



Invisible Students: Institutional Invisibility and Access to Education for Undocumented Children

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care</i>
Manuscript ID	IJMHC-01-2014-0001.R2
Manuscript Type:	Academic Paper
Keywords:	access to social services, children, Canada, entitlement, action research, undocumented migration

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

Invisible Students: Institutional Invisibility and Access to Education for Undocumented Children

Abstract

In Canada, undocumented children are “institutionally invisible” - their access to education to be found in unwritten and discretionary practices. Drawing on the experience of a three-year university-community partnership among researchers, institutional and community stakeholders, this article examines how undocumented children become excluded from free education in Quebec. Proposing the notion of “institutional invisibility,” we argue that issues of access and entitlement for undocumented children are constructed within unwritten and ambiguous practices that make the lives of young people invisible to the institutional entities with which they interact. Through the establishment of a collaborative research space, we were able to hear a range of contradictory perspectives which have often gone unheard in simplistic representations of the “state” or “policies” as homogenous entities. The article reflects on the role of action research in both documenting dynamics and pathways of invisibility in undocumented children’s access to education, as well as in initiating social change - as both horizontal, and vertical mobilisation.

Keywords: education; undocumented children; youth; migration; entitlement; deservingness; access to social services; action research; policy; invisibility; Canada

1
2
3
4
5
6 The invisibility occurs because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The invisibility occurs because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I
come in contact.

Ralph Ellison, *Invisible Man*

Introduction

This article is about the making of institutional invisibility in relation to undocumented students in Canada. It is about particular dispositions of the eyes of those who come in contact and, often, do not come in contact at all, with undocumented children and their families. And, finally, it is about the ways in which we tried, through the establishment of a community-university partnership, to unmake this invisibility.

We define here “institutional invisibility” as a set of norms and practices that are often unwritten and ambiguous, making specific groups of people disappear, in a social, legal and political sense. Families living without legal status exist in such space of non-existence - outside national borders, hidden within niches of social reality (Coutin, 2003).

In Canada, between 200,000 and 500,000 persons are estimated to live without legal status - a quarter of whom are minors (Goldring et al., 2009). Approximately 3,000 undocumented school-age children are considered to live in Quebec (Rousseau et al., 2013). The precarisation of legal status has been the consequence, on the one hand, of the tightening of immigration policies and, on the other, of the negative public opinion, shifting from representations of the vulnerable “other” to the idea of migrants as potential fraud and criminals (Crépeau and Nakache, 2006). These increasingly restrictive policies

1
2
3 have also jeopardized the access to services of many people living with a precarious
4 migratory status, making them illegal and vulnerable at multiple levels (Magalhaes et al.,
5
6 2010).
7
8

9
10 This article analyses a specific situation of institutional invisibility: the limited
11 access to education for undocumented children in Montreal, Canada. Under Quebec law,
12 even if access to public education for all minors is both a right and a requirement, *free*
13 education is provided only to legal residents. Specific categories of people are classified
14 as legal residents of the province: Canadian citizens; permanent residents; asylum
15 seekers; foreign workers. Yet, the specific group of “undocumented children” simply
16 fails to be mentioned *at all* by the law.¹
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The issue of access to education for undocumented children rested, therefore, on
28 various discretionary institutional practices. The perceptions of teachers, the relative
29 sensitivity of school administrations, the advocacy of community organizations, and the
30 fear and silence of children and their families: they all played a role in determining
31 whether a child would be successful in enrolling and attending school.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 This article describes a three-year collaborative partnership among research,
40 institutional, and community stakeholders which was established in order to understand
41 these unwritten practices, and to move towards policy change. Our aim here is twofold.
42 First, we document trajectories and discourses of invisibility in the context of access to
43 education. Second, we reflect on the role of action research, and on its methodological
44 and ethical implications, in conducting scholarly work and in promoting social change.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 ¹¹ The fact that there is no mention of these children in the law could be partially explained by the relatively
58 low numbers of children without legal status in Canada in the past decades.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

As we will explain more in detail, this project was an unanticipated result of research: it emerged from the unexpected findings of a study on access to health care for undocumented migrant women and children.² When the voices of the women interviewed in this study paralleled the advisory committee's casework experiences – insisting that access to education for undocumented children was an urgent problem – we were prompted to broaden the initial study's objectives, and to conduct a project in order to shatter the institutional invisibility of this issue.

Framing institutional invisibility

The issue of access to social services is deeply connected to a more profound ethical question: which children should have – or deserve - the right to these services? (Ruiz-Casares et al., 2010). Willen (2011) defines deservingness as the flip side of rights: “*rights* are presumed to have universal relevance, even when they are not universally enjoyed in practice, whereas *deservingness* is always reckoned in relative terms” (814). Particular groups may be considered undeserving specific rights, such as health care or housing, on the basis of presumed or actual characteristics – for instance, their status as non-citizens. In the last years, many scholars have examined discourses and representations shaping one's sense of deservingness, especially in relation to health care (Vanhuynne et al., 2013 , Willen, 2012 , Yarris and Castañeda, 2015).

