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Introduction

The goal of the research project that is partially contained in this document was to propose a comparative examination of the approaches, models, policies and practices dealing with the welcoming and schooling of immigrant pupils that have been undertaken in different countries and regions. At the same time, it merits explaining that one of the ultimate goals of this study was to endeavour to provide different models and experiences of organising the reception and education of newly arrived students that could serve to inform the strategic avenues of action in the Catalan educational administration, as well as more directly the policies implemented by schools. These goals were based on the following caveat: any attempt to find possible references as to usefulness on an international level must take into consideration the weight of the conditions of transferability –the contextual distances and proximities that allow their exportability to be assessed– of policies and approaches from one situation to another.

Starting from this premise, the study performed suggested a comparative vision of the models and policies for receiving and educating newly arrived students implemented in Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium and Canada. Very briefly, the criteria justifying this selection were: 1) being multilingual and plurinational contexts (Belgium and Canada); having an educational administrative structure similar to that of Catalonia (Germany); a context of educational competences falling on the municipalities (United Kingdom). As one of the objectives of this study was to grasp the effects of the structure of both the administration and competences of the educational systems in these countries on their respective models of reception and education, the study stressed how these models operate on a regional level: the Land of Bavaria in Germany, England in Britain, the French Community in Belgium and the province of Quebec in Canada.

The complete (original) report of this study was organised around five more specific objectives. Briefly, they are:

1. To learn about and compare the cultural and linguistic context that has historically characterised the national identification process of the countries examined.

2. To find out and compare the realities of the phenomenon of migration and how it is politically regulated in the different countries and regions examined.

3. To learn about and compare the organisation of the educational administration and the educational system itself in the countries and regions studied.

4. To learn about and compare the theoretical-political models, agenda, political planning and main programmes and interventions that make up the type of approach to the education-immigration binomial in each of the countries and regions examined.

5. To provide factors for reflecting on the meaning and measurement of how these references provide useful lessons to the main debates taking place in the Catalonia in this realm.
The summary presented herewith focuses on **specific objective 4**. Choosing this option has meant summarily capturing in this document the main contents of chapter 4 of the original research report. Referring to the exercises on contextualisation (linguistic and cultural framework, immigration framework and educational framework) which are contained in its previous sections, this chapter surveys the realities, prospects and political planning that describe the status of the processes of receiving and educating newly arrived immigrant students in the educational systems being examined. More specifically, the sections elaborated evolved from a more macro to a more micro perspective: after starting by examining the different general models that guide the theoretical political framing of dealing with cultural diversity in the school setting in the different countries and regions, they lead to a description of practical interventions in the field of receiving and educating students who are the children of foreign families.

1. **Education and diversity: General models**

We shall endeavour to define the approaches that serve to interpret the frameworks for legitimising the political actions aimed at dealing with education and cultural diversity in the different countries and regions examined.

1.1. **Bavaria**

In Germany, the educational systems are the exclusive competence of the *Länder*. Despite this, the dynamic of how the Federal Republic of Germany works leads to there being certain points that are regarded as especially important in which either consensus is reached or they are at least debated in the Permanent Conference of Ministers of Education and Culture from all the federal states.

In the 1950s, this Permanent Conference approved its first resolution with the objective of introducing classes with special native language programmes for foreign students. Twenty years later, the perspective had gradually shifted, and in 1971 the Permanent Conference decided to include foreign children and teenagers into the existent educational system instead of offering them separate classes. A new step was taken in 1976, when the “*Unterricht für Kinder ausländischer Arbeitnehmer*” (“Education for the children of foreign workers”) emphasised the role of native languages in the educational process (Schmahl, 2001).

The Permanent Conference’s recommendations were as follows (Schmahl, 2001):

a) All children with their main residence in Germany are subject to compulsory education within the general educational system.

b) So that students may attend regular classes without significant language difficulties, they must be educated in those classes and schools that are in line with their age and skills.

c) As a support to those foreign students encountering considerable problems with the German language, special support will be provided, such as preliminary courses, courses in their native language, special and/or intensive classes, etc.
d) Supplementary classes in the native language will be held for up to five hours per week.

The resolutions of the Permanent Conference are not binding, such that the Länder have considerable leeway. Essentially, there are two different models in terms of the education of immigrant children in Germany (Schmahl, 2001: 286):

First is the so-called Berlin Model, where foreign-born students are immediately included in regular classes alongside German students. In this model, language difficulties are compensated by special assistants, and, when this is not possible, training is provided prior to inclusion in the school.

The Bavaria Model, on the contrary, chooses those students with the same native language who do not have the skills needed to attend regular classes, and groups them in extra classes where the lessons are taught bilingually (native language and German). These are referred to as “Nationalklasse” (“national classes”). All the subjects are taught in the students’ native language in the first two grades of primary school, and the use of German is gradually increased until German is spoken in the upper grades. Students may make the transition to regular classes in German as long as they have reached a sufficient level of knowledge of German.

The segregating component of the Bavaria Model is not a characteristic that is exclusive to this Land, rather it is quite common throughout the German educational system, leading it to be one of the most segmented systems in Europe. The sorting that takes place in the German educational system, though most obvious in the Bavarian system, is present in all the Länder and takes place through a variety of mechanisms, such as certain students joining the regular schools later, selective repetition of courses, recommendations for certain educational plans in the transition from primary to secondary education, and so forth (Diefenbach, 2003: 226).

Diefenbach (2003: 238-239) establishes a list of times or circumstances when one can speak about ethnic segregation in the German educational system:

- Immigrant children receive preschool education less frequently than local children.
- Including immigrant children in the formal educational system is put off more often than in the case of local children.
- Immigrant pupils are more often recommended to pursue their secondary education at Hauptschule, the lowest level educational institution.
- Immigrant pupils pursue their secondary education less often at Realschule or Gymnasium.
- Immigrant pupils achieve lower reading competency than local students, regardless of whether or not the former were born in Germany.
- A much higher percentage of immigrant pupils leave school without obtaining the corresponding degree than local students.
Twice as many immigrant pupils are educated in special schools (Sondernschulen) than local students.

However, it is worth pointing out that the so-called Bavarian Model is especially segregating in terms of how it deals with diversity since, as we have seen, it is founded on creating special classes for foreign pupils students, thus avoiding contact between immigrant and local students.

The belief in the temporary nature of immigration, and thus in the relatively brief sojourn of immigrant students in Bavarian schools, was the inspiration behind the creation of native language classes for these students, with the goal of easing their return to their homelands.

However, as the years went by it became clear that immigrant pupils did not return to their homelands, rather they underwent their entire education (and in many cases, lived their entire lives) in Germany. This, along with the emergence for the earliest intercultural discourses, are the factors that motivated a gradual change in the Bavarian educational approaches aimed at handling diversity. Thus, we can claim that the Bavarian segregating model is experiencing ongoing evolution towards trends more in line with the compensatory model, especially since the report issued by Ursula Neumann in the early 1990s (Beauftragte der Bundersregierung für Ausländerfragen, 2001:16).

At this time of change, welcoming classes in the native language are being implemented, transition classes combining German with the native language are being taught, the need to learn German is being reinforced, and teaching aids are being provided to fulfil this task. In a more advanced phase which is still today experimental, in Bavaria the first trials of including immigrant students into regular classes are getting underway.

Thus, the Bavaria Model has gradually lost its segregating component that most clearly identified it as it has shifted, albeit gradually, towards the compensatory model. It is true that a certain intercultural discourse is beginning to emerge amongst the Bavarian educational authorities, yet as of today it is still merely a rhetorical discourse that has not been materialised in noteworthy educational initiatives.

1.2. The French Community (Belgium)

According to Verhoeven (2004) until the 1970s Belgium did not have such a clearly assimilationist model, rather it was founded more on the precepts of “differential exclusion”. This approach was characterised by the hurdles foreigners had to face to become naturalised and a conception that referred to the phenomenon of immigration as a “temporary” situation, not an endogenous reality.

Starting in the 1970s, with the economic crisis and the change in paradigm about immigration, a shift took place in the conception of cultural diversity at school. As Verhoeven (2005) asserts, educational actions in this field began to be permeated with the general premises of the French model:
A republican or assimilationist model, embodied by France, which is based on being anchored in citizenship. This model is defined by participation in the public domain and by the acquisition of the dominant culture, which is defined as universal, and which is contrasted to the particularisms of the private domain [...] Thus, the school becomes a central institution in access to citizenship, in a context far removed from a cultural interpretation of the social reality (Verhoeven, 2005: 77).

In general terms, nowadays one can conclude that the francophone model of dealing with cultural diversity (in the educational system as well) is clearly inspired by the premises of the French-style assimilationist approach, while also being clearly positioned within the so-called compensatory perspective.

Whereas Flanders has chosen a “culturalist” avenue, where this facet is clearly present in the educational discourses and practices (for example, there is talk of policies in favour of the “ethnic-cultural” minorities), we can see how the French Community has chosen a generic, “social” type of approach, replacing attention to ethnic inequalities in education with dealing with these inequalities and providing aid to the most disadvantaged. Thus, the (positive) discrimination is justified according to socioeconomic categorisation, virtually never according to cultural or ethnic categories.

The francophone perspective is effectively oriented along the lines of the assimilationists (integration “by default”), with a foundation based on social, individual and citizenship concerns. At the same time, this perspective does not prevent compensatory educational policies and practices from being implemented, specific interventions that show the nuances and complexity of the specific approach to the phenomenon of immigration.

However, it is worth mentioning that the application of this general model is currently encountering resonances and a diverse array of specific manifestations according to the very diversity and tensions inherent in the organisation of the school system within the French Community. As Verhoeven explains:

*Although in the French Community the very idea of an intercultural school policy has been based on the model of national integration largely inspired by the French model, this generalisation should be tempered by two realities: first, the two predominant school systems (the official or the free catholic) are not necessarily bearers and executors of the same model of integration; and secondly, it should be understood that the situation of the schools in a quasi-market context also exerts a great deal of influence* (Verhoeven, 2005a).

When assessing how this social model of integration through assimilation has worked with different particularities in the French Community, and with strong doses of positive discrimination in the field of education, a variety of issues emerge that should be taken into account. The Centre National pour l’Egalité des Chances et la Lutte contre le Racisme (CNECLR), an official institution created by the Belgian Government and Parliament in 1993⁴, has issued significant criticisms and warnings as to the results and

---

⁴ The official mandate of the centre is “to promote equal opportunities and fight against any form of exclusion, distinction or restriction based on differences of race, colour, parentage, or national or ethnic background, as well as based on sexual orientation, marital status, birth, age, religious or other type of belief, health, handicap, etc.”
Schools have traditionally been regarded as one of the most powerful vectors for integration. Thus, for example, in the decree defining the missions of the educational systems in the French Community (Décret de missions, 1997), rectification of social or cultural inequalities is explicitly dealt with. At schools within the French Community, 20% of the student body is foreign or comes from immigrant families, for whom, based on the available data, schools still seem to be more a place of failure than success. It is even more disturbing to see how for these students, in the past twenty years, the rates of school failure, being held back, overrepresentation in vocational schools, etc., continue to show the significant hardship they experience within the educational system, despite the specific measures and positive policies (e.g., positive discrimination) (CNECLR, 2001: 56).

Thereafter, the same report questions the validity of lumping educational inequalities that are specifically attributable to the issue of immigration under the heading of educational inequalities that can be explained based on socioeconomic criteria. This same process of questioning also gives rise to references to the specificity of the educational needs of many of the newly-arrived immigrant students.

We know that the causes behind these outcomes are, first, the socioeconomic factors common to the entire disadvantaged population. Yet additionally, there are specific problems with these students, such as their proficiency in French, their parents’ cultural distance and the fragility of their own identities, which spotlight the latent crisis in our educational system. And especially, our school institutions’ difficult adopting to and providing responses to the sociocultural diversity of their student bodies (CNECLR, 2001: 57).

Although the general model of reception and education of immigrant pupils has remained largely unaltered, it does appear that in the past few years the educational administration in the French Community has gradually included some approaches and avenues of intervention that harmonise with the arguments of CNECLR and other similar voices.

For example, on 14th June 2001, the Décret visant à l’insertion des élèves primo-arrivants dans l’enseignement organisé ou subventionné par la Communauté française was passed down, the objective of which was “the insertion of newly-arrived students into education that is organised or subsidised by the French Community”. The goal of this decree is to provide better orientation and reception of newly-arrived children into the educational system by outlining specific support measures (the classe-passerelle, courses on language and culture, etc.).

At the same time, also in recent years Brussels has begun to formulate and implement proposals that, though they do not act directly on schools, do attempt to deal with the increasing difficulties of integration of entire neighbourhoods in the city. Thus, in 2000 the COCOF (the French Community’s commission in the region of Brussels) started up the Programme for Cohabitation and Integration, with four overarching objectives, some of which also specifically address how to deal with intercultural relations and the problem of racism:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation into citizenship;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enlivenment of public spaces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising the awareness of social stakeholders and actors who deal with the problem of racism in the territory;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing harmonious intercultural and intergenerational relations within neighbourhoods; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to encourage social and professional inclusion of the most disadvantaged people based on a partnership between the administration, enterprise and civil society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the French Community in general, several political initiatives involving specific action that are being implemented in the different Regional Integration Centres are worth mentioning, ranging from the Interdepartmental Directorate of Social Integration to the Directorate General for Social Action or the Ministry of Health. The recent drafting of the Strategic Plan for Social Inclusion (presented on 19th October 2005) represents a clear sign of the intention to coordinate many of these initiatives and give them renewed impetus. Let us examine the six overarching spheres of high priority action included in the plan:

1. **Decent housing for everyone**
2. **The elderly**
3. **Individuals with handicaps**
4. **Individuals in unstable situations, citizens needing to be maintained**
5. **Integration of foreign people**
6. **Unemployed individuals**

In terms of our focus, special mention should be made of the target group mentioned in the fifth strategic sphere. The introduction to the actions framed within this sphere declares:

*The smooth integration of foreign people is essential for their presence to represent an enrichment for everyone. Nonetheless, numerous indicators show that foreign people have specific difficulties integration.*
It is worth mentioning that to handle these needs, the plan only develops a single action: strengthening the Regional Integration Centres and actions to foster citizenship\(^2\).

Thus, we can conclude that the educational system in the French Community is situated within a social and political context in which the assimilationist paradigm imported from France predominates. This model of implementation has not been exempt from generating criticism and being questioned by different sectors. In subsequent sections we shall expand more fully on how the educational administration itself has gradually opened approaches and interventions specifically addressed at the reception and education of newly arrived immigrant pupils. At that point, we will be able to refine our interpretation of the scope of this attempted reinterpretation of the French assimilationist model.

