L. (2015). *The Educational and Mental Health Needs of Syrian Refugee Children*. Washington DC, Migration Policy Institute.

Stewart, M. (Ed.). (2012). *The Gypsy Menace. Populism and the new Anti-Gypsy politics*. Oxford University Press.

Szalai, J., & Schiff, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Migrant, Roma and Post-Colonial Youth in Education Across Europe. Being Visibly Different*. Palgrave Macmillan, UK.

Tomova, I. (2009) The Roma in Bulgaria: Education and employment. *Sudosteuropa Mitteilungen*, *2*, 66–87.