However, norms of entitlement can be intertwined with pathways to access in non-obvious ways. For example, assessments of deservingness, as stated in policies and laws, may significantly differ from informal norms at local and regional levels (Watters, 2011).

² Research Project “The Migratory Status of the Child and Limited Access to Health Care: Equity and Ethical Challenges,” funded by CIHR (Canadian Institute of Health Research), grant number 201355.

1
2
3 These practices are often driven by what Lukes (2005) defines “covert preferences:”
4 stakes and interests which may not even be voiced, fully articulated, or written. And yet,
5
6 these preferences can operate, at a local level, in important ways that are distinct from
7
8 broader government policies.
9
10

11
12 Moreover, pathways to illegality can be shifting and ambiguous, bringing into
13 question any clear boundary between legality and illegality (Bosniak, 2008), and further
14 complicating the relationship between deservingness and exclusion from social rights
15 (Bhabha, 2004). The issue of access to education for undocumented children is an
16 example. While undocumented children are not explicitly constructed by the law as
17 undeserving subjects, neither are they portrayed as deserving. Because of their
18 contradictory status as both minors in need of protection *and* as illegal migrants who
19 should be rejected, they simply fail to be mentioned at all by the law (Meloni et al.,
20 2014).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 This article proposes the analytical framework of institutional invisibility in order
35 to integrate the missing link between questions of access and deservingness. When it is
36 morally difficult to assess who deserves what, as in the case of undocumented children
37 who have a conflicting social status, silent attitudes and norms play a key role in
38 determining access to services. To put it in another way, these children have limited
39 access to education not because they are explicitly considered as undeserving, but
40 because they are made institutionally invisible – as if they are not there. They are not
41 even mentioned, in the debate of deservingness – precisely because their moral
42 assessment would be problematic. Considering institutional invisibility as a social,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 administrative, legal and political construction then allows us to explore policies and
4 practices which may be contradictory and which, often, are not even there.
5
6

7
8 In the following section, we will describe in detail how the experience of our
9 university-community partnership helped us to unpack the issue of access to education –
10 at the level of laws, policies, and practices.
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 **The process of collaboration**

19
20 As Metha (2008) put it, “policy research is not only about evidence and outcomes but
21 also about the process through which these are constructed” (235). In our case, the
22 process of our research has been essential to underpin both evidence and outcomes. In
23
24
25
26
27 determining the course of the process, our multiple roles have been certainly crucial.
28

29
30 As we already mentioned, all authors were involved in a research project on
31 access to health care for precarious status women and children. Moreover, each of us was
32 affiliated to both a university, and a community health centre or a community
33 organisation. This double role allowed us to consider the problem of access to education
34 not only from the perspective of researchers, but also from our experience of clinicians
35 and community organisers who had a sense of what was happening on the ground.
36
37 Furthermore, these multiple affiliations made it possible to establish collaborations with
38 social workers, lawyers and community advocates willing to take action, and to offer
39 direct support to undocumented children.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Our community-university partnership thus emerged from a confluence of events,
52 both in the community and university setting. As mentioned above, unexpected findings
53 from a research project on access to health care led to the establishment of a working
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 group on access to education in September 2010. With the involvement of researchers,
4
5 community organisations, community health centres, school boards, the Department of
6
7 Youth Protection, and the Ministry of Education, the working group aimed to: (1)
8
9 document barriers in access to education for undocumented children; (2) create
10
11 collaborative partnerships between researchers, community health centres and
12
13 community organisations, in order to facilitate access to education on a case-by-case
14
15 basis; and (3) to engage different stakeholders, in order to develop policies and
16
17 guidelines, as well as to monitor school practices.
18
19
20
21

22 The project can be divided into three phases, as shown in Figure 1. In the first
23
24 phase, the problem of access to education emerged as an unforeseen yet central finding of
25
26 our study. This prompted us to widen the research design to include access to education,
27
28 and establish a steering committee with community organizations, a legal clinic, and
29
30 children's advocates. Following this, in the second phase, the steering committee helped
31
32 to document pathways to access and developed a support network to help undocumented
33
34 children on a case-by-case basis. Finally, the third phase involved the mobilisation of
35
36 institutional stakeholders in a working group in order to develop policies.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **FIGURE TO INSERT HERE (SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT)**
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Listening to women's voices**

51
52
53 As part of our research project on access to health care for precarious status migrants, we
54
55 interviewed undocumented women regarding access to health care during their
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pregnancy. While we initially expected to document the difficulties these women face in
4 getting adequate medical treatment for themselves and their children, we came to realise
5 that issues around education for their children were often more troubling and long-lasting
6 for them.
7
8
9
10
11