### 1.3. England

In this section, we shall endeavour to situate the main common points that have prevailed in the political and academic discourses and practices related to the conceptualisation of and approach to dealing with cultural diversity in the realm of educational policy. As we shall see, in England (and in Britain in general), the foundations of this debate lie in the ongoing confrontation between different stances on the variables of *race* and *ethnicity*.

**Races and ethnicities: The debates from the 1970s to the 1990s**

Many English authors have made in-depth analyses of the constants and transformations which have characterised the handling of *ethnic diversity* by the British educational system in the course of the past three decades\(^3\). David Gillborn (1995), for example, discusses the vicissitudes this issue has undergone, focusing on two key moments that identify, in their time, two metamorphoses in the use of the very concept of “ethnicity”. Both processes can be explained as trends towards what is called the “deracialisation” of political discourse and educational practice, and all three are framed within the context of decades of successive conservative governments in the United Kingdom.

At first, what Martin Barker (1981) has defined as the “new racism” prevailed, from the British “new Right”. This is a process in which the explicative value of the variable of *race* (as a biological entity) is replaced with the transcendence of definitions of the variable of *ethnicity* or *culture*. The consequent transformation in the discourse entails

\(^2\) The seven Regional Integration Centres were created in 1996 and undertake different actions to promote the integration of newly arrived immigrants and foreigners. This plan adds a new action which involves promoting cultural exchanges and respect for cultural differences.

a shift from *racialisation* to *ethnification*. From this cultural fundamentalism, which is equal parts deterministic and essentialist, ethnic identity takes on a quasi-biological guise.

Considering school-society-family/community relations, the contributions provided from this perspective are, in the best of cases, extremely limited. A theoretical elaboration of the transcendence and meaning of these relations is virtually nonexistent in the conservative line. Nonetheless, the commonly prioritised unit of analysis in the majority of these approaches is nothing other than the school “microsystem” itself, always with a dearth of in-depth reflections on the role played by the very structure of society when defining the specifically school-related dynamics. All the weight of determining these dynamics can be explained based on an essentialist view of the ethnicity of the family and community environment. In this sense, the independent or explicative variable of both educational and social differences-inequalities is this type of desocialised and ahistorical culture that reinforces ethnic groups and that, ultimately, serves to account for why many of the students belonging to these groups fail at school. Ultimately, everything is interpreted in terms of the minority student body affiliated with ethnic identities that are more or less “assimilable”.

The 1980s witnessed the onset of a second shift in the process of deracialising the debate and political practice. This is the shift leading to the “invisibilisation” of the discussion on the implications of ethnic identity and racism, to its lack of consideration in terms of the political agenda. Generally speaking, social policy is designed from a vantage point of colour-blindness. According to the words of David Gillborn:

> *By denying ‘race’ any special status in education (and other areas of social policy) this discourse undermines the position of individuals and groups who seek to address ‘race’ issues. If ‘race’ has no special status, then anyone who claims otherwise is not only wrong, but likely to be stirring up trouble (probably deliberately). This position is clearly illustrated in discourses that attack any individual or group that attempts to promote antiracist practice* (Gillborn, 1995: 34).

In the realm of education, this is the stage when the transcendental 1998 Educational Reform Act (ERA) was approved (under Margaret Thatcher’s government) and later refined and bolstered by the 1993 Educational Act (under John Major’s government). Amongst many other factors, for the first time the ERA established the legal framework for the unification of a National Curriculum, as well as a testing system for accrediting standards achieved at certain key ages (seven, eleven, fourteen and sixteen years old). Many authors have pointed out the ideology underpinning the basic principles of the National Curriculum (Whitty, 1992; Gillborn, 1990): in the framework of a meritocratic neo-liberal scheme (which encourages competition amongst students and amongst schools), its contents continue to reinforce a conservative notion of Britishness that prevents other minority cultural (called “ethnic”) expressions from being included. One example of this is illustrated by the tentative inclusion of the “multicultural question” as a cross-curricular *dimension* rather than as a subject. Right from the start, the curricular implications of this formula did not go beyond an “ethnic-specific multiculturalism” (in McLeod’s terms) or “additive multiculturalism” (according to Banks’s scheme).
The invisibilisation of ethnic inequalities in education takes place by means of their being dissolved into the “problem” of schools located in disadvantaged urban settings (i.e., inner city problems). In other words, the measures aimed at benefiting these areas do not encompass many of the causes of the problem: the social exclusion of the families belonging to minority ethnic groups, attitudes of disaffection at school and high rates of school failure particularly among minority students, an ethnocentric curriculum and discriminatory school practices, and the list goes on. Once again in the best of cases, the “ethnic or racial problem” is regarded as a “problem of prejudices”. Given the fact that significant social differences (inequalities) between the diverse ethnic groups are not assessed, and that ultimately everything is rooted in the existence of an individual feeling of antipathy based on irrational stereotypes (and upheld by a minority of students, families and teachers from the majority group), everything together distracts attention from the implications of the social, political and institutional structures that sustain an educational system that is largely discriminatory.

**Antiracism and critical pedagogy: The current debates**

The anti-racist education perspective gained momentum in the English political Left within the framework of a structuralist interpretative scheme. Authors such as Barry Troyna (1993; with Williams, 1986; with Carrington, 1990; with Selman, 1991; with Hatcher, 1992) and David Gillborn (1990, 1995), amongst others, supported and elaborated on this perspective in different directions. Over time, this approach has been influenced by the post-structuralist critical paradigm, mainly crossing points of view with the ideas from American cultural studies. Thus, certain formulations are resignified and a discourse emerges that talks about critical multiculturalism. Writings by authors such as Peter McLaren (1995, 1997) and Henry Giroux (1992, 1996) are especially “to blame” for this process. At the same time, once again in the British context, the traditional antiracist arguments began to mix with (with greater or lesser strength, according to the authors) stories characteristic of the post-modern paradigm: there is now talk critical antiracism (Gillborn, 1995) and reflexive multiculturalism (Rattansi, 1999).

But what we are interested in highlighting here are the convergences between these perspectives, convergences that today are much more important than their divergences. Nazir Carrim explains it succinctly:

> In an important way there is a necessary continuity between traditional anti-racism and a critical anti-racism. This being the case, since it is traditional anti-racism that provides us with the coordinates of racist and anti-racist discourses, the focus on structures in society, on power relations, issues of access and the historical and socially constructed nature of racism within traditional anti-racism need to be maintained in order to contextualise the articulations of self in ‘own voices’. It is also an important way to ensure a conversation between the local and particular with the general, between the micro and macro levels of societies. Significantly, this may also ensure that a ‘critical anti-racism’ maintains its ‘anti-racism’, rather than lapse into a decontextualised ‘celebration of multiple identities and
differences’ for the sake of it; to the point where ‘race’ is not only ‘silent’ but ‘invisible’ (Carrim, 2000: 40).

Also worth mentioning is the acceptance and implementation of some of the “classic” antiracism principles by the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) through the drafting of the controversial baseline document entitled Race, Sex and Class 3. A Policy for Equality: Race, Anti-Racist Statement and Guidelines (1983), which presents a series of conclusions and proposals regarded as requisites for dealing with any type of racism in education.

These proposals are justified around four major building blocks: i) an assessment of the economic conditions of Black Caribbean and minority groups compared to the white population; ii) the scope of the differences in terms of the different groups’ access to resources and power; iii) the existence of phenomena of job, housing and educational discrimination experienced by the minority ethnic groups; and iv) the conflictive relations between these groups and police corps. These four points taken together indeed show concern for understanding the structural factors surrounding racist practices and discourses. At the same time, trust is still placed in the role of education in the struggle against reproducing these practices and discourses.

After decades of influence by political stances that have combined the implementation of neo-liberal directives with an ethnic multiculturalist discourse, it is not clear to what extent the antiracist perspective has become part of the principles governing current British educational policy. Since the end of the 1990s, the new Labour policies do seem to include a certain focus on reconsidering the reasons behind and implications of ethnic inequalities in education as a prime focal point, even as an issue that requires specific examination, albeit only in the framework of political programmes aimed at combatting social exclusion. Initiatives and measures for intervention such as those outlined in section 4.3 reveal the meaning and real measure of this focus.

1.4. Quebec

As we shall see, in Quebec these debates have shifted from the prototypical foundation that segregated cultural differences, towards approaches that are more typical of the liberal stance, and today they are beginning to resemble an “intercultural-civic” model, an alternative route at the opposition between multiculturalism (the prevailing style in the United States) and assimilationism (French “jacobinism”).

The segregating model

Historically, and almost down until the last quarter of the 20th century, the educational system in Quebec was made of diverse sub-systems divided mainly by ethnic-religious

---

4 David Gillborn himself makes a very similar claim: “An awareness of the new cultural politics of difference offers a lens on the racism at work between and within various minority communities –a really often denied by previous antiracist analyses. An awareness of hybrid identities and ‘cultural syncretism’, however, should not blind us to the continuing power of traditional ‘racial’ dichotomies –categories that have genuine currency in countless contexts and can still prove fatal” (Gillborn, 1995:90).
affiliation. At first, these sub-systems fell along the lines of the two ethnic groups vying for a predominant position in the national rift: the French Canadians dominated the Franco-Catholic sector, and the Anglophone minority originally hailing from Britain\(^5\) prevailed in the Anglo-Protestant sector.

As other ethnic groups began to settle in Quebec, the educational network gradually became increasingly fragmented. Starting in the mid-19th century, Irish Catholics prompted the creation of an Anglo-Catholic school network which would gradually become the sector which received and educated a good part of the non-French Catholic immigrant population. This was especially the case of the immigrant groups from Italy and Portugal post-World War II.

Also during the second half of the 20th century, the arrival of immigrants with different religious practices from the majority (Jews, Muslims and Orthodox) led to the emergence of private schools that were culturally and religiously homogeneous\(^6\). These schools —today Jewish, Greek, Orthodox, Armenian and Muslim— were financed for decades by the communities themselves and have only been receiving state subsidies since 1969. However, it is worth mentioning that a significant portion of families belonging to these groups chose to educate their children in the non-Catholic English-speaking system. The degree to which this option arose from a strategic move towards social mobility or, conversely, from the French Catholic population's purported greater reluctance to receive immigrants, is an issue about which there is currently no consensus (McAndrew, 2002).

Finally, starting in the 1960s, the Sephardic Jewish immigrant population no longer had to choose between its language and its religion as it promoted the emergence of a fifth educational sector, the French Protestant system. This system experienced significant growth starting in 1977.

Shortly before Loi 101 came into effect, almost 90% of the immigrant student body was registered at the Anglo-Catholic schools, where they represented the majority of the school population. In summary, according to McAndrew and Proulx (2003), "(...) it could be considered that the percentage of immigrant students that did not have contact with classmates from the Francophone or Anglophone community was very high. In terms of relations between Francophones and Anglophones within the educational system, they could also be considered weak" (2003:33-34). In short, the prevailing educational model in this stage clearly fell within the premises of the segregating framework. Ultimately, the line demarcating the structure of the educational system was based on reasons of ethnic-religious belonging\(^7\).

---

\(^5\) Commonly referred to as “WASPs”: White Anglo-Saxon Protestants.

\(^6\) It is calculated that even as late as the 1990s, more than half the Greek and almost three-quarters of the Jewish students were being educated at schools run by their own communities (McAndrew, 1993).

\(^7\) It has become common to point to the traditional weakness of the state in the realm of education – and also in the regulation and planning of the educational system – as one of the causes behind this fragmentation of the educational network along ethnic-religious lines.
Approval of the *Charte de la langue française* (1977), a key regulation in terms of the social and institutional normalisation of the French language, must be viewed within the framework of a process of national construction that, amongst other dimensions, involved redefining in terms of identity the French-Canadian space as a national Quebec space. More specifically, the articles in the *Charte* dealing with the issue of education (the section commonly referred to as *Loi 101*) are explained by the following argument: the process of constructing a state of Quebec could scarcely progress without the existence of a common educational space.

In effect, this legislation “universalises” French schools, making attendance at these schools the norm for the student body as a whole. At any rate, *Loi 101* allowed the completion of the schooling process within the English educational system for local or immigrant students who had registered in it before the law entered into effect. For this reason, the impact of the law in terms of the distribution of students at schools within the structure of the educational system was especially noticeable in the case of newly arrived students. Towards the end of the 1990s, more than 80% of these students were educated in the French system.

*The compensatory model*

Just as is the case for many of the educational systems that are beginning to face up to the challenge of receiving and educating immigrant pupils, the intervention programmes undertaken in Quebec starting in the 1970s fell within what we could call the “liberal-compensatory model”, clearly centred around the area of linguistic compensation. Thus, in 1969 Montreal’s Board of Catholic Schools set into motion the first “welcoming classes” as a pilot programme. These were full-time classes specifically addressed at immigrant students arriving within the past five years, the main objective of which was to accelerate their learning of the basic rudiments of French along with other minimal instrumental knowledge that would subsequently enable them to join ordinary classes. Organising these welcoming classes swiftly spread around all the school districts in the metropolitan region, and after the adoption of *Loi 101*, they could be found around the entire Quebec educational system.

Within the general framework of this model, the way of handling of cultural diversity within the ordinary school system is described by Marie McAndrew (2002) using the categories of “ethnic-specific” (in McLeod’s terms) or “additive multiculturalism” (Banks). From this vantage point: “the programmes valuing pluralism have a marginal impact, since they are not aimed at anyone other than the clientele of students from ethnic minorities, and they leave the functioning of the school institutions intact, especially their hidden curriculum” (McAndrew, 2002: 11).

Over the years, mainly during the 1980s, Quebec witnessed a gradual awareness-raising about the multidimensionality of the adjustments needed to truly encourage socio-educational integration, a multidimensionality that goes beyond mere linguistic compensation or facilities for learning in native languages. The effects of this process of changing approaches was translated into political practice, in the development of diverse *ad hoc* measures by Quebec’s Ministry of Education and school districts in the metropolitan region. Some of these measures are: including intercultural educational objectives in the different school curricula; developing teaching materials that help to achieve these objectives; revising “ordinary” teaching materials with the aim of
eliminating the presence of stereotyped “ethnic” visions; offering continuing education programmes and courses on intercultural education for teaching staff and school managers; subsidising cultural mediation services for certain schools; publishing a guide for school managers for taking decisions in the conflicts between values that arise in multicultural contexts; and so forth.

The intercultural model

At least in the realm of political discourse, progress seems to have been made in the category of educational handling of cultural diversity that Banks defines as “multiculturalism as an integral part of the curriculum” (Banks, 1988). Another issue is how to assess, as McAndrew cautions, “the sometimes important gap between policies and official programmes, and the interpretation and implementation of them on a local level” (2002: 12).