12 The barriers they encountered in access to education were multiple. Some women
13 complained that the school administration refused to enrol their children because they did
14 not hold valid immigration documents. Other children were accepted into school but were
15 asked to pay high tuition fees, since they were considered non-residents. Moreover, both
16 the school administration and the families did not know what documents were needed,
17 and what the existing policies were. One woman, who has lived without legal status for
18 many years, explained her confusion:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *When I finally got my status and I went to Immigration, they asked me why my*
33 *nine-year-old child didn't go to school for two years, when we did not have papers. They*
34 *told me that my child didn't need a study permit to go to school. But I didn't know that!*
35 *Because that's the thing: you need to be informed and know stuff. And when I went to the*
36 *school, they just told me that they didn't want to take him. So they need to inform the*
37 *school about that stuff, too! Because at the school, they asked me for a study permit*
38 *although he didn't need it. And if you don't have papers, then you have to pay fees. And*
39 *they charge like crazy!*
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Many women also voiced their concerns about school registration. Even if schools
54 sometimes turned a blind eye and allowed children to attend school without paying fees,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 children were not officially registered by the Ministry of Education. And, since their
4
5 education was considered unofficial, many of these students were denied their final
6
7 diploma. Although physically present in the education system, they were not formally
8
9 recognised as such.
10
11

12
13 The mothers of these children certainly used the research space to make their
14
15 voices heard, their distress visible. By transmitting their worries, and their children's
16
17 suffering related to school – worries and suffering that can have a huge impact on health
18
19 and wellbeing – they were moving us toward action. Without asking us directly, they
20
21 prompted us to act.
22
23

24
25 As in many action research approaches, the process of listening to the voices of
26
27 these women was a turning point that shifted the study design into an action-oriented
28
29 approach. Yet, different from more traditional participatory action research which is
30
31 conducted *by* and *for* those taking the action, with the goal to empower subjects and
32
33 move toward an emancipatory result (Chatterton et al., 2007), our research did not quite
34
35 follow such a straightforward line. Children and their families –the main subjects for
36
37 which our action was taken - were not directly involved in our collaborative endeavor,
38
39 and yet they played a significant role in reframing our initial research aims.³
40
41
42
43

44
45 Women's voices resonated with our experience not only as researchers, but also
46
47 as clinicians and community organisers. These voices also echoed the stories we heard
48
49 from many community organisers, service providers, and community health staff who
50
51 were part of the research project's advisory board. The resonance of the same issue
52
53 contributed to the feeling of urgency that stirred us to shift the research focus. And yet, as
54
55

56
57 ³ Although we can consider, in important ways, our project as “action research” – a project where action
58
59 and research became intimately intertwined (Brydon-Miller et al., 2003), we did not follow more traditional
60
participatory action research approaches.

1
2
3 we came to realise, the same story turned into a completely different one, when it was
4
5 told from another perspective.
6
7

8 In November 2010, we organised a first meeting with different community
9
10 subjects that were interested and affected by the issue: two community organisations
11
12 which were also members of the advisory board of the project on access to health care; a
13
14 legal clinic serving precarious status migrants; a support centre for newcomer families;
15
16 and an organisation for children's advocacy.⁴ The aim of this introductory meeting was to
17
18 create a steering committee of persons concerned; to document and detail the different
19
20 situations that precarious status immigrants faced; and to look for possible solutions.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Community perspectives**

28
29 The first issue emerging from the steering committee was the heterogeneity, not to say
30
31 the confusion, of practices. The puzzle faced by the women we met was also experienced
32
33 by community workers. They also lacked clear information about the norms adopted by
34
35 school boards, and the existing policies. Whereas undocumented children could be
36
37 accepted to some schools, they could be refused by others, being asked for different
38
39 identification documents or to pay diverse levels of fees.
40
41
42

43
44 Since the practices were so disparate and scattered, we decided that, as a first step
45
46 in moving towards policy change, it was necessary to act at the micro level, and to collect
47
48 data about what was happening on the ground. We created a collaborative support
49
50

51
52
53 ⁴ One person for each of these groups participated in the steering committee, for a total of nine persons
54 involved, including us. Another twelve people involved in community organisations joined the group in the
55 following months. Five meetings were held by the steering committee (before launching the working group
56 with institutional stakeholders) and e-mails were often exchanged to discuss specific cases of access to
57 education. The research team's role, through this entire process, was to organise meetings; coordinate the
58 working group; and manage communication.
59
60

1
2
3 network among the members of the steering committee, in order to document cases of
4
5 denied access to education, and to help families enrol their children.⁵
6
7

8 The tactics of this horizontal mobilisation varied in response to different
9
10 circumstances. Here, we provide some examples of actions that were undertaken within
11
12 the group. In some instances, barriers to access were related to families' lack of
13
14 information and worries of being deported. Fear of disclosing immigration status to the
15
16 school, which would render children visible and more at risk, often prevented some
17
18 families from asking for full information about the registration of their child, or from
19
20 seeking advice. In this case, we would put the family in contact with the community legal
21
22 clinic which was part of our working group. This often helped to reassure the family
23
24 about their rights, or supported them with their immigration situation.
25
26
27
28

29 Other times, barriers to access emerged from the restrictive practices of schools or
30
31 school boards. When a school refused to enrol the child, or when the family could not
32
33 afford to pay the registration fees, we asked for the help of a social worker of a
34
35 community health center. The social worker would meet the family and provide an
36
37 assessment – attesting that the denial of education would cause the child irreparable
38
39 damage for her/his psychological development and wellbeing. This professional
40
41 assessment was used strategically by the family, with the support of the community
42
43 organisation. Specifically, it was used to advocate for the discretionary power of the
44
45 Ministry of Education to waive registration fees. This process was repeated with a
46
47 number of cases and, though successful in the cases we followed, it was very onerous for
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ⁵ The steering committee documented and supported about 20 cases per year. Thanks to the collaboration
55 between the members of the committee, each time we have been successful in getting the child enrolled in
56 school. In the context of case support for children, we acted as intermediators: we linked the families (who
57 were referred to us by community organisations) with social workers. Our twofold role of researchers
58 affiliated to a community health center, or to a community organisation, was essential in this process.
59
60

1
2
3 the family and the workers. Moreover, the families often felt highly exposed in having to
4 present their personal case to the Minister of Education's office.
5
6

7
8 To be sure, these actions were extremely precarious - as insecure was the
9 population they were supporting. They were based on the singularity of each case, and
10 did not guarantee that the child could successfully be enrolled at school. However, this
11 work of support and documentation uncovered, and made clear, two of the main
12 challenges to access to education. First, at the level of the law, a clear policy was missing.
13 Second, at the level of practices, contradictory attitudes informed and shaped the
14 decisions of schools. While school principals had to comply with budgetary frames and
15 obligations in regard to access to education for non-resident children, they had also to
16 respect children's rights and ensure access to school. As a result, decisions remained
17 arbitrary, and a similar situation could lead to completely divergent results, if taken by
18 different school directors or institutions.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 This experience of case advocacy, then, underscored the importance of political
35 change to create a normative system of entitlement to education, rather than a fragile
36 network of discretionary access. Yet, in order to make some effective change at the level
37 of policies, we still lacked certain key voices and perspectives: those of school boards
38 and policy-makers. We then decided to include institutional stakeholders in the working
39 group - at the local, and the provincial level.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Identifying policy actors**

51
52 In organising a first meeting in March 2011, an initial challenge was to strategically
53 identify the most appropriate people with whom we could collaborate. Our decision was
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 informed by the experience of the steering committee, which unpacked the knot of access
4 to education from three different angles: the law; its application; and the protection of
5 children rights. We then believed that it was essential to involve subjects who dealt with
6 these three perspectives in their daily work.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 At the level of the law, we contacted the Ministry of Education, which has the
14 power to determine broad guidelines for the education system, and to allocate resources
15 to the school boards. Equally important, the Ministry guarantees the validity of the
16 diplomas – a key issue for many undocumented children. A consultant working in the
17 Ministry of Education, in the department of services for cultural community, actively
18 participated in the working group. His collaboration has been decisive in providing
19 information about the existing policies, and about the policy changes which were most
20 likely to be acceptable to the Ministry. Although not involved in decision-making at a
21 higher level, this person played an important role in establishing a trust relationship
22 between the working group and the Ministry.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 At the level of law application, we involved different school boards in the region
37 of Montreal. School boards are responsible for the registration of children and they hold
38 jurisdiction over planning, supervision, evaluation, and support. Among the five school
39 boards in Montreal, four decided to participate in the working group.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Finally, in terms of children's rights protection, we included an organisation for
47 child advocacy and two Youth Protection agencies responsible for the security and
48 development of a child – regardless of the child's immigration status.⁶ Notably, the
49 security or development of a child may be considered to be in danger if a child does not
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 ⁶ All of their services are mandated by the Québec Youth Protection Act, the Canadian Youth Criminal
58 Justice Act, and other applicable legislation.
59
60

1
2
3 attend school, or is frequently absent without reason. We thus hoped that the youth
4
5 protection institutions were able to advocate for greater access to education for
6
7 undocumented children.
8
9

10 11 12 **The power to discover the law**

13
14
15 The very fact that a space of discussion and collaboration was created between
16
17 community and institutional actors was the first step to unravel, and connect together the
18
19 discourses and interests of different subjects - in the hope of determining a common
20
21 strategy of action. The first action we took in this direction was to discover the grey areas
22
23 within the law, and its different (mis)interpretations. By discovering the law, we mean to
24
25 uncover law and regimes of power as comprising “more than legal codes, government
26
27 policies, and bureaucratic apparatuses” (Coutin, 1993 88). As Calavita (1998) has argued
28
29 with respect to the production of illegality in Spain, “there may be no smoking gun, but
30
31 there is nonetheless a lot of smoke in the air” (557). Without any smoking gun, we still
32
33 had to understand where all the smoke came from.
34
35
36
37