We saw above how, also in terms of the political discourse on the issue of citizenship, the Quebec model could currently be situated as a type of third way between Canadian multiculturalism (which drinks from the same multiculturalist fount as the US) and the more liberal-uniformity trend rooted in France. Concerning our field of attention, this third way did not find a political frame of reference until 1998, the year the Politique d’intégration scolaire et d’éducation interculturelle was adopted. Indeed, its articles redefine the meaning of intercultural education, integrating it into the broader concept of education for citizenship in a pluralistic context, or, as proclaimed in the preamble of the plan that set forth this policy, “intercultural education and citizenship education are two mutually inseparable dimensions of this policy” (Une École d’avenir. Énoncé de politique en matière d’intégration scolaire et d’éducation interculturelle; 1998: iv).

Within this framework, the school as an institution is conceived as a key mechanism in the process of integrating the newly arrived population (both students and their families), a process that is not regarded as finished until “immigrants or their descendants fully participate in the community life of the receiving society and experience a sense of belonging to that society” (1998: 1). More specifically, in terms of the necessary steps that this process must pursue in the case of newly arrived immigrant students, the Énoncé places linguistic and academic integration as a necessary condition for an ultimately successful social integration:

Young non-Francophone students have to acquire a certain proficiency in French, which is the language of instruction and of public life, in order to master the subjects taught in schools (linguistic and academic integration) and must also assimilate the social codes in order to establish meaningful relations with their classmates and participate in the life of the community (social integration). In addition, it takes time before students from other countries develop a feeling of belonging in Quebec society. This happens gradually, and depends in large part on the acceptance of immigrants as full members of the host society (1998: 1).

The values and objectives of intercultural education are legitimised based on this foundation. This is the point where the distance between the principles of this policy and the multiculturalist rhetoric officially accepted by the Anglo-Saxon context becomes explicit—at least on the level of political discourse. As defined by the Énoncé,
**Intercultural education** refers to any educational measure designed to foster awareness of the diversity—notably ethnocultural diversity— that characterizes the social fabric and to develop skill in communicating with people from various backgrounds, as well as attitudes of openness, tolerance and solidarity (1998: 2).

From this standpoint, the basic purpose of intercultural education becomes relativising the meanings of cultural or ethnic affiliations, not only of those people who represent the “others”, or “otherness”, rather starting precisely by questioning one’s own cultural assumptions and expressions, those that account for the meanings of “we”. According to Énoncé,

*The object of intercultural education is not to convey knowledge about cultures –there are already disciplines that do that– but rather to foster a better understanding of culture in pluralistic societies. This sort of education requires that people take stock of their cultural backgrounds and ties and reflect on their socialization in order to overcome their prejudices concerning “otherness”, in whatever form it presents itself, and so be able to communicate better with people who are different from themselves* (1998:2).

The basic principles that, according to the Énoncé, should govern educational action—also, and more noticeably, in dealing with the different forms of diversity—are:

| Equal opportunities. Updating this principles requires the educational institution to effectively fulfil three fundamental functions: 1) the **instructional function**, which enables the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to understand and transform the world to be learned, as well as the possibility of extending learning throughout one’s life; 2) the **socialising function**, which seeks to transmit values and ideas of democracy and respect, and which at the same time promotes a critical spirit in students when exploring and choosing their own values; 3) the **certification function**, the goal of which is to prepare and qualify students in terms of both on their own interests and the needs and trends of the job market. Fulfiling this principle is not viewed as contradictory to implementing certain **compensatory measures**, for example in the field of linguistic compensation (such as the welcoming classes). Although they hardly manage to be conceptualised as measures of “positive discrimination”, this type of specific intervention must be planned in light of the values of equity, interculturality and social cohesion. |

| Linguistic competencies. The major role played by the educational institution in learning the French language is highlighted, as it is the language used in schools and the public sphere which enables all Quebecers to communicate with each other and participate in community life. Acquiring these linguistic tools is an equally important priority for French-speaking students, for those for whom French is a second language (the primarily Anglophone school population), and those newly arrived students who do not know this language used in school and the public sphere when they arrive. Proper language learning is justified from the **instrumental** standpoint—to avoid shortcomings in communicative skills that place certain groups at the risk of social exclusion, as well as reiterating the importance of “linguistic integration” as a condition for developing feelings of belonging to the Quebec society (expressive value). |
Education for citizenship in a democratic, plural society. Intersecting in all educational actions (not just the curriculum), the underlying purpose of encouraging education for citizenship is to promote the learning of the values, codes and basic norms shared by Quebec society as a whole, in addition to knowledge of its institutions. In short, the ultimate goal is to train well-informed, responsible citizens prepared to exercise their rights and fulfil their duties.

Acknowledgement of diversity is viewed as one of these shared values. Thus, the school is given the fundamental mission of empowering its student body to live in a plural society (which goes beyond what plurality exists in the family setting) and to appreciate the wealth of opportunities and challenges this poses. According to the Énoncé’s formulations: “With the proper skills, students should be able to understand the relationship between diversity and unity, the particular and the universal, identity and difference, to extend the boundaries of the familiar and open up to the world” (1998: 7).

2. Data on the foreign student body

The original research report presents an entire array of statistical data on the weight of the immigrant student body that is being schooled in each of the educational systems in the countries and regions studied. In this document, two tables are presented as a type of comparative summary.

By comparing the data on Bavaria, Belgium’s French Community and Quebec, it can be seen that the percentage of foreign students fluctuates considerably in each of these contexts. While in Quebec, foreign students made up 6.1% of the total primary and secondary student body in academic year 2002-2003, in Belgium’s French Community this figure was 10.4% in academic year 2003-2004. Bavaria falls midway between the two aforementioned territories; in 2001 the percentage of foreign students accounted for 7.7% of the total student body.

Table 1. Foreign student body in primary and secondary school in Bavaria, Belgium’s French Community, England and Quebec (most recent data available)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>104,948</td>
<td>67,768</td>
<td>63,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage over total student body in primary and secondary school.

Table 2 presents data on the coincidence between native language and the language used in school instruction. Data gathered in the PISA 2000 tests, administered to 15-year-old students, indicate that in England 4.5% of the student body of this age speaks a language at home other than the language of instruction. In the Belgium’s French Community, this figures rises to 5.5% of the total, while in Germany it stands at 7.9%. Data on Quebec on students in elementary and secondary education indicate that in academic year 2002-2003, the native language of around 10.6% of the school-aged population was different than the language used for teaching in schools.

Table 2. Percentage of 15-year-old students that speak a language at home other than the language of instruction, which is not one of the national languages of the country – official or not (2000*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Belgian French Community</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Quebec**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data from the OECD’s PISA 2000 report.
** The data on Quebec corresponds to the percentage of the primary and secondary student body with a native language other than the languages of instruction (academic year 2002-2003).

Source: Developed by authors based on Integrating Immigrant Children into Schools in Europe (Eurydice), and for Quebec, Statistiques de l’éducation. Enseignement primaire, secondaire, collégial et universitaire. Édition 2004 (Ministère de l’Éducation, Quebec).

3. Key points on the agenda

To a large extent, the order of concerns outlined by the political agenda of each of the countries and regions examined must be viewed in reference to the profiles of the basic educational models followed in each country and region in order to rise to the challenges and problems posed by the cultural diversity found in the educational setting. Now is the time to undertake an exercise in abstraction that can capture how these concerns are emerging in each case. As will be corroborated below, planning and implementing practices dealing with the reception and schooling of immigrant pupils clearly reflect the respective considerations of this order of priorities.

3.1. Bavaria

Special schools and Special Educational Needs

The education of immigrant students in special education schools is one mechanism often used to achieve a purported homogeneity of autochthonous Germans in the classrooms. These special educational needs are often not learning difficulties, rather they are derived from linguistic shortcomings in German (Gomolla 1998, in: Will and Rühl, 2002: 42-43). Given this practice, there are scholars that ironically wonder what
the characteristics are that make special schools the best mechanisms for teaching the German language (Hunger and Thrändhardt, 2004: 179-180).

The number of foreign students being educated in special schools (Fördernschule) in Bavaria is among the highest in Germany. Around 7.2% of foreign students are taught at schools for students with special educational needs, while only 4.4% of autochthonous students require this type of schooling (Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 2002). This, then, is a clear sign of the inequalities existing today between Germans and foreigners in education (Bund-Länder-Komission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung, 2003: 6).

School concentration and early educational segregation

The majority of immigrants go through their secondary education in the least academically challenging institution, the Hauptschule. This takes place first because the teachers themselves recommend it, and secondly because classes preparing students for late entry (Seiteinsteiger) into the educational system are only offered at the Hauptschule (Gomolla 1998, in: Will and Rühl, 2002: 42-43).

If we compare the types of training pursued by immigrant pupils with those pursued by their German classmates, we can see significant differences, as shown in the table below:

Table 3. German and foreign students in Bavaria during academic year 1997/1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total student body</th>
<th>Foreign student body</th>
<th>Foreign students / Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volkschule</strong> 8</td>
<td>858.993</td>
<td>83.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fördernschule</strong></td>
<td>61.436</td>
<td>8.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realschule</strong></td>
<td>149.670</td>
<td>5.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gymnasium</strong></td>
<td>312.040</td>
<td>10.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>15.270</td>
<td>3.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.397.409</td>
<td>110.773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 2002: 103

The differences displayed in the table show that equal opportunities between foreign students and German students has not been achieved. While 22% of German students choose the route of the Gymnasium and thus expect to pursue higher education, only 9.3% of immigrant pupils choose this institution. Likewise, the proportion of German students attending the Realschule (10.7%) is twice that of foreign pupils who choose the same educational track (5.2%) (Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 2002: 106-107).

8 The Volkschule includes the Grundschule and the Hauptschule
The differences, consequently, become clear when we examine the degrees obtained by foreign and German students. While the degree most often obtained by young immigrant people is the lowest one (Hauptschulabschluss), most young Germans obtain a degree from the Realschule (Realschulabschluss). The 23.9% of autochthonous students who pass the university entrance examination (Abitur) and pursue university studies also clearly contrasts with the 9.6% of immigrant students who manage to do so.

As we are aware that in many cases generalisations and treating immigrant groups as if they were homogeneous leads us to overlook nuances and ignore important characteristics, in this case we believe it is especially necessary to break down the group of students according to nationalities in order to see the diversity of educational pathways pursued by each of these groups.

Students from Bosnia-Herzegovina are represented in the Volkschule (Grundschule and Hauptschule) and the basic vocational schools (Berufschule). For their part, students from former Yugoslavia are more commonly found in the Realschule, although many are also found in the special schools. Italian students are over-represented not only in the special schools but also in the higher professional training schools, while few of them are found in the Gymnasium, Realschulen and higher technical schools (Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 2002: 106-107)

The Turks, the most numerous foreign group, have a significant presence in the special schools as well as at the professional training schools, while conversely they are under-represented at the Realschulen and Gymnasium (Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 2002).

The German educational system is characterised by being one of the least comprehensive amongst the European educational systems and by selecting and separating students according to their educational tracks at a very early age, namely at nine years old. It is precisely this selection process that sparks many critics to claim that more comprehensive factors are totally eliminated from the German system.

The study entitled “Internationalen Grundschul-Leseuntersuchung” (IGLU) aims to observe the role that this selection at a very young age plays in the German educational system in terms of academic success. One of the foremost conclusions of this study is that – based on international comparisons – the Grundschule, or primary schools, present better results than secondary education, and that academic success depends on one’s social background less in primary than in secondary school, despite the fact that in Germany the correlation between school performance and social background is higher than in other national contexts at all grade levels (Bund-Länder-Komission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung, 2003: 15).
The results of this study once again put into question the efficacy of selecting educational pathways at the age of ten in the German educational system, during the transition from primary to secondary school. If the academic success rate is higher in the first stage, when students have not yet been selected, and thus when there is no individual curricular adaptation and there are fewer school resources allocated to compensating for shortcomings, what is it that is not working in the different pathways in secondary education (Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung, 2003: 15)?

**Distance between the academic success rates of autochthonous students and those of foreign students**

At the onset of immigration, school failure rates among foreign pupils was quite widespread. The number of foreign students who finished their schooling but did not obtain the corresponding degree has gradually decreased; however, there is still a vast gulf compared to autochthonous students (Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung, 2003: 3).

The 2003 PISA study shows for Germany as a whole that students who have at least one parent born in the country obtain better grades than students whose parents have both immigrated to Germany (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004: 182). The results show
that the chances for academic success are three times higher for autochthonous students than for immigrant pupils. However, if we control for social background, there are still differences, albeit to a lesser extent (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004: 187).

Within Germany as a whole, in the PISA study Bavaria emerges as the Land with the best academic success rates among immigrant students in terms of mathematics, reading and the natural sciences (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004: 183).

Yet despite these promising results, in the country-wide statistics conducted by Germany, Bavaria is close to the tail end in terms of degrees obtained by foreign students. Only one out of every four immigrant students obtains the corresponding degree when finishing their studies, and if we do not take the special schools into consideration this figure falls to one out of every five (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004: 188).

This distance between the results of the PISA report and academic success achieved by immigrant pupils according to German statistics might be explained based on the group being studied in the PISA report. Just like the other federated states in southern Germany, Bavaria is characterised by having a high percentage of immigrants educated in special schools, which escaped the attention of PISA report (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004: 189).

Likewise, the IGLU study claims that 75% of the immigrant students were born in Germany, and of the others, 14% arrived before the age of five. Yet, despite the fact that they were integrated into the educational system in the earliest grades in the majority of cases, 90% of the foreign students show academic success rates lower than non-foreign students (Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung, 2003: 17).

The number of foreign pupils who do not graduate, that is, who do not obtain the corresponding degree, is higher than that of German students. In primary education, foreign students tend to repeat grades between two and four times more often than autochthonous students, and at the Gymnasium the number of immigrant pupils who have to repeat grades is twice that of German students (Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung, 2003: 6).

Specifically in Bavaria, the statistics show that the opportunities for children with non-German citizenship to obtain a qualified degree is less than half those of German students. However, it should be said that these opportunities have gradually risen, shifting from 30.5% in 1985 to 52.2% in 2000 (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004: 180).

Proficiency in German language and maintenance of their own cultural identity among immigrant students

The government of Bavaria’s initial idea of instructing foreign students in their respective native languages in order to ease their return to their homelands has gradually lost momentum as it has become clear that these students are remaining and settling on Bavarian soil.
Once this shift in perspective took place, the German language became the key element in the process of integration, in both the educational system and other realms such as society or the labour market. For this reason, teaching German has become one of the central objectives of Bavarian educational policy. However, this is combined with the desire for immigrant pupils—within certain margins—to keep their own cultural identities or at least to create a new one.