38
39 Not surprisingly, we found that there was little discussion about undocumented
40
41 children and access to education in either immigration or education policies. The bulk of
42
43 the action took place off the record. What slowly emerged, during the meetings of the
44
45 group, was a reciprocal understanding of the myriad of underground practices, half-
46
47 written guidelines, and contradictory interpretations of the law which evoked opacity,
48
49 rather than transparency.
50
51

52
53 As we explained earlier, there was a “legal black hole” (Wilde, 2005) regarding
54
55 these children, meaning that there was no mention of this specific category and their
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 rights. Interestingly, this legal vacuum created the impression, especially in institutional
4 subjects at higher levels, that the issue did not exist at all. In the first meeting of the
5
6 working group, the representative of the Ministry tended to minimise the problem: after
7
8 all, there was no mention of these children in the law, and these issues were never
9
10 brought to their attention by the schools. When he later was confronted with the
11
12 experiences of school boards and community organisations, he expressed his genuine
13
14 surprise, stating that “we have never perceived the situation as real.” In the rooms of the
15
16 Ministry, indeed, it was as if these children were not part of social reality.
17
18
19
20
21

22 While for policymakers the issue was non-existent, it was real enough at the level
23
24 of its application. For school boards, it was acutely felt as a financial burden to their
25
26 system capacity because they received no additional funding for undocumented children
27
28 attending their schools. They were then left with a huge responsibility and were often
29
30 caught in an ethical dilemma - that of deciding who should have access to school. Each
31
32 school board adopted different administrative practices of entitlement – they decided
33
34 what documents were needed, and what categories of undocumented children they should
35
36 accept. These norms were not entirely official or written,⁷ nor homogenously applied by
37
38 schools. The school board directors on the working group expressed a feeling of being
39
40 isolated: they were alone without any guidelines or information from the Ministry of
41
42 Education, and without any support from other school boards. Each school board was, in
43
44 fact, completely unaware about how others in the region of Montreal were struggling
45
46 with similar situations. The meetings of the working group became then essential in order
47
48 to establish a reflective space of discussion where, for the first time, the issue was
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 ⁷ Procedures about access to education could be, for instance, published on the website of a school board,
58 although an official institutional policy was not necessarily communicated to schools.
59
60

1
2
3 recognised. And where, most importantly, the heterogeneity of unofficial practices
4
5 became visible.
6

7
8 Two main problems were raised by the school boards. Firstly, there were multiple
9
10 enrolment procedures. A few schools demanded only a birth certificate as a proof of
11
12 identity, as required by the provincial regulation, while most also required a valid
13
14 immigration document. For particular cases of children in a legal limbo – for instance,
15
16 children who were awaiting a decision on humanitarian and compassionate grounds -
17
18 some schools accepted the child without asking for any registration fees, while others
19
20 refused access altogether.
21
22

23
24 Secondly, even when the child managed to enrol in school, there were barriers in
25
26 terms of bureaucracy and administration. Normally, a child receives a lifetime permanent
27
28 code from the Ministry of Education, which allows the student's credits to be recognised
29
30 provincially and to issue the diploma. In the case of children registering for the first time
31
32 without any legal residency, the lack of proof of Quebec residency prevented a permanent
33
34 code from being issued. As one school board representative bluntly put it in one of the
35
36 meetings, “if you do not have a permanent code, simply you do not exist.” Without this
37
38 code, children then became legally and socially invisible.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Establishing an action plan**

47
48 The collaborative environment, which was slowly formed over the months, helped to
49
50 unveil the messiness of the practices and to foresee potential solutions. With time, people
51
52 felt comfortable expressing their concerns and perspectives. The fact of listening to
53
54 others’ experiences created a common space of reflexivity – where people questioned
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 their own practices, and gradually shifted the perception of their own role. For instance,
4
5 many institutional subjects – especially the ones who did not encounter undocumented
6
7 children in their daily work – initially felt that they were not directly concerned. Yet,
8
9 when they later learned about the difficult ways in which others were trying to
10
11 accommodate these children, they became aware of the constraints of policies, but also of
12
13 their own institution. At the same time, community actors also nuanced the negative
14
15 opinions that they had about institutions, becoming more conscious of the challenges that
16
17 they faced. This process facilitated a common understanding of the issue, and moved
18
19 institutions towards action.
20
21
22
23