The distance between integration and assimilation is an issue still being debated in Bavaria.

### 3.2. The French Community (Belgium)

It should be said that in the case of the French Community, an examination of the main focuses of attention that are the cornerstones of the political and academic “problemisation” of the issue concerning us has had the occasion to be examined within the framework of the debate surrounding the drafting of the Strategic Contract for Education. In effect, within the framework of the French Community’s recent securing of more financing and autonomy to manage its educational system, throughout 2005 the government of this community has spearheaded and channelled a process of public debate about the problems, challenges and objectives for the current educational system, in which more than 25,000 citizens have participated. This process has culminated in the publication of the report entitled “Contrat pour l’école. 10 priorités pour nos enfants”.

It is worth mentioning from the outset that among the ten top priority objectives outlined in the report, there are no specific, explicit references to the cultural-ethnic issue. Indeed, this reinforces the thesis expounded about that the Belgian francophone model of approaching this issue falls within the parameters of a model of integration-assimilation basically oriented towards individual compensatory treatment of social inequalities.

*Homogeneity – heterogeneity in schools*

According to the report by the Intercultural Commission of the CNAPD (National Coordinator of Action for Peace and Democracy), the process of the concentration of

---

9 See [www.contrateducation.be](http://www.contrateducation.be).

10 Namely: 1) More teachers for the schools; 2) For all youngsters to master the basic competencies; 3) To effectively inform and guide every youngster; 4) To allow every youngster to choose and learn a trade at school (professional/vocational training); 5) To better train the teachers; 6) To provide schools, teachers and students with the teaching materials and resources needed for learning; 7) To appreciate the role of teachers; 8) To bolster and support schools’ educational missions (through inspection, external assessment, support for management teams, etc.); 9) To put an end to “ghetto-schools”; and 10) To strengthen the school-family dialogue.

11 We are referring to the 2005 report by the Intercultural Commission of the “Coordination Nationale l’Action pour la Paix et la Démocratie” (CNAPD). This well-known NGO brings together more than fifty trade unions, NGOs, political parties and groups that work for democracy and the spread of citizenship in Belgium. Its standpoint is eminently critical, but it interests us due to its contrast with the “official” versions. [http://www.cnapd.be](http://www.cnapd.be).
foreign students is leading certain schools to become veritable ghettos, while the overall process of homogenisation of the student body at schools is becoming one of the key factors in reproducing social inequalities and cultural distances.

This claim is in complete consonance with one of the conclusions of the diagnoses reached within the framework of the process of drafting the Strategic Contract for Education. The resulting report concludes that social segregation of schools, a consequence of the overall dynamics of homogenisation of their respective students, has become a clear hindrance to achieving two basic principles of compulsory education: equal opportunities and respect for diversity. According to this report:

No parent wants to send their children to a bad school. But not everyone has the means to send them to a good one. (…) Society gains nothing by grouping students based on their socio-economic background or marks. And there is no miracle solution to this problem.

From this standpoint, one of the ten objectives outlined in the same report is: Objective 9: To put an end to “ghetto-schools”. More specifically, the report proposes that efforts be made to achieve this objective through measures such as:

- Taking into account students that have to change schools because they are excluded.
- Regulating registration and avoiding the “flight” of certain student groups towards certain schools known for being “elitist”.
- Limiting the possibilities of changing schools in the middle of the academic year or school cycle.
- Studying other measures that encourage social mixing at schools, such as making children’s socio-economic background an important factor when weighing requests for school admission.

It is worth mentioning that the quasi-market situation characteristic of the school system in the French Community is quite closely tied to the current (intra-school) social homogeneity and the (inter-school) social heterogeneity. Within this context, the different schools show clear distinctions and hierarchies. Schools compete to educate the kind of students that will most likely enable the school to uphold its privileged status within the field. These selective practices, regardless of whether they are formal or informal, clearly reinforce the dynamics of homogenising the socio-cultural composition of the schools. Thus, it seems that both axes of inequality, class and ethnicity, join forces to further deepen the rift separating the “good” schools from the disadvantaged ones.

Further reinforcing this dynamic, mention must be made to the “intercultural pedagogy” projects being developed at some schools. According to claims by Verhoeven, implementing these experiences has the undesired effect of increasing the ghettoisation of those schools where they take place.

In summary: on the one hand we have schools, especially the most “prestigious” ones, attempting to select their student body and maintain their privileged positions within the
school scene; and on the other, we find a series of schools immersed in significant processes of social and cultural ghettoisation. Many of the latter are chosen by students belonging to minority groups who value their faculty’s ability to relate to and recognise their differences (the students at “good” schools, conversely, value the teachers’ capability to effectively convey knowledge)\textsuperscript{12}. Meanwhile, the former end up being among the few that, obligated by the composition of their student body, undertake intercultural pathways that, despite their good results, affect their image by strengthening certain stigmatising dynamics.

\textit{School “failure”}

Also the subject of shared concern are the high rates of inequality among the student body in the French Community in the area of what are referred to as basic competencies. This concern, which gained public and political notoriety after the publication of the results of the first PISA report (in 2000), is especially striking in contrast to the results presented by the Community of Flanders which place it third in the ranking of EU regions in this same report.

The results of the 2003 PISA report continue to show data that confirm these trends. The PISA study itself introduces the \textit{ethnic and cultural variable} based on the indicator of the father’s background (born in or outside of Belgium), and here it can be seen that this variable constitutes one factor of academic inequality specifically affecting the case of the French Community (Dupreiez and Vandenberge, 2004). More specifically, if the results of the basic competency tests are broken down according to this variable, and at the same time they are crossed with socio-economic and instructional variables – including the mother’s educational level and the socio-economic category of both parents – then the French Community and Germany appear as the educational systems that least equalise the underlying social inequalities.

In concordance with this finding, the aforementioned \textit{Contrat pour l’école} mentions one of its basic concerns as “the high number of students who do not obtain a secondary degree or take a long time in doing so”. This serves to reinforce the fact that “a high number of students cannot pursue the studies they wish to”: due to a lack of required degrees, due to academic performance or due to a dearth of places. Ultimately, this feeds school disaffection among those students who are deprived of their desired options, a significant portion of which are foreign pupils.

\textit{School and cultural discrimination}

Based on the aforementioned report by the Intercultural Commission of the CNAPD (National Coordinator of Action for Peace and Democracy), and the document “Four forms of ethnic discrimination in education”\textsuperscript{13} by the movement for pedagogical renewal

\textsuperscript{12} According to Verhoeven, “(...) whereas students in a weak position express demands for differential recognition, relation and treatment, students in a strong position tend to demand efficacy and individualist and ‘universalist’ treatment” (Verhoeven, 2005).

\textsuperscript{13} “Quatre formes de discrimination ethnique dans l’enseignement”. June 2001. \url{www.ecoledemocratique.org}. 27
called “École Démocratique”, we can examine factors as sensitive in teaching as those surrounding discrimination and racism from a critical vantage point.

First, the CNAPD report states that some immigrant students are subject to discrimination, and even racism. An increasing feeling of mistrust towards this type of student can be detected by local or European students. This feeling, according to the CNAPD, is fed or at least justified by the conflict in the Middle East, by the banalisation of the extreme Right’s discourse as presented in the mass media, and by other factors.

At the same time, according to the document by “École Démocratique”, mention must be made of the scope of certain “more structural” types of discrimination. It highlights the following:

- In terms of registration, some schools make use of all types of duplicity in order to handpick their students. According to the aforementioned report by École Démocratique, this does not tend to involve an explicitly racist attitude rather a practice tied to the desire by management teams of these schools to avoid possible processes of social stigmatisation and ghettoisation.

- The teaching staff often tends to forget that many newly arrived parents from a low socio-cultural level have low educational levels, in addition to a fragile socio-economic position. These facts lead the students coming from these foreign families to “disappoint” the expectations of teachers, who wanted to see a more “active” attitude in the families, one that stimulated their children’s education more. Not receiving this feedback from the families can lead, in turn, to teachers having more passive or detached attitudes towards the educational challenges involved in receiving and educating these students.

- The teaching staff also tends to judge children using their own schema and values. Thus, if the starting point for immigrant children is a self-image that is already negative, teachers can easily end up reinforcing this image and these expectations through social racism or negative school experiences. For example, if the school requires and awards an active, participatory attitude among children, the fact that these are school rules that are problematic for students that are often relegated to disadvantaged social positions contributes to reinforcing an image of people who do not “take an interest” in school.

- Finally, on a cultural level, there is a reminder that neither books nor methods nor tests nor any other resources are culturally neutral. As the document states, school texts are remote from the world and daily lives of children from both immigrant settings and blue collar families, since as a whole the referents and imagery in these materials tend to be those of the Western upper class culture.

3.3. England

The question of standards

Generically speaking, British educational policies fall within a model guided by the values of excellence, quality and efficacy. It is important to emphasise that, in this
model, the degree to which these values are achieved is measured based on the school attainment of different schools and LEAs (Local Education Authorities), more specifically around school performance of their respective student bodies compared to the national averages. Thus, the degree of excellence, quality and efficacy achieved by the projects at schools or the national benchmark programmes implemented by the LEAs is measured according to the impacts they have on the academic attainments of their students.

The main stakeholder in charge of inspecting and assessing these impacts is OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education). Its reports on the characteristics and policies of schools in the country as a whole are made accessible to the public at large. Beyond this, the office itself has a bank of good practices which include the evaluations of the centres with the highest rankings in bolstering their academic attainments.

Effectively, this method based on good practices enables the characteristics of the educational strategies used in successful schools to be identified and spread in a variety of areas: improving academic performance of minority ethnic groups, reducing absenteeism and/or drop-outs, reducing inequalities in terms of performance between boys and girls (i.e., the gender gap), and so forth. In this way, the best schools are envisioned as being the ones to provide an example for the others that cannot manage to reduce either their distance from the average national performance or the unequal results among the different groups within their own student body.

The same evaluation policy becomes clear in the study on the impacts of local implementation of national benchmark educational programmes. We can see this in the discussion surrounding initiatives such as those represented as part of the Excellence in Cities (EiC) programmes (with their range of variants\textsuperscript{14}). Once again in this case, OFSTED is in charge of inspecting and assessing the degree to which of the main objectives are fulfilled in the context within which these programmes are financed: (once again) reducing rates of school failure amongst their student body\textsuperscript{15}. And here, too, work takes place on the basis of a methodology of good practices, that is, of inclusion on the corresponding database on the characteristics of those EiC evaluated as “effective” in this sense.

In this entire context, it is understood that the politically “problemised” students, those that figure in prime position on the political agenda, those that centre the debate on the current shortcomings of the educational system and on the interventions (specific or otherwise) regarded as necessary, are those students that present levels of academic performance that are significantly beneath the national average. According to the data, within this group of students, children and youngsters belonging to minority ethnic groups are over-represented. In reality, studies conducted by OFSTED discriminate between the school attainments by the different minority groups, and two especially noteworthy conclusions are drawn:

\begin{itemize}
\item[{14}] EiC Action Zones or EiC Clusters. In section 4.3. we outline some of their principal features.
\item[{15}] These objectives are set from the area of School Improvement and Excellence, part of the DfES.
\end{itemize}
– Students from Chinese and Indian backgrounds obtain an average on the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) higher than that obtained by the majority student body, called the white British.

– Students from Pakistani and especially Black Caribbean backgrounds, along with those belonging to groups defined as gypsy/travellers, obtain the GCSE much less frequently than the majority student body.

Table 4 illustrates this comparative data in further detail:

Table 4. Percentage of pupils achieving the expected level at each Key Stage by Ethnic Group (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Key Stage 1: % expected level</th>
<th>Key Stage 2: % expected level</th>
<th>Key Stage 3: % expected level</th>
<th>Key Stage 4: % expected level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller of Irish Heritage</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy/Roma</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other White background</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed background</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian background</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ethnicity and Education: The Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils (Department for education and skills, United Kingdom).

Based on this situation, and in accordance with the policy of assessing and identifying good practices, the DfES itself (through its Ethnic Minority Achievement programme)
offers a bank of good practices which gathers together reports drafted by OFSTED on primary and secondary schools that are “effective” in dealing with school failure among the Black Caribbean\textsuperscript{16} and gypsy\textsuperscript{17} student body.

\textit{Leadership and effectiveness}

In the British setting, the concept of effective leadership is strongly rooted in the political and academic discourse on the limitations and potentialities of school actions as agents of social change. In other words, within the framework of an administrative structuring that grants schools clear autonomy in terms of organisational and pedagogical management, from the start the possibilities of effectively putting into practice the principles and political directives set nationwide are envisioned to depend to a large extent on the school management team’s capacity for leadership and strategic vision.

Traditionally, this point of view has been reflected in the spread of the management-oriented perspective to the organisational parameters of schools. As an organic institution, the governability and functionality of the schools depends on the existence of a \textit{legitimate} authority (democratically chosen) capable of effectively and efficiently managing the positions-roles of the stakeholders involved and the resources available. From this basis of reference, management teams at schools, especially the figure of headmaster or headmistress, become effective inasmuch as they effectively fulfil the \textit{roles} assigned to them\textsuperscript{18}.

In recent years, however, a perspective largely opposed to the functionalist assumptions of managerialism has gradually gained momentum in the debate on the conditions and principles governing school organisation. It is worth mentioning that this new approach does not end up implying a relativisation of the transcendence of the key leadership role of school headmasters/mistresses; on the contrary, it simply maps it within a different set of coordinates. We are referring to those perspectives that, at the most micro level, view specific school spaces as territories of confrontation between interests – what have been called “sites of struggle” (Ball, 1987). Thus, from the “\textit{micropolitical standpoint}” (Ball, 1981, 1987; Gillborn, 1994, 1995), the emphasis is placed on conflict as the criteria defining the life and internal logic of school organisations: conflicts (either manifest or latent) between the interests of teachers, between those of the teaching staff and the administration, between the school rules and students, amongst student groups themselves, between the school’s policies and family or neighbourhood associations, between the school’s plans or projects and the local or autonomous educational authorities, and the list goes on to encompass all the

\textsuperscript{16} See, for example, the following reports: \textit{Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils: Three Successful Primary Schools} (OFSTED, April 2002), and \textit{Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils: Good Practice in Secondary Schools} (OFSTED, April 2002).

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{LEA Framework 2004: Support for Ethnic Minority Pupils, including Gypsy and Travellers} (OFSTED, January 2004).

conflicts that complicate the governability of the institution and explain the possibility (or impossibility) of implementing certain criteria for action.

Many examples serve to illustrate the scope of the internal and external conflicts experienced on a daily basis by schools when undertaking certain curricular or extracurricular initiatives. Without citing specific cases, we could reach the conclusion that in those situations in which despite the good will of a small number of teachers to programme certain intercultural and antiracist educational projects in a school where the immigration variable has become “problematic”, ultimately the implementation of those projects is hindered by opposition from certain “interest communities” (parent associations, teaching teams, etc.) that are fearful of publicly and too visibly drawing specific attention to the school immigrant population.

As mentioned above, the micropolitical standpoint does not question the utmost importance of the leadership role that school headmasters/mistresses must play. On the contrary, it sheds light on the context in which this role must be carried out. In any event, the leadership roles become even more complicated and become burdened with political management. The headmasters/mistresses (also “effective”) must not only be good administrators, they must also be competent decision-makers in contexts of conflict, decisions that commit the school's global strategy to the true upholding of equal opportunities and social inclusion.

At the same time, this entails a reformulation which also encroaches on the teaching role. The “good teacher” who implements the dynamics of effective teaching are not only good managers of order in the classroom and good conveyors of the knowledge contained in the school curriculum; they also become actors who effectively spearhead (in the classroom setting) the promotion of a non-neutral education based on the principle of a way of handling diversity that has a positive impact on the attitudes and academic performance of their students.

It is not clear to what extent this recontextualisation of the values of leadership and effectiveness in the field of managerial (and also teaching) action has been included in the examination of educational policies likely to have an impact in this realm. For example, it is worth pointing out that the training programmes designed by the National College for School Leadership explicitly include contents that go beyond the field of administrative management and emphasise the importance of having global strategies for combating educational inequalities.

**Education and environment**

Starting at the end of the 1980s\(^{19}\), British educational authorities began to examine whether the educational processes taking place at schools should be opened up to cooperative and coordinated work with educational and social stakeholders that form part of their more or less immediate environment.

---

\(^{19}\) The earliest Education Action Zones were created by the conservative government in 1988.
In any event, this is based on the following premise: as social institutions, schools cannot be mere mechanisms for socio-cultural reproduction of the status quo, rather they must be relatively autonomous instruments playing a key role in the struggle against the perpetuation of the different facets of inequality that permeate the social structure. However, as empirical and experienced entities, school are inserted within the community, with which they forge relations that are mutually determined. This community context frames the situation of the intertwined structure of the main facets of inequality (class, gender and ethnicity), and these are the coordinates that most directly inform the type of social relations that are established at the school (student-to-student, student-to-teacher, family-to-family, family-to-teacher, family-to-school administration, etc.) Factors such as the social trajectory and cultural inertia of the schools themselves, as well as the strategies derived form the particular and momentary interests and subjectivities of the stakeholders involved, without neglecting the weight of implementing certain educational policies on this topic, can all contribute to generating dynamics of transformation in the life of the school and community themselves. In order to prevent this process from fragmenting, school and community must remain in constant dialogue: formal education (the school) must be brought into daily life (community), just as the community must take part in school life.

In short, the purposes and conceptions of different educational plans in a network are founded on the need to extend the educational, inclusive actions of schools to their surrounding community fabric, without whose “complicity” schools would lose not only their ability to make a difference, but also the legitimacy of their actions.

From the start, the British context of formalising educational plans for working in networks has been associated with the struggle for social inclusion, setting the objective of enhancing and equalising the educational standards attained by the different schools and LEAs in the country. Thus, initiatives aimed at zoning educational action (beyond the institutional limits of the schools) place priority on developing them in especially deprived areas (on a socio-economic and cultural level) or in contexts in which the school failure rates are noticeably higher than the national average. This is the case of initiatives such as those included in the Education Action Zones or programmes such as Excellence in Cities. The allocation of specific resources such as Extended Schools or Supplementary Schools is basically earmarked for neighbourhoods or districts with worrisome levels of students not being educated or educational disaffection. At the same time, it is worth pointing out that other community development policies – such as the Neighbourhood Renewal Initiatives or the Social Exclusion Units – tend to view the struggle against school failure (absenteeism, drop-outs, poor marks at school and the like) as a prime avenue of action.

The fact that significant portions of the resident population in these particularly deprived areas tend to belong to minority ethnic groups ultimately explains why dealing with ethnic inequalities in education frequently appears as a central sphere of intervention in all of these programmes.
3.4. Quebec

Welcoming classes

According to McAndrew, “the recent debates, however, are more concerned with services aimed at students who have just arrived than at institutional adaptation to pluralism” (2002: 13). The discussion on whether or not to continue making exclusive attendance in welcoming classes the main mechanism of reception and “linguistic and cultural integration” for newly arrived students falls within these debates.

These debates, these discussions, refer to the constraints that are associated with both educational normalisation policies and measures of specific educational attention. In other words, they refer to the weak points of taking both normalisation strategies and options for specificity or focalisation to their ultimate consequences.

Indeed, the Politique d’intégration scolaire et d’éducation interculturelle (1998) questions centres’ and their teachers’ preferences for prolonging immigrant students’ stay in these classes for as long as their process of linguistic immersion and learning of the basic instrumental rudiments may take20. According to claims by the aforementioned Énoncé:

Spending more time in the welcoming classes does not necessarily lead to better learning of French, the language of instruction, in that they excuse their students from functioning in ordinary classroom situations. What should be done is not so much reinforce the intensive classroom language learning services but develop a range of complementary programmes and strategies.

As we shall see further on (point 4.4), some of these programmes and strategies involve strengthening bridges between the welcoming classroom and the ordinary classroom. It is thus understood that in certain circumstances the welcoming classroom by itself is not likely to successfully compensate for the language and academic weaknesses of an important swath of the newly arrived student population. Strengthening these bridges first acknowledges practical reasons: the aim is to favour the immigrant student body’s language competencies by promoting the everyday use of French with local classmates. At the same time, this strategy is brought into line with the underlying values of a broader policy of adopting and spreading intercultural education.

Teaching home country languages

Also in correspondence with the values of spreading intercultural education in the curriculum, the issue of teaching home country languages at schools is being debated. Within this context, the benefits within the framework of learning a third language have

---

20 Indeed, pressures from teacher trade unions have led the average stay of newly arrived students in welcoming classes to currently stand at ten months.
been acknowledged. Very briefly, first, it is clear that mastery of the family language implies an advantage in the process of acquiring and developing competencies and skills also in the way of learning the new host country language. Secondly, the positive implications for immigrant students of seeing their native language recognised by the school is highlighted in terms of its positive implications on self-image and expressive identification with the school.

However, it is large agreed that the *strategic sense* of teaching a third language should be defined. Either this teaching is defined in a “compensatory” sense, limited to the family languages of those students at a risk for detachment from school, or it falls within a broader programme aimed at reflecting the increasing plurilingualism within Quebec society. Obviously, choosing either option affects the prioritisation of which third languages will be included on the official curriculum, as well as other issues.

Additionally, there arises the question of the practical value of proficiency in one language or another within the framework of globalised society, that is, a society with certain international ties that are closer than others. In other words, beyond French and English, not all languages have the same “exchange value”; not all can be equally capitalised on by the citizens of Quebec.

The Quebec Ministry of Education’s policy falls in the middle of this series of dilemmas. Thus, in general terms, it defines possible third languages in which to receive instruction as those that are official languages in the countries belonging to the United Nations, as well as all those that are recognised by the UN (such as aborigine languages). In practice, however, priority is placed on teaching the languages of those state with which Quebec maintains closer cultural and/or economic relations21. In practice, too, primary school students have been the main recipients of instruction in these languages.

*Education for citizenship*

Although the benefits and generic objectives of education for citizenship – that is, learning the values, codes and basic rules of Quebec society, as well as knowledge of its institutions, with the ultimate purpose of preparing well-informed, responsible citizens capable of exercising their rights and fulfilling their duties – are shared for the most part, their specific implementation in educational practice generates some concern.

First of all, especially amongst teaching staff, two different visions tend to clash: first those that limit the value of implementing an education for citizenship programmes to the history curriculum; and secondly, those who suggest programming it as a cross-curricular competency throughout all the academic disciplines and in the different realms of school life.

---

21 These include Spanish and Portuguese, given the importance Quebec’s strategic ties with Latin American countries.
Secondly, the fear has also arisen that emphasising the learning of contents and competencies within education for citizenship might end up implying (albeit unwittingly) insensitivity towards cultural diversity, or even a certain dosage of cultural assimilationism. In other words, there is a fear that defining an obligatory framework of values and knowledge that are “necessary” for the full exercise of citizenship might provoke situations of “symbolic violence” (in Bourdieu's terms), that is, situations in which certain values and knowledge that correspond to the reality of the majority francophone culture are framed as “neutral”, “shared” and – thus – “legitimate”.

Relativising the reason behind these fears, conversely, it is emphasised that when the inculcation in the curriculum of the objectives of education for citizenship takes place within a framework of intercultural education, then the dangers of assimilationism are avoided. Ultimately, the aim is to provide the student body as a whole with an instrument, with certain “common knowledge” (in Connell’s words) that empower it to not remain excluded from the dynamics inherent in citizenship in a democratic, plural society, and doing so within a programme that relativises the ethnic nature of both the minority and majority cultural assumptions. Referring to practical matters, there is a clear positive assessment of the effects of the pluralistic redefinition of history teaching programmes in Quebec schools, which is shared by the majority (MEQ, 1994).

Concentrations of immigrant students at certain schools

In recent years, the issue of the effects of concentrations of immigrant students at certain schools has gradually taken on a central role in the debates about how to politically handle pluralism and cultural diversity (McAndrew and Jaquet, 1996). In any event, however, in the case of the educational situation in Quebec, these debates must be introduced in light of two prior circumstances.

First of all, examining the concentration of immigrant students at certain schools must refer to the process of rearticulating a school system that was traditionally segregated by ethnic and religious criteria. The gradual overcoming of this rift, initiated by the adoption of Loi 101, the abolition of religious school districts and the implementation of language-based school districts (definitively certified by the 1998 Politique), and the creation of a Francophone system of public schools: all these together have affected the features of the composition of schools. In effect, this process has led to a significant redistribution of immigrant and newly arrived students within the school system. Thus, some of the foreign students that before would have been educated in the Anglo-Protestant school sector has now been channelled to the Francophone sector for some years now. Recalling what was mentioned above, by the end of the 1990s, more than 80% of students speaking foreign languages (allophone) were educated in the French system.

Secondly, it is noteworthy that for some and even more so now, on ministerial academic evaluations the allophone school population achieved success rates equivalent to or slightly higher than those of the Francophone students, in schools in both the French and English sectors. Likewise, immigrant pupils present rates of graduation from secondary school and continuing on to post-compulsory education (the Cégep, an intermediate structure between compulsory secondary education and university) that are higher than the overall student average.
The exception to this generally positive situation is certain groups of recently arrived adolescent immigrant students with serious educational shortcomings. In accordance with what is claimed in the analysis presented in the Énoncé, six years after having begun their education in welcoming classes, a vast majority of these students has repeated one or two years, and only one out of every three manages to graduate from secondary school.

In any event, this overall situation of relative academic success by the immigrant student body partly avoids one of the reasons why in other regions and countries the concentration of foreign pupils in certain schools is framed as a problem. We are referring to those reasons that, when there is a significant correlation between schools with high percentages of immigrant students and situations of school failure, reference is made to the difficulties in meeting the curricular objectives when there a significant portion of foreign children concentrated in the classroom. We are in the domain of defending the equitable distribution of these students amongst schools for fundamentally practical reasons. Indeed, in Quebec there is no definitive statistical evidence as to the effects of concentrations of these students on the academic performance of the school population as a whole. A survey of the situation of schools in Montreal reveals, for example, that the academic success rates are higher in schools with lower percentages of foreign students, that these rates go down when the percentages hover around the average, but that surprisingly the rates of academic success go up considerably when there is an especially high concentration of these students (MEQ, 1998)22.

Aside from the justifications of a practical nature that are more or less well-founded (the generally positive situation does not prevent there from being schools where the concentration of certain kinds of newly arrived students hinders the academic progress of the student body as a whole), from the standpoint of intercultural education the struggle against “artificial” concentrations of the immigrant student body – imbalances between schools in the same school zone – is also justified for expressive reasons: it is assumed that by reducing the concentration by means of favouring dispersion, “intercultural” contact is forced, which in turn facilitates peaceful coexistence in that it contributes in general to overcoming prejudices and racist attitudes, as well as to accelerating certain informal learning processes in the case of students from minority groups. In accordance with the educational objective of approximating and redefining cultural identities, McAndrew pronounces: “It turns out that if it is believed that the school has an important role to play in developing interethnic attitudes and relations, it is hard to see how this could be limited to conveying normative ideals and teaching contents” (2002: 25).

22 It should certainly be pointed out that situations of schools with high or very high percentages of allophone students and/or foreign students are practically exclusively found in the Montreal metropolitan area. In the late 1990s, 90% of the immigrant population in Quebec settled in the Montreal region. In terms of school registration data, on the island of Montreal in academic year 1998-1999, 46.4% of the school-aged population in the French sector were immigrant, while 35% of its schools had an immigrant student body of upwards of 50%. In this case, comparable to the dynamics inherent in other large cities, a variety of factors contribute to the concentration of these students at certain schools: the concentration of the immigrant population in certain neighbourhoods, policies aimed at prioritising specific resources at certain schools in these neighbourhoods, and finally, the popularity of certain private schools that attract a significant mass of students belonging of immigrant groups with a high purchasing power.
4. Practical interventions

Finally, in this last section we will compile and describe the most prominent programmes, actions and specific resources implemented by the different countries and regions being examined to deal with the processes of receiving and educating immigrant pupils.

4.1. Bavaria

In Bavaria, educational interventions designed to favour the integration of the entire student body are focused on two target groups: first, students with native languages other than German, and secondly, immigrants with German ethnic backgrounds (Aussiedler).

The measures and mechanisms designed are similar for both groups, but it is interesting to point out certain nuances as well as highlight the administration’s desire to educate both foreign students and Aussiedler separately whenever possible (Beauftragte der Bundersregierung für Ausländerfragen, 2001:13).

Below is a description of the main instruments the government of Bavaria has made available to receive foreign students and Aussiedler.

Bilingual or “national” classrooms (Zweisprachige Klassen)

Bilingual classrooms have existed in Bavaria since the 1982-1983 academic year between first and eighth grades, and they are mainly offered at the Grundschule and the Hauptschule.

These bilingual classes are organised by grouping together students that share the same native language. Frequently, students who speak the same native language also have the same nationality, hence these classes are often referred to as “national classes” (Will and Rühl, 2002: 8).