24
25 It was after one year that the working group decided that time was ripe to take
26
27 collective action. A letter and a background document were sent to the Ministry of
28
29 Education, outlining the main problems and possible solutions. The representative of the
30
31 Ministry helped in giving suggestions and insights about how to develop the letter. At the
32
33 level of access to school, we asked the Ministry of Education to develop clear policies
34
35 and guidelines that would make undocumented children living in Quebec one of the
36
37 categories having free access to education. The premise of the working group was that
38
39 education should be free for all children *residing* in Quebec. Then, we recommended that
40
41 the legal definition of “resident” should be modified, allowing free education as based on
42
43 factual residency rather than legal immigration status. At the level of administrative
44
45 barriers, we requested that a permanent code had to be issued. Moreover, a document on
46
47 the long-term social and financial negative cost of the exclusion of undocumented
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 children from education was drafted by one of the researchers, in order to support the
4
5 adoption of new policies.⁸
6
7

8 The draft of the document was a gradual, slow and collaborative process. Regular
9
10 meetings were organised in order to discuss and finalise the documents, with the
11
12 participation of many members of the working group. Researchers and community
13
14 organisations prepared a preliminary draft; then, school boards and the representative of
15
16 the Ministry gave their feedback and added a layer of complexity to the explanations of
17
18 different situations of denied access.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Policy change**

25
26
27 In September 2013, subsequent to the advocacy letter and to public demonstrations of an
28
29 activist collective for access to education for undocumented children,⁹ the Minister of
30
31 Education finally announced new regulations. Yet, the main changes allowed not a
32
33 reformulation of the notion of resident - which would have required an integral
34
35 modification of the law. Rather, they broadened the categories of non-resident children
36
37 who were entitled - as an *exception* to the law - to free education. The new policy added
38
39 new classifications of precarious status migrants,¹⁰ as well the definition of children
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 ⁸ Jill Hanley analysed the long-term negative social impact of exclusion from education.

49 ⁹ This public mobilisation had a significant impact in terms of strategic media pressure, bringing the issue
50 to the public eye. Yet, it was also perceived with ambivalence by institutional actors, some of whom felt
51 that the organisation was promoting a “radical” portrayal of the issue that unnecessarily polarised the
52 debate. The tone of the public actions also created the impression that undocumented children can almost
53 never attend school, which may have the unintended result of increasing the fears of families and may
54 discourage them from seeking support.

55 ¹⁰ New categories include, for instance, children who are refused refugee status but come from countries
56 where there are moratoria on removal. It is important to note that these categories of children all have a
57 temporary legal right to remain, and do not explicitly include undocumented children who are not allowed,
58 by any legal means, to remain in the national territory.
59
60

1
2
3 “being followed”¹¹ by social workers at a community health center or a Youth Protection
4
5 Agency.
6
7

8 In these new regulations, undocumented children were yet again not mentioned at
9
10 all. Two were the main reasons. First, a redefinition of the category of resident would
11
12 have required a change in the law, which is a much slower and complicated process.
13
14 Second, perhaps these children were still unmentionable, due to their unlawful status.
15
16 And yet, the notion of “being followed” was deliberately left ambiguous, in order to
17
18 allow space for action. The strategic support network working to get children into schools
19
20 – which, before then, was merely informal and only included community organisations –
21
22 was now, even if ambiguously, recognised and extended to institutional subjects such as
23
24 youth protection agencies.
25
26
27
28

29 With the passing of this new guideline, the institutional actors involved (school
30
31 boards, community health center and youth protection agencies) felt that they were given
32
33 the capacity to address most of the problem from an administrative perspective. In our
34
35 experience since the changes, every case we have brought forward, with an attestation
36
37 that the child is being followed, has been successful in enrolling the child in school
38
39 without tuition fees and with an official registration code. So although this policy offers
40
41 only a backdoor, it does seem to be open.
42
43
44
45

46 At this point, the most important difficulty limiting access has become lack of
47
48 information. Those most concerned by the issue (community groups and families
49
50 themselves) remain largely unaware of the changes. A year and half after the new
51
52 regulations, families are still approaching community groups unaware of the loophole
53
54 that can allow their children into school relatively easily. Or, perhaps even more
55
56

57
58 ¹¹ What in French is translated by “prise en charge.”
59
60

1
2
3 disturbing, parents reported that they knew about the new regulation but feared to expose
4 their status to institutions. Without an official “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy, the assurance
5 that school boards respect confidentiality and do not share information with immigration
6 authorities fail to assuage the fears.
7
8
9
10
11