The teaching takes place in students’ native language in combination with German, which gradually is increased as the courses progress. Despite the fact that the transfer to regular classes can take place between the fourth and seventh grades (and is officially sought), foreign students can go as far as ninth grade attending these national classes. In many cases, then, these students’ education takes place totally apart from that of the German students.

At the beginning of the 1980s, 40% of foreign students were educated in bilingual classrooms. They were mainly addressed to students from Turkish backgrounds, although there were and still are classrooms for students from other nationalities, namely Greeks, Italians and Croats.

As mentioned above, the bilingual classrooms in secondary education are mainly offered at the Hauptschule, leading this to become a key factor in many foreign families’ decisions to educate their children in this way (Hunger and Thränhardt, 2004:
193). However, it is worth mentioning that at the Realschule and the Gymnasien there is also a special type of bilingual classroom called the Eingangsklassen. In these classrooms, the native language replaces the German language subject, and German takes the place of the foreign language subject (usually English).

**Welcoming classes (Sprachlernklassen)**

The Sprachlernklassen are language learning classrooms. They were initially created in primary education for those non-German speaking children who began their education in the German school system, but they have now spread to secondary education for those students who enter the German educational system at upper grades, that is, for late-entry students (Späteinsteiger) (Will and Rühl, 2002: 9).

The Bavarian Ministry of Education and Culture officially regards three groups as the targets of this welcoming mechanism:23

a) Late-entry students

b) Students born in German “whose parents show no interest in integration, nor in the German language nor in education”.

c) Children from German ethnic backgrounds (Aussiedler) who do not speak German despite having German citizenship.

Students with language deficits who begin their education in primary school attend the “Sprachlernklassen for beginners”, made up of twelve to fifteen pupils who meet fourteen hours per week. These classes mainly focus on learning German, although other subjects in the curriculum are also taught. In a parallel fashion, the pupils take subjects such as music and others with more practical contents along with their regular classroom group, and once they have attained a high enough level to join the class with the other students, the transfer to the regular classroom takes place.

The objective of the Sprachlernklassen is to work on developing the students’ skills for one or two years without any loss in the student’s link with their regular classroom group.

It is believed that the success of these welcoming classes is only possible if students can apply German to their everyday lives, and for this reason the Sprachlernklassen are combined with a joint action with the families including organising educational free-time activities, preparing homework to be done with the families, and similar actions.

The Sprachlernklassen are also addressed to late-entry students, that is, those pupils who enter Grundschule between second and fourth grade, or who enter Hauptschule between fifth and ninth grade. Between second and seventh grade, the Sprachlernklassen are organised so that students can join the regular classes after a

---

23 See [www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml](http://www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml).
maximum of two years. Students who begin their education in Germany in eighth or ninth grade must undergo their entire education in the Sprachlernklassen.

In academic year 2004-2005, a total of 215 Sprachlernklassen were operating in the Bavarian Grundschule and Hauptschule. In addition to these, there were also the Eingliederungsklassen aimed exclusively for Aussiedler students.

Transition classrooms (Übergangsklassen)²⁴

Übergangsklassen (transition classrooms) are very similar to Sprachlernklassen, or welcoming classes, but with the peculiarity that they combine teaching in German with teaching in students’ native languages.

Integrated classrooms (“Integration auländischer Schülerinnen und Schüler in Regelklassen”)²⁵

In academic year 1990-1991, a pilot project was started under the banner “Integration of foreign students into regular classes”. This project has been conducted annually since then in twelve Bavarian schools.

The experimental model consists of joint instruction and education of a class containing 75% German students with 25% foreign students from a single nationality (mainly Turks). All the subjects are taught to the entire class in German, and the group only divides up for the native language and religion subjects (Beauftragte der Bundersregierung für Ausländerfragen, 2001:15-16).

Complementary native language classes (Müttersprachlicher Ergänzungsunterricht)

Müttersprachlicher Ergänzungsunterricht, or complementary classes for native languages, may be attended voluntarily by pupils studying in German language classrooms. During academic year 2004-2005 in Bavaria, almost 11,000 students benefited from this mechanism in both the Grundschule and the Hauptschule.²⁶ Students from the majority nationalities in Bavaria (Greek, Italian, Moroccan, Spanish, Portuguese, Turkish and from the former Yugoslavia) are the ones who have Müttersprachlicher Ergänzungsunterricht available to them. The teaching in the native languages is done by foreign teachers hired by the Land of Bavaria, unlike in other Länder where the consulates and embassies of each country are in charge of teaching their respective languages.

²⁴ Beauftragte der Bundersregierung für Ausländerfragen, 2001:15.
²⁵ Literal translation: “Integration of foreign students into regular classrooms”.
²⁶ www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml
The creation of this instrument was spurred by the goal of easing the return of the children of "guest workers" (Gästarbeitern) to their homelands, despite the fact that later this option gained importance as the socialising role of the native language began to be valued (Will and Rühl, 2002: 9).

Despite this, the realisation that the majority of foreign students had moved permanently to Germany and that returning to their homelands was increasingly a less common option, was behind the declaration by the government of Bavaria on 14th September 2004 expressing its desire to reduce the number of Müttersprachlicher Ergänzungsunterricht to zero within a period of five years, aiming instead to bolster the teaching of the German language.27

**German as a Second Language (Deutsch als Zweitsprache)**

With the goal of emphasising the teaching of the German language, and as a solution to the German language weaknesses detected in immigrant students and Aussiedler, in 2002 intensive preparatory courses in German and German teaching classes were created as part of the “Deutsch als Zweitsprache” (German as a Second Language) programme. The preparatory courses are attended by students every day from May to July with the goal of by September, when the academic year begins, they can minimally get by in German and will have mastered the contents corresponding to the first level of the yearlong courses.

In academic year 2003-2004, these preparatory courses were attended by around 2,750 children (116 courses in *Kindergarten* and 220 at the *Grundschule*), and around 2,007 more pupils attended the German teaching classes (Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus, 2004: 149).

The groups are always made of at least eight students from different countries, and they are offered at the primary schools (*Grundschule*) and special schools (*Förderschule*), as well as at several different secondary education institutions (*Hauptschule, Gymnasium, Realschule and Berufschule*).28

**Diagnosis of the German language (Sprachstandsdiagnose)**

In February 2002, the Staatsinstitut für Schulqualität und Bildungsforschung (State Institute for School Quality and Educational Research) set the standards for conducting a diagnosis of students' knowledge of the German language.29 The ultimate goal of this diagnosis was to decide on the most appropriate school placement for students; that is, whether students should be included in regular classrooms or whether it was preferable for them to attend German courses or receive other shelter measures.

---

27 [www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml](http://www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml)
28 [www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml](http://www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml)
29 [www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml](http://www.km.bayern.de/km/schule/schularten/allgemein/fremdschuelerfoerderung/index.shtml)
This is a particularly useful instrument for assessing the language skills of children with native languages other than German at the onset of schooling. Foreign pupils who started school in the 2002-2003 academic year had to take a German test when registering. Those who were regarded as lacking knowledge of German were given the opportunity to take a German course at both the Grundschule and at Kindergarten. In academic year 2002-2003, eight German classes were opened as a special measure for children with language difficulties (Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 2002: 102).

Teaching assistants (Fachbetreuer)  

Fachbetreuer are teaching assistants hired by the Bavarian government with the purpose of providing support to both foreign and German teachers in charge of teaching the German language to immigrant students. These assistants not only must know the subjects being taught, but they must also demonstrate knowledge of students’ native languages. The goal, then, is to enhance the quality of teaching aimed at foreign schoolchildren through teacher support.

“Mothers learn German at their children’s schools” (“Mütter lernen Deutsch an der Schule ihrer Kinder”)  

This mechanism is not addressed directly to immigrant pupils, rather to their mothers. It is based on the fact that most mothers, especially those from Turkey, lack knowledge of German, and the goal is to compensate for these language shortcomings while improving coordination and communication between families and schools. They are basically German language courses taught in the mornings, and they focus on mastering the language especially in spaces related to the schools, in order to make it easier for parents to keep track of their children’s education.

Specific measures at the Realschule  

At the Realschule there is a variety of resources available to immigrant students (Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus, 2004: 149). Several examples include:

a) The possibility of taking one’s native language as an elective subject.

a) Special rules for assessing the German language subject for students in the orientation courses (grades five and six) for students who have joined the German educational system during these two grades.

b) The possibility of supplementary training for English, German and mathematics in the orientation courses (grades five and six).
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c) The possibility of replacing the English subject for the native language when students enter Realschule in grades nine or ten.

Specific measures in Gymnasium

The Gymnasium have a resource called the “Modellklassen” to accommodate those students whose parents are foreign workers. These classes endeavour to compensate for these students’ difficulties by teaching in the native language and holding intensive German language classes at the entry levels of fifth and sixth grades (Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus, 2004: 149).

In terms of Aussiedler students, since 1996 they have been given the opportunity to attend a special class to prepare for the entrance examination to tenth grade at the Gymnasium, after having obtained good grades in Hauptschule.  

4.2. The French Community (Belgium)

Medhounet and Lavalle (1998) are quite explicit in their analysis of why the French assimilationist model has gradually taken on compensatory and, to some extent, culturalist, features, especially since the 1997 “Décret de missions” (particularly articles four and nine). According to these authors:

One could say without going too far astray that as of the 1980s Belgium reluctantly adopted a certain number of measures aimed at facilitating the integration of newly arrived students under pressure from the European Council (Medhounet and Lavalle, 1998: 157).

Below we shall examine the main measures implemented in the French Community to achieve the objective of improving the treatment of “allochton” (called “allochtones” as opposed to the “autochtones”) students at school:

Bridge classes (Classe-passarelle)

This resource, along with others aimed at providing support for newly arrived (primo-arrivants) children and youngsters, are regulated by the decree dating from 14th June 2001, called the Décret visant à l'insertion des élèves primo-arrivants dans l'enseignement organisé ou subventionné par la Communauté française (June 2001). In this decree, a “primo-arrivant” is deemed to be any student between the ages of two-and-a-half and eighteen who has immigrated to Belgium within the past year, or who has recognised status as either a refugee or stateless.

In general terms, then, only these students are recognised as having the right to receive differentiated school support. This support takes place in the guise of “bridge classes” (“Classe-passarelle”) which these students may attend for between a
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minimum of one week and a maximum of one year. In accordance with the aforementioned Décret, these classes are “an educational structure that seeks to ensure the optimal reception, orientation and insertion of primo-arrivants students in fundamental (primary) or secondary education”.

During the period when they are attending these “bridge classes”, the newcomers receive specific support to help them to adapt to the country’s social, culture and school system. These classes exist in primary and secondary schools, and students can attend them for a certain number of hours or for the entire school day. The bridge classes are founded on three main axes:

a) Intensive learning of French by students who do not have mastery of the language.

b) Work on the general educational objectives given the students’ ages, which are outlined in the “Décret de missions”.

c) Adapting the curriculum corresponding to the students’ ages so that they can achieve a comparable threshold of learning as their classmates in “ordinary” classrooms.

Schools requesting “bridge classes” are granted extra teaching hours (“capital–période” in primary or “périodes–professeurs” in secondary) which the schools organise independently. For example, in academic year 2003-2004 there were fourteen primary schools and four secondary schools with “bridge classes” in Wallonia, and twelve primary and secondary schools with these classes in French Brussels.

Educational support in the bridge classes is coordinated by the “integration council” at each school. This group, presided over by each school’s headmaster/mistress, is in charge of “guiding every primo-arrivant student towards optimum integration into education in the French Community”.

In 2004, Maravelaki, Sinzot and Leonard conducted a preliminary assessment of the operation of these bridge classes in secondary education by analysing documentation, classroom observations, interviews and the teaching materials used. These authors drew the following conclusions:

a) The teachers in charge of the classes-passarelle highlighted problematic factors such as: lack of specific teaching materials available to them; the overly restrictive definition of primo-arrivant, which excludes attendance at bridge classes by some children and youngsters in need of this support; the difficulty of handling ongoing registration given the pre-set resource planning; the fact that the length of the bridge classes was insufficient for certain students; the lack of means at the school both generally and specifically to keep up with the material and organisational demands of the bridge classes.

32 Although twelve months is enough for the majority of students to integrate into school life, there are cases (especially students who had inadequate schooling prior to arrival) who need a longer period of specific support in order to overcome their lag behind the minimum requirements for their age group.
b) In terms of **classroom dynamics**, the authors gleaning that the majority of time is spent working on French grammar and vocabulary, and much less on reading and especially writing in French. In the field of oral skills, listenings and comprehension exercises predominated over speaking practice.

c) In terms of **students**, there was increasing diversity in the students being taught in the French Community's educational system. In the twelve schools examined alone there were children from more than thirty different countries. In particular, there was an upward trend in the arrival of students from “non-traditional” countries: Latin American and Eastern Europe are the new poles from which immigrants have been arriving in the past three or four years, replacing the more “traditional” countries (Morocco, Turkey, Italy, Spain, etc.).

d) In terms of an **overall assessment** of the bridge classes, the authors concluded that according to the tests administered at the end of the process, two main factors tend to influence: the time the student remained in the bridge classes, and the parents’, especially the mother’s, educational level.

e) Finally, the report speaks very highly about the results of the different **intercultural projects** undertaken within the framework of the **classes-passarelle**, especially those involving theatre (writing and putting on plays).

f) **Teaching the language, culture and religion of the home country (LCO)**

Chiefly since the 1970s, this service for immigrant students has gradually become more widespread. To cap it off, in 2001 a four-year programme was signed with the countries that send the most immigrants to the French Community (Greece, Italy, Morocco, Portugal and Turkey) so that they may provide qualified staff to teach the courses on the language and culture of the immigrants’ home country. The issue of religion, as a subject on morality (ethics), is regulated by other direct agreements with the different religious groups.

The LCO programme is implemented through the possibility of early childhood, primary and secondary schools offering a “course on homeland language and culture” and/or a “introductory course on the homeland culture”. These courses are taught by teachers that each **partenaire** country has provided to the French Community. Throughout academic year 2003-2004, more than seventy schools had requested at least one LCO course. All told, more than one thousand courses were requested, with a total of 74 teachers. Courses were distributed by countries as follows: Morocco 457 courses (228 on language and 229 on culture), Italy 355 (169 on language and 186 on culture), Turkey 104 (70 on language and 34 on culture), Portugal 82 (50 on language and 32 on culture), and finally, Greece 20 (eight on language and twelve on culture).

**Pilot projects**

Since academic year 2003-2004, some schools have voluntarily offered to participate in a pilot teaching project called EVLANG, the goal of which is to prepare children and young people to live in a linguistically and culturally diverse society. The goal of the
government of the French Community is to extend this project through all the school systems by 2010.