12 13 14 15 **Concluding reflections** 16

17 Although the objective of obtaining full access for undocumented children has not yet
18 been totally reached, the process of the working group - its positive results, and its pitfalls
19 - are significant in highlighting key questions concerning how we can better understand
20 the making of illegality and social marginalisation.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 To be sure, the experience of our collaborative research brought questions of
28 access and entitlement into a new light. While hearing different yet complementary
29 perspectives, we came to realise that we were dealing with hidden practices of
30 invisibility, rather than transparent norms. In the last years, many scholars have called for
31 a study of illegality as an historical, political and social construction (see: De Genova,
32 2002). In line with this approach, many have examined the ways in which legal regimes
33 make migrants undeserving and outsiders from the community of citizens. Yet, in the
34 case of undocumented children, social exclusion was created within the silences and
35 absences of laws. If laws did produce something, it was an *absence*, rather than an
36 excess. Proposing the notion of “institutional invisibility,” we argue that access and
37 entitlement are often constructed within unwritten and ambiguous practices that make the
38 lives of people invisible to the institutional entities with which they interact.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For the Ministry of Education, it was as if these children did not exist at all –
4 simply because there was no mention of them in the law. For school boards, these young
5 people represented an unspoken dilemma. They were not officially recognised as students
6 with a valid registration code, even if they were physically present in the school system.
7 They were there, yet they did not exist at a legal and administrative level. The arbitrary
8 attitudes of some of the school boards were implicitly condoned by the silence of the
9 Ministry, and unchallenged by families and children who were afraid to expose their
10 status.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In order to understand these opaque and intricate ways in which institutional
23 invisibility is shaped, it becomes crucial to create different collaborative research
24 strategies beyond the university. It is key, in the field of undocumented migration, to
25 open a dialogue with all subjects involved: policy-makers, school administrators,
26 community organisations (Atweh et al., 2002 , Ross et al., 2003). But this is not simply
27 necessary because researchers, as many have argued, “need to translate their work more
28 effectively and for a much broader array of audiences” (Willen et al., 2011: 333).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In our experience, the methodological and epistemological dimensions became
40 blurred, in a more profound sense - opening new ways for thinking about issues of
41 illegality and access to social services. The shift in our research focus – from health care
42 to education - was triggered by those who had the most at stake: the mothers of
43 undocumented children themselves. By voicing their concerns, they made visible to us an
44 issue that we did not initially intend to study. Our research process was not linear – it did
45 not begin with a question and ended with a solution. Neither was our research objective
46 in any reductive sense. It was rather an unpredictable process of sequential reflection,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 research, and action, carried out with and by different subjects (Cornwall and Jewkes,
4 1995). Research and intervention then became intimately entwined, and it became
5 impossible to separate the two in any meaningful way. This created possibilities for
6 learning and acting that reformulated the entire research process as reflective endeavour
7 between different voices and stakes (Meloni et al., 2015). In this sense, we acted because
8 women's concerns triggered a reflective network of other voices in the community and
9 research settings – in which our voices, as well as our actions, became an inextricable
10 part of it.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Collaborative and action research then became the key for understanding the issue
23 of access to education in a more comprehensive perspective – from the ground up, and
24 from the centre out. Through the act of listening to multiple covert stakes, we were able
25 to hear a whole range of contradictory perspectives which have often gone unheard in
26 simplistic representations of the “state” or “policies” as homogenous entities. The
27 creation of a common and reflective space for these different voices – which were silent
28 or alone before - was essential in order to highlight the blind and contradictory spots of
29 practices surrounding access.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The partnership between community and institutional actors has been a
42 significant, even if only a partial, first step that can potentially help to establish different
43 and alternative forms of recognition. Yet, the understanding which emerged from our
44 process did not lead to full translation at the level of the policies, and of the law.
45 Undocumented children now have access but through an ambiguous channel. Our work is
46 far from over. Making visible the invisible is a gradual and ongoing process when it
47 comes to recognising, with different eyes, what was not seen before.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgments

We are profoundly indebted to the members of the working group for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this draft, as well as for their invaluable collaboration in the research process.