More specifically, the EVLANG project was created with the purpose of “contributing to building cohesive and linguistically and culturally pluralistic societies by working on developing two key competencies: the competency to learn a different language, and the competency to live in a multicultural and multilingual society”. The implementation of the project centres around three general dimensions:

a) Developing positive portrayals and attitudes of openness towards linguistic and cultural diversity as well as the motivation to learn other languages;

b) Developing metalinguistic, metacommunicative (observation and reasoning) and cognitive aptitudes that facilitate the mastery of other languages;

c) Developing a language culture which constitutes a series of references that help to understand the multilingual and multicultural world in which the children and young people live.

Another programme worth examining is the project on “Diversity and Citizenship” being carried out by IRFAM33 and CAI34 from Namur. The benchmark for this initiative is the framework of an action programme undertaken in Quebec aimed at promoting the integration of immigrant families in a rural setting. The objective is to enhance immigrants’ visibility and recognition in the rural regions located far from cities. This initiative has been transferred to small towns in Wallonia where there is, generally speaking, a very negative social perception of immigration, and particularly of immigrants at schools. In each town, the way of breaking the staunch prejudices against the immigrants based on mutual knowledge and meeting points is studied.

For example, in Cheratte, a small town located in south-eastern Belgium, training workshops were held to bring together teachers who taught the different “religions” (Muslim, Catholic and secular morality). In this region, too, the issue of cultural diversity has been examined through theatre, with more than 100 children and six different schools.

School mediation35

This is a service that has been up and running since the 1990s, putting the educational teams and the community into contact in order to examine the most conflictive issues, frequently consisting of tensions arising from the phenomenon of migration. On 30th June 1998, a decree was enacted that regulates school mediation in the French Community.

33 Institute of Research, Training and Action on migrations. Directed by Altay Manço, one of the most prominent experts in the issue in Belgium. http://www.irfam.org
34 Namur Centre for Intercultural Action.
The mission of the school mediation service is to prevent violence and school drop-out in secondary schools. To this end, the objective of mediation is to foster, conserve or re-establish the climate of trust that must prevail in relationships amongst students, their families and the school. This mediation process is exercised at the behest of school management teams by a mediation professional, a member of the educational community, a student or his or her family.

The mediation service is organised in one of two ways. The internal way is requested by a specific school, while the external way takes place within a group of schools within the same system that belong to the same district. In both cases, mediation in schools which show “positive discrimination” is prioritised.

*ZEPs (Zones of Education or Priority Action)*

Also following the French model on this front, the French Community has been deploying these positive discrimination projects at the most disadvantaged schools since 1996. Some schools had entered into a vicious circle: the gradual homogenisation of their student body, especially in working class and immigrant contexts, led the remaining families to avoid these schools, which once again became receivers of the students rejected by the schools in stronger positions and with the ability to pick their student body in a quasi-market school system.

Through a supplementary allocation of resources (human, economic, projects and programmes, etc.) and a lower student-teacher ratio in the classrooms, the ZEPs endeavour to enable the most disadvantaged schools to increase their resources; make more guarantees possible in order to comply with the general principle of equal opportunities; and reduce the drop-out and failure rates of students with a lower sense of affiliation with the system.

In the wake of a clearly “social” official discourse when justifying the implementation of the ZEPs, there has also emerged a certain acknowledgement of the need to positively discriminate at those schools with more proportion of immigrant pupils (the cultural facet) and with a lower socioeconomic status (the social class facet). Thus, as hinted at above, we can see how the official “social” discourse to a large extent subordinates the treatment of these educational inequalities specifically experienced by immigrant students or those belonging to minority ethnic groups.

**4.3. England**

In this section we shall highlight some of the main action programmes implemented in England with the objective of improving the treatment of students belonging to minority or immigrant ethnic groups at schools.
Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG)

Ever since they were created in 1999, EMAGs represent the main source of non-current resources available to LEAs and schools in their struggle to attain academic success for all their students belonging to minority ethnic groups. These state aids replace those from the previous fund created as part of sections 11 (from the 1966 Law on Local Government) and 488 (from the 1996 Educational Law) and have shifted from being managed by the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) to being administered by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). The package set aside for academic year 2004-2005 totalled 186 million pounds sterling (around 263 million euros).

In theory, the purpose of this aid was to attempt to encourage schools to design and implement strategic and global programmes to improve the academic performance of their minority student body at risk of failure. The goal was thus to overcome the usual restrictive and reactive use of earlier subsidies, which had mainly been aimed at hiring specialised teaching staff – English as an Additional Language teachers and language assistants.

However, it bears mentioning that since EMAGs was created, reports by OFSTED assessing the impact of their use by schools have detected that this financing was fundamentally spent on attending to the needs of students who have just joined the schools, many of whom are children of families seeking asylum or belonging to the gypsy-travellers group.

In order to foster broader targets and simultaneously a more global and strategic school policy, in 2003 the Department created the aid programme called the Vulnerable Children’s Grant, aimed at interventions to meet the immediate needs of this type of student. In this way, EMAGs are “freed up” and redirected towards promoting school policies based on national guidelines that strive for a global approach to ethnic inequalities in education and strategic work driven by a shared methodology of “good practices”. In a certain way, this new approach to the way EMAGs should be used reduces schools’ and LEAs’ management autonomy. According to the political programme called Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils, the justification for this new approach is two-fold: first, it improves the transparency of what this additional aid is spent on; and secondly, it promotes non-reactive actions that are in line with the DfES’s strategic political goals.

English as an Additional Language (EAL)

What we have just covered in the previous section does not entail a step backwards in the programmes supporting teaching English as an Additional Language (EAL). On the
contrary, the aim is for those schools that hire specialised teaching staff to implement these programmes to accompany this measure with other global intervention strategies. Not for nothing, different OFSTED reports have pointed out that at many schools with this resource (financed through EMAGs), the EAL teachers/specialists working there are not asked to participate in an integrated fashion in the school’s overall dynamics\(^{38}\). In contrast, those schools that have developed a coordinated working method between regular and specialised teaching staff over time have managed to increase the academic performance of their non-Anglophone minority students.

Regardless, the justification accompanying the implementation of the EAL programmes corroborates the retreat of British policies for educating non-Anglophone students from the “closed” model of classroom. Since the end of the 1980s, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) has been one of the stakeholders in this domain that has most vehemently spoken out against any model of attending to minority and/or immigrants students that involves generating parallel learning structures (CRE, 1986 and 1989). According to CRE, these solutions have the (often indirect) effect of viewing and stigmatising the groups participating in them by reinforcing the association between educational shortcomings and cultural differences. At the same time, it delays the learning of the other subjects taught in normalised classrooms as well as contact with the school dynamics conveyed by informal knowledge.

In short, it is conceived that the most effective way of encouraging these students to linguistically and pedagogically prepare for the curriculum standards is envisioned as integrating them into mainstream situations by sharing the classroom with students whose native language is English. In this context, the specialised EAL teachers base their work on being present in the regular classroom, by monitoring the work of students who need linguistic acceleration either individually or in small groups\(^ {39}\). Ideally, this specific support is backed by a regular teaching staff competent at introducing the following into the classroom: time for independent work (centred on language tutoring for minority students), specific tasks that can be done in the students’ native language, working dynamics in heterogeneous or (occasionally) homogeneous cooperative groups, and similar activities and dynamics.

In any event, it should be highlighted that it is the specialised EAL teachers’ job to contribute to training and raising the awareness of the regular teaching staff on how to teach taking into account the diversity contributed by students belonging to minority ethnic groups.

---

\(^{38}\) See Managing Support for the Attainment of Pupils from Ethnic Minority Groups (OFSTED, 2001) or Support for Minority Ethnic Achievement: Continuing Professional Development (OFSTED, 2002). The latter also stresses that fewer than 30% of EAL teachers have the qualifications needed to teach in that area of speciality.

\(^{39}\) In addition to the specialised EAL teaching staff, EMAGs allow schools to hire teaching assistants for specific tutoring or other professionals for socio-educational needs (social workers, mentors, etc.). Using EMAG funds to hire professionals and specialists depends on the needs detected as well as the policies according to the schools’ own priorities. Along these lines, the profile the additional human resources ultimately earmarked for educating the minority student body is highly variable. For example, referring to secondary education, schools with an approximate 10% minority student body have a part-time specialised EAL teacher, while others where this ratio hovers around 80% might hire up to six full-time specialised teachers.
Work on leadership

School management’s leadership skills and strategic vision is one of the central aspects at the core of many of the intervention programmes that DfES designs to foster “good school policy” in the struggle against the risk of school failure among the minority student body. Thus, any teacher aspiring to be a headmaster/mistress must hold the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), an accreditation granted by the National College for School Leadership.

This course – the NPQH – involves learning the competencies contained in the National Standards for Headteachers, which include: grasping strategies that facilitate good performance among students belonging to minority ethnic groups; promoting a good atmosphere of interethnic relationships and developing preventative strategies for conflict resolution; developing and backing pedagogical and didactic approaches that respect and take into consideration the student body’s cultural diversity; having attitudes and aptitudes that enable one to understand the implications of the social and religious backgrounds of the student body as a whole40.

Other programmes such as SHINE and Equal Access to Promotion complement the training programmes at the National College for School Leadership. The former – SHINE – is a pilot project aimed at encouraging candidacies for headteacher posts amongst teachers from minority ethnic backgrounds. The latter – Equal Access to Promotion – a joint initiative by the DfES and the National Union of Teachers, is aimed at encouraging minority teachers to develop strategic and leadership roles within school structures41. Unquestionably, the premises of the funding for both programmes are clear. The view is held that ethno-cultural diversification of the teaching staff (even more when this involves positions of responsibility) has an entire set of psycho-educational implications for students belonging to ethnic minorities or immigrants: it provides them with positive role models and fosters processes of identification that can enhance their sense of affiliation with the schools (and improvements in the corresponding academic performance) and can work towards more widespread feelings of belonging.

Finally, as an example of an “incentive” policy, since 2003 secondary schools located in especially deprived areas around the country have support from the Leadership Incentive Grant. This is a programme that pursues three fundamental goals, the school’s fulfilment of which is a condition for earning the subsidy: 1) stepping up the academic improvement of the student body as a whole; 2) implementing innovative strategies for integrated work within the school; and 3) building collaborative networks with other schools.

40 In light of the significant concentration of minority students in the London area, the efforts by the National College for School Leadership focus many of its programmes on training in these competencies.
41 In academic year 2004-2005, only 5% of primary school teachers came from minority ethnic backgrounds, a figure that contrasts with the figure of 15% of minority students in these grades compared to the total school population.
“Education and environment” initiatives

Since the end of the 1980s, the need to invest in resources for the educational recovery of depressed zones with a greater risk of social exclusion became clear in England; however, it was not until 1997, spurred by the Labour government, that initiatives and programmes began to be implemented in which schools are called on – and economically supported – to supplement their educational activities with environmental resources.

**Education Action Zones, EiC Action Zones and Excellence in Cities**

Education Action Zones were created by the government in 1988 with the chief goal of reducing school failure. These zones are organised as school systems in a territory that includes around twenty primary and secondary schools managed and evaluated by the central government. The local authorities form part of the participatory bodies that are in charge of monitoring their functioning and evaluate to what extent the goals have been reached. In order to involve other stakeholders, contributions of public or private resources from the territory must equal the government’s contribution. Within these zones, smaller-scale zones are also created, the EiC Action Zones, with a territorial scope no larger than a municipality. These zones link one secondary school with a primary school and have shown themselves to be more flexible and effective. Shortly thereafter, the central government implemented yet another programme, Excellence in Cities, aimed at overcoming the low percentages of graduation among students in the most depressed urban areas; its actions include governmental support and resources to set into motion tutoring plans, along with impetus for the EiC Action Zones.

**Social Exclusion Unit and Policy Action Teams**

The Social Exclusion Unit, which is a consequence of the shift in priorities that took place with the advent of the Labour government, drives initiatives aimed at fighting against social exclusion under the generic motto of “joined-up solutions to joined-up problems”. This programme is implemented through eighteen Policy Action Teams aimed at different social policy fronts which attempt to implement specific action plans that are centrally designed and totally controlled by the government.

**Neighbourhood Renewal Initiatives**

Since 1999, the central government has placed priority on developing programmes that endeavour to encourage initiatives aimed at neighbourhood renewal within a framework programme aptly named Neighbourhood Renewal Initiatives. Since 2001, 88 Neighbourhood Renewal Initiatives have been set into motion in the same number of particularly depressed areas. Each one is managed by the corresponding local authority with participation by citizens and community groups. The goal of these initiatives, which are supported by the central government, is to improve the quality of life of people living in the most depressed areas of the country, an improvement which should translate into achieving basic levels of housing, health, education and access to jobs. In each of these areas, a Local Strategic Partnership is created which is responsible for leading and implementing the community renewal in each of the areas of intervention, and which is in charge of drafting a strategic plan for neighbourhood
renewal. In effect, recovering the educational standards of the children living in these
eighbourhoods tends to figure as a top priority in these plans, generally as a
necessary condition in the fight for equal opportunities and social inclusion.

**Schools for the Community**

Schools for the Community, also called Extended Schools or Full Service Schools,
began to operate in 2001 and have as benchmarks other proposals along the same
lines undertaken in the United States and Scotland. They are schools that offer
students and their families a comprehensive range of services and activities, normally
during the school day, with the goal of helping the entire community meet its basic
needs. These services can span from school tutoring to offering free-time or sports
activities, and can even include social assistance and health care. These experiences
are promoted by LEAs and are recognised by the central government, which provides
them economic support and regulatory flexibility. Once again they are mainly created in
zones with the greatest poverty and risk of marginalisation. The expected results of
these experiences are improving learning, community health, safety, literacy and the
overall welfare of the community, thus increasing families’ degree of involvement with
the schools. These initiatives are often set up in a local partnership organisation and
thus link up with the structures running the Neighbourhood Renewal Initiatives.

**Supplementary Schools**

Supplementary schools are official schools or educational networks that are financed
by LEAs or the EiC Action Zones with the goal of improving attention to and the
academic performance of students in disadvantaged social or cultural circumstances
by involving the entire educational community. The entire range of activities
programmed are similar to the services provided by the Extended Schools. In the case
of the Supplementary Schools, however, emphasis is placed on performing intervention
aimed at receiving and providing educational support for students belonging to ethnic
minorities. And unlike the Extended Schools, here we can find educational activities
scheduled outside schools. In practice, educational projects presented by different
ethnic communities are acknowledged and financed as Supplementary Schools, and
they are allowed to use a variety of spaces (community premises, neighbourhood
centres, churches and the schools as well) to hold their activities.

**Methodology of good practices**

Based on an exhaustive standardisation of criteria for evaluating schools’ situations
and policies (as well as their impacts), in recent years OFSTED (Office for Standards in
Education) has included in its reports an analysis of the academic performance and
needs of students belonging to minority ethnic groups in the schools of many of the
LEAs around the country, while assessing the extent to which LEAs and schools
ensure that they meet the educational needs detected amongst these students through
an elaborate system of indicators

More specifically, OFSTED itself has recently drafted reports evaluating the use and
impacts of state EMAG aids in different LEAs around the country. Drafting these
reports produces comparable results with a certain periodicity. For example, in October 2001, this office drafted the report entitled *Managing Support for the Attainment of Pupils from Minority Ethnic Groups*, which analysed the effects of EMAGs on the support of schools in 39 LEAs with the purpose of lowering the school failure and exclusion rates that especially affected certain ethnic groups (especially students from African and Caribbean backgrounds). According to this report, the overall situation is better compared to the one detected two years earlier by another report also drafted by OFSTED (*Raising the Attainment of Minority Ethnic Pupils: School and LEA Responses*, 1999): many of the LEAs had gradually introduced better uses of the EMAG subsidies, and in doing so managed to reduce ethnic inequalities in academic attainment.

These contributions are often complemented by more specific comparative studies. One example of this is the study conducted by David Gillborn and Safia Mirza, also subsidised by OFSTED and entitled: *Educational Inequality. Mapping Race, Class and Gender*. This information makes it possible to critically examine the appropriateness of the standards used to determine the places of schools in the official rankings into a hierarchy. One example of this is the report by the Commission for Racial Equality entitled *Inspecting Schools for Racial Equality: OFSTED’s Strengths and Weaknesses* (2000).

It is worth noting that since 2002, DfES has had an extensive electronic database that compiles exhaustive information on the school circumstances in all LEAs and schools in the country, and more specifically on the attainment of academic standards by their student bodies. This is called the Pupil Level Annual Schools’ Census (PLASC) 42. The data contained in the PLASC are free and accessible to the public 43 and enable accurate information to be available about the academic performance of the student body at each school according to their ethnic background, sex, place of residence and other factors. In this sense, it is an enormously useful instrument for detecting needs, as well as for periodically evaluating the impact of certain educational policies.

This methodology and tradition of evaluation simultaneously fosters the gathering of “good practices” in a variety of fields, which always seeks real examples of efforts made by specific schools. As stressed above, the gathering and dissemination of experiences involving good practices, based on the corresponding systematisation of the evaluation indicators, has become one of DfES’s political priorities. Not for nothing, in an educational system that clearly leans toward the decentralisation of competencies and independence in schools’ policies and management, it is essential to have instruments that, by setting common criteria-guidelines, allow for a “feedback” of information that can be shared and used by all the schools in the country’s educational system.

---

42 This database is completed by all the primary and secondary schools in the country and returned to DfES to be drafted and published. PLASC is part of the Annual School Census that also includes other data on the general characteristics of the schools.

43 As mentioned above, both the reports evaluating schools periodically released by OFSTED and the data that DfES has on the circumstances in schools are always made public and can be examined over Internet.
This policy of gathering and disseminating “good practices”, once again with OFSTED at the helm, also allows attention to be focused on specific issues. Directly in relation to the issue at hand, two avenues that are particularly worth examining are: 1) good practices on improving academic performance by the Black Caribbean student body; and 2) good practices on administering EMAG funds by schools. In terms of the former, in April 2002 OFSTED published the reports entitled *Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils: Three Successful Primary Schools* (OFSTED, April 2002), and *Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils: Good Practice in Secondary Schools*44. In terms of the latter, the following reports stand out: *Managing the Ethnic Minority Grant: Good practice in primary schools*, and *Managing the Ethnic Minority Grant: Good Practice in Secondary Schools* (OFSTED, March 2004)45.

In any event, the system of indicators developed to discern examples of *good practices* in terms of specific strategic areas starts by considering certain conditions of a general nature which are the cornerstones for constructing the corresponding indicators. As claimed in *Aiming High...* (DfES), different studies and reports drafted by the department itself46, the Runnymede Trust47 or the aforementioned reports by OFSTED lead to the conclusion that behind all “good practices” in the field of improving the academic performance of minority students the following *constants* are fulfilled:

The *whole-school approach*. Regardless of the target of the actions planned by the school, their effectiveness depends on the degree of transversality and global work that accompany their design and implementation. This is the *sine qua non* condition to ensure involvement by the entire teaching staff and management, student body, families, local authorities, and any other stakeholders.

a) *Strong leadership*. The management and teaching staff at the school with positions of responsibility must have strategic vision and leadership skills that permeate the dynamics of the school as a whole. We have referred to the value given to this factor in section 3.3

b) *Effective teaching and learning*. The planning of how the curriculum is carried out and the classroom dynamics must ensure that the student body’s cultural diversity is taken into consideration by effectively programming the specific support that students with specific educational needs might require. A recurring factor in this context is participation by the majority of the teaching staff in ongoing training programmes aimed at acquiring or improving competencies in this area.

---

44 In addition to their support by compiling quantitative data (comparing data on accreditations, absenteeism, drop-outs and school graduation over time and by ethnic groups), these reports also provide a great deal of information that is gathered using qualitative methodologies: discussion groups with the teaching staff, interviews with headmasters/mistresses, with Black Caribbean students and their families, and classroom observation.

45 These reports also interpret the quantitative data gathered, in this case more the structure of the budgetary headings financed through EMAG or other programmes, through interviews with headmasters/mistresses, regular and specialised teaching staff, students and families.

46 *Removing the barriers* (DfEE, 2000).

c) High expectations. Working on the expectations that teachers and families share in terms of the academic value of the different students is envisioned as necessary. Stated conversely, it seems to be proven that upholding negative stereotypes about the ability of certain sectors of the student body to perform and efficaciously graduate from school effectively undermine the aspirations of these students and reproduce the cycle of school failure\textsuperscript{48}.

d) An ethos of respect with a clear approach to racism and bad behaviour. The life of the school as a whole must be rooted in a culture of mutual respect and the rejection of any type of discrimination based on class, sex or ethnicity. This ethos or spirit of the school is linked to interest in the school's policies, which based on a preventative approach, eradicate bullying and intimidation practices from relations amongst the student body as a whole. This approach must also be used by all the stakeholders in the educational community.

e) Parental involvement. Family involvement throughout the different phases of design, implementation and evaluation of results is regarded as a necessary condition for the success of any school measure (including the school's educational projects).

In addition to these factors, the aforementioned reports on good practices related to improving academic performance among African Caribbean pupils in primary and secondary school (OFSTED, 2002) point out a final key factor in schools’ attainment of effective results in this realm: working in a network with other schools and local services within the framework of a joint strategy based on the principle of social inclusion. This component stresses once again the value of initiatives involving schools reaching out to their surroundings such as those mentioned above.

4.4. Quebec

Given the spotlight on the structure of the school organisation (more or less open systems of welcoming classes, more or less normalised structures of attention to diversity and so forth) in the scenario of objectives and interventions that make up Quebec’s educational agenda, we shall devote this section to outlining the characteristics of the different organisational mechanisms that the Quebec educational system has at its disposal for this purpose.

\textsuperscript{48} The meaning of this condition refers us directly to the functioning of the so-called Pygmalion effect (Jacobson and Rosenthal, 1968) or theories about “labelling”. Unquestionably, the explanatory core of these approaches is based on the sociological maxim according to which “if people believe something to be true, it is true in its consequences”. (W. Thomas).
The “closed” welcoming classes

The resource of the “closed” welcoming classes within the school has been one of the mainstays for handling the reception and education of newly arrived students since it was initially launched in a pilot project by the Catholic Schools Board in Montreal at the end of the 1960s.

Currently, these welcoming classes are specifically addressed at immigrant students arriving during the five previous years with the primary goal of intensifying their learning of the basic rudiments of French and other minimum practical knowledge that will enable them to later join the regular classrooms. The fact that they are called “closed” (fermée) classrooms comes from the fact that the students attend them full-time, that is, all the hours in the school day, without provisions for them to attend regular classes on a part-time basis. Although the minimum period set for attending these classrooms is one month, it is currently estimated that newly arrived students’ tend to stay in these classrooms for an average of ten months.

In primary school, the welcoming classes generally educate a mixed group students in terms of ages and grades. In secondary school, where they are a more widespread resource, students are preferentially grouped according to their mastery of French and mathematics; three levels are usually distinguished: beginner, intermediate and advanced.

At certain primary schools with “closed” welcoming classes, experiments have been conducted in organising small cooperative work groups made of students from these classrooms along with students from regular classes. The regular classroom teacher and the welcoming classroom teacher work together to oversee the monitoring of this work, which takes up part of every school day.

Experiences of this sort endeavour to break with the isolation often caused by dynamics of specific educational attention such as the “closed” welcoming classes. Indeed, the very principles of the current political directives debate the wisdom of continuing exclusive attendance in welcoming classes as the chief mechanisms for receiving and “linguistically and academically integrating” newly arrived students. The text of the Énoncé itself questions the pressures on schools and teachers to prolong immigrant students’ stints in these classrooms as long as necessary to ensure that they have achieved certain linguistic and practical standards.

Starting from the premise that in many cases the welcoming classes themselves can hardly compensate for the linguistic and academic shortcomings of an important portion of the newly arrived student body, models of school attention are spotlighted that complement the use of specific resources (such as the welcoming classroom) with solutions which tend to advocate normalisation (gradual inclusion into regular classrooms) or at least the use of regular school structures for attending to diversity. The solutions described below exemplify this strategy.

---

49 In all cases, students spend the entire school day in the welcoming classroom, gradually progressing from one level to the next until they ultimately pass the advanced level.
Inclusion in ordinary classrooms with tutoring measures aimed at learning French

In this model of organisation, newly arrived students are immediately included in the ordinary classroom group and receive individualised or small-group tutoring fundamentally in the area of linguistic skills for several hours a week (usually between two and five hours).

This is an organisational solution applied at many schools in the majority of school districts in Quebec. In the case of early childhood education, this combination is often implemented as an early measure of attending to immigrant students who have just arrived. In contrast, in primary and especially in secondary school, this treatment tends to be used as a follow-up solution after foreign students conclude their stints in the closed welcoming classes.

As a more exceptional case, one can find an occasional school district that, in compulsory secondary education, chooses to organise these individual or small-group tutoring sessions (with compulsory attendance) outside school hours.

“Observation” classrooms

This resource is addressed to students that directly join the system in the second cycle of primary education or in secondary school. The students are sent to a temporary specific tutoring classrooms (which lasts no longer than one month) inside the school with the goal of ensuring an observation period sufficient to assess the status of the student's prior knowledge and to organise strategies appropriate for their inclusion in the school system: setting levels, assigning tutoring groups, individualised working plans, etc.

This model is implemented by some schools primarily in the Montreal metropolitan area.

Welcoming classes with gradual inclusion into the regular classroom

The application of this model falls within the aforementioned desire by the Ministry of Education to diminish the policy of “closed” welcoming classes as the mainstay of the system of receiving and educating newly arrived students. In this case, the strategy centres on reinforcing the bridges between an unclosed welcoming classroom and the regular classroom.

In accordance with the aforementioned, reinforcing these bridges conforms to both practical reasons (fostering the immigrant students’ linguistic competencies by promoting everyday use of French with autochthonous classmates) and expressive reasons (promoting the values of intercultural contact).

In short, welcoming classes are envisioned as a specific educational mechanism that is transitory (the first step towards inclusion in the regular classroom), open (can be combined with attendance in common subjects) and flexible (these combinations are
set according to each student’s individualised working plan), aimed at intensive French learning and at acquiring certain basic practical knowledge.

More specifically, in terms of the openness of the welcoming classroom timetable, the general rule seems to be that students attending these classrooms can join their regular classroom groups in those sessions in which linguistic competencies are not liable to direct evaluation (mathematics, physical education, arts, etc.).

Just as in the case of “closed” welcoming classes, managing this resource falls onto the role of the welcoming classroom teacher, who must be in charge of the tasks involved: performing the initial assessments of the students and working together to design individualised programmes, drafting methodological proposals and specific teaching strategies for the teaching staff in the different areas, follow-up tutoring of students and accompanying them in their process of joining the regular classroom, coordinating and transferring information to the teaching teams, coordinating with services outside the school, mediating between the school and the family and so forth.

In recent years, this model has begun to be applied around many of the primary schools in the Quebec school districts. In secondary education, although this formula has been implemented in some cases, the option of “closed” welcoming classes is still more prevalent.

**The post-welcoming classroom**

This classroom is organised specifically for those foreign students in primary and secondary education who, having exclusively attended the “closed” welcoming classroom for approximately ten months, still exhibit significant academic and linguistic deficits. As a general rule, a “significant” deficit is an academic delay that places the student in question three grades or more below the grade they would normally be placed in according to their chronological age. In these cases, the students are sent to post-welcoming classes in the school, where their learning of language and basic practical knowledge will continue for a period of approximately ten more months.

This is a seldom-used solution which is primarily implemented at certain primary and secondary schools in the Montreal metropolitan area.

**“Inclusion” classrooms**

These classrooms are attended by non-French speaking students in secondary school who, after spending time in the “closed” welcoming classroom and, in some cases, in the post-welcoming classroom, still need specific tutoring in the area of language and the social sciences. For a period lasting around one academic year, these students spend part of their school day attending this classroom, where they work with specific curricular adaptations, and they join the regular group in the remaining hours as determined on a case-by-case basis.
Once again, this resource is used at certain secondary schools in the Montreal metropolitan area, fundamentally at those with high percentages of newly arrived students with specific educational needs.

_Tutoring systems in the “closed” welcoming classroom_

This solution is applied within the context of those “closed” welcoming classes attended by students in the last cycle of primary school or secondary school who are severely under-educated. In these circumstances, an auxiliary teacher brings together these students for extra tutoring, on either an individual or a small group basis. This tutoring takes place for a period of twelve hours per week at the school, plus three hours per week at the family home. It is organised in conjunction with NGOs or cooperation entities.

This is also a case of a resource organised at some primary schools pertaining to the Montreal school district, particularly in situations with a high concentration of newly arrived students with severe educational shortcomings.

_Specific tutoring structures_

When the newly arrived students included in the Quebec educational system as of the last cycle of primary school present severe situations of under-education or illiteracy, they are often integrated into the general tutoring and diversity structures at the school. One of these resources involves grouping together students (not just foreign students) with severe learning problems into support classes for approximately one academic year for a significant number of hours per week. In these classrooms, specific curricular adaptations are worked on with student-to-teacher ratio that is much lower than that of “normalised” groups.
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