For Peer Review

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 ATWEH, B., KEMMIS, S. & WEEKS, P., (2002), *Action research in practice:*
9
10 *Partnership for social justice in education*, Place, Routledge.
11
12 BHABHA, J., (2004), "The" Mere Fortuity" of Birth? Are Children Citizens?", *In*
13
14 BENHABIB, S. & RESNIK, J., *Migrations and Mobilities: Citizenship, Border*
15
16 *and Gender*. New York University Press, Published, 187-227.
17
18
19
20 BOSNIAK, L., (2008), *The citizen and the alien: dilemmas of contemporary membership*,
21
22 Place, Princeton University Press.
23
24
25 CALAVITA, K., (1998), "Immigration, law, and marginalization in a global economy:
26
27 Notes from Spain", *Law and Society Review*, 529-66.
28
29
30 CHATTERTON, P., FULLER, D. & ROUTLEDGE, P., (2007), *Relating action to*
31
32 *activism: Theoretical and methodological reflections*, Place, Routledge.
33
34
35 CORNWALL, A. & JEWKES, R., (1995), "What is participatory research?", *Social*
36
37 *Science & Medicine*, 41, 1667-76.
38
39
40 COUTIN, S. B., (1993), *The Culture of Protest: Religious Activism and the U.S.*
41
42 *Sanctuary Movement*, Place, Westview Press.
43
44
45 COUTIN, S. B., (2003), *Legalizing moves: Salvadoran immigrants' struggle for US*
46
47 *residency*, Place, University of Michigan Press
48
49 CRÉPEAU, F. & NAKACHE, D., (2006), "Controlling Irregular Immigration in Canada:
50
51 Reconciling Security Concerns with Human Rights Protection", *IRPP Choices*,
52
53 12, 1-44.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 DE GENOVA, N., (2002), "Migrant "illegality" and deportability in everyday life ",
4
5
6 *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31, 419-47.
7
- 8 GOLDRING, L., BERINSTEIN, C. & BERNHARD, J. K., (2009), "Institutionalizing
9
10 precarious migratory status in Canada", *Citizenship Studies*, 13, 239 - 65.
11
- 12 LUKES, S., (2005), "Power and the Battle for Hearts and Minds", *Millennium-Journal of*
13
14 *International Studies*, 33, 477-93.
15
- 16
17
18 MAGALHAES, L., CARRASCO, C. & GASTALDO, D., (2010), "Undocumented
19
20 migrants in Canada: a scope literature review on health, access to services, and
21
22 working conditions", *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 12, 132-51.
23
- 24 MEHTA, L., (2008), "Over the Rainbow: The Politics of Researching Citizenship and
25
26 Marginality", *Action Research*, 6, 233-53.
27
- 28
29 MELONI, F., ROUSSEAU, C., MONTGOMERY, C. & MEASHAM, T., (2014),
30
31 "Children of Exception: Redefining Categories of Illegality and Citizenship in
32
33 Canada", *Children & Society*, 28, 305-15.
34
- 35
36 MELONI, F., VANTHUYNE, K. & ROUSSEAU, C., (2015), "Towards a relational
37
38 ethics: Rethinking ethics, agency and dependency in research with children and
39
40 youth", *Anthropological Theory*, 15, 106-23.
41
- 42
43 ROSS, S., LAVIS, J., RODRIGUEZ, C., WOODSIDE, J. & DENIS, J.-L., (2003),
44
45 "Partnership experiences: involving decision-makers in the research process",
46
47 *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 8, 26-34.
48
- 49
50 ROUSSEAU, C., LAURIN-LAMOTHE, A., RUMMENS, J., MELONI, F.,
51
52
53 STEINMETZ, N. & ALVAREZ, F., (2013), "Uninsured immigrant and refugee
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 children presenting to Canadian paediatric emergency departments: Disparities in
4 help-seeking and service delivery", *Paediatrics & Child Health*, 18, 465 - 9.
5
6
7
8 RUIZ-CASARES, M., ROUSSEAU, C., DERLUYN, I., WATTERS, C. & CRÉPEAU,
9
10 F., (2010), "Right and access to healthcare for undocumented children:
11 Addressing the gap between international conventions and disparate
12 implementations in North America and Europe", *Social Science & Medicine*, 70,
13 329-36.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 VANTHUYNE, K., MELONI, F., RUIZ-CASARES, M., ROUSSEAU, C. & RICARD-
21
22 GUAY, A., (2013), "Health workers' perceptions of access to care for children
23 and pregnant women with precarious immigration status: Health as a right or a
24 privilege?", *Social Science & Medicine*, 93, 78-85.
25
26
27
28
29 WATTERS, C., (2011), "Towards a new paradigm in migrant health research: integrating
30 entitlement, access and appropriateness", *International Journal of Migration,
31 Health and Social Care*, 7, 148-59.
32
33
34
35
36
37 WILDE, R., (2005), "Legal "Black Hole"? Extraterritorial State Action and International
38 Treaty Law on Civil and Political Rights", *Michigan Journal of International
39 Law*, 739-806.
40
41
42
43
44 WILLEN, S., (2011), "How is health-related" deservingness" reckoned? Perspectives
45 from unauthorized im/migrants in Tel Aviv", *Social Science & Medicine*, 74, 812-
46 21.
47
48
49
50
51 WILLEN, S., MULLIGAN, J. & CASTAÑEDA, H., (2011), "Take a Stand Commentary:
52 How Can Medical Anthropologists Contribute to Contemporary Conversations on
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “Illegal” Im/migration and Health?", *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 25, 331-
4
5
6 56.

7
8 WILLEN, S. S., (2012), "Migration,“illegality,” and health: Mapping embodied
9
10 vulnerability and debating health-related deservingness", *Social Science &*
11
12 *Medicine*, 74, 805-11.

13
14
15 YARRIS, K. & CASTAÑEDA, H., (2015), "Special Issue Discourses of Displacement
16
17 and Deservingness: Interrogating Distinctions between “Economic” and “Forced”
18
19 Migration", *International Migration*, 53, 64-9.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Map of the research process

To insert at the end of page 7