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PREFACE

We have been asked to write a research paper on the teaching of immigrants in the European Union (EU) as part of a multicultural framework for EU education policies. The aim of the paper is to contribute to the debate on the education of the children of migrants in the EU, specifically as regards nursery, primary and secondary school education. It reflects the dual concerns of further European integration and respect for cultural diversity in the application of European policies.

The paper seeks to provide a basis for discussion based on qualitative and quantitative data on the measures taken by the EU and the Member States in the teaching of immigrants in the EU and also attempts to identify the problems and shortcomings of and future prospects for the teaching of immigrants in the EU.

We have divided the paper into two sections. The first gives an outline of the background and the current situation based on a quantitative, qualitative and comparative analysis of data on the immigrant population in the EU's various education systems.

The second looks at the measures implemented by the EU in the teaching of immigrants and their objectives and instruments, as well as the recent Community programmes, in particular Socrates and its specific project targeted at the children of migrants in the Comenius subprogramme. In identifying the most important aspects of the actions targeted at the teaching of immigrants in the EU and appraising the problems and shortcomings of and prospects for the programmes, our analysis has been based on political, legal and socio-economic factors in order to obtain an overall picture of the situation.

In the conclusion, we attempt to identify and assess the future problems and outlook for the teaching of immigrants in the EU in an open context which accepts that education is an instrument for changing society.

For the purposes of this research paper, we have compiled statistical data and information on the quality of nursery, primary and secondary school education for immigrants in the EU through an in-depth analysis of scientific and specialist literature, the official documents of European and international organizations and informal contacts with specialists in this field in the European organizations, whom we would like to thank for their help.
It goes without saying that such research cannot be exhaustive and that its aim is to contribute to the compiling of quantitative, qualitative and comparative information regarding intercultural education in the EU. The teaching of immigrants in the EU is an issue which forms part of the social thinking which could lead Europe towards a better future.
INTRODUCTION

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The basic premise for this research paper is the increasing importance of education and migration in the general debate on the EU. The EU’s action hitherto shows that there has been more cooperation between the Member States in the sphere of education than in the sphere of immigration. Immigration is now a global factor affecting the whole fabric of society, and must be taken into account when drafting any social policy, for example education policy. That is the underlying basis for the premises set out in this research paper:

. The importance of education in the eyes of the Member States as a political and cultural issue and a means of achieving the socialization of citizens has not prevented close cooperation at European level, particularly in higher education, initially as a flanking measure in the completion of a fully functioning and effective single market and thereafter, since the Treaty of Maastricht, with the aim of developing an educational area with a European dimension. The cultural diversity of European societies, including the presence of a growing number of immigrants, is now recognized as a social reality. Whereas previously the education of immigrants had been the subject of occasional specific measures under the action programme launched in 1976 and Directive 77/486/EEC, the notion of intercultural education has now become the basis for all EU action in the field of education, for example, under the SOCRATES programme.

. In this approach involving the notion of intercultural education, education must be seen as a means of developing not only individual creativity but also greater participation in social, economic, cultural and political life and as a more effective contribution to human development. To achieve this, education must develop effectively and practically in close conjunction with society - education must not be seen as separate from the social factor. The issue of immigration must be dealt with not only in terms of cultural differences but also in socio-economic terms, and the conditions must be created to enable immigrants to play a full part in the political, social and economic life of the EU. Such participation is a vehicle by which individuals become aware of the social sphere and can therefore see themselves as part of a community, contributing by their own experiences to collective development. The resulting cultural diversity helps to develop the innovatory, dynamic nature of societies.

---

Lastly, it should be pointed out that, although the education of immigrants in Europe was previously a flanking measure in the process of achieving an area permitting the free movement of persons\(^1\), today, with the scope extended to include the children of immigrants from third countries, the education of immigrants is seen as a political and human rights issue and no longer merely an economic issue related to the single market. The teaching of languages to immigrants of non-Community origin is therefore viewed differently from the teaching of languages to the nationals of EU Member States. From the point of view of Community law, a distinction must be drawn between the free movement of workers and members of their families and the integration of immigrants, because of the problem raised by the extent of entitlement to freedom of movement. This distinction is responsible for the confusion between the concept of *migrants* (the term used to denote migration within the European economic area) and the concept of *immigrants* (the term used when speaking of nationals of non-EU countries).

It can therefore be said that immigration today affords a golden opportunity to transform and enrich the conceptual substance of the rule of law and democracy, which form the foundations of the EU. The key to these foundations lies in guaranteeing and extending human rights. It is not a question of displaying humanity towards those who do not enjoy our privileges, but a logical consequence of the principle of human rights and the notion of intercultural education.

\(^{1}\) As Mrs P. Viehoff says in her report on *the education of the children of migrant workers* (EP, Document 1 – 329/81, p. 7): ‘without measures to ensure the education of migrant workers’ children, the freedom of movement of workers would be severely impeded and the principles of equal treatment of individuals in the Member States made largely meaningless. This is therefore a problem which is closely connected with the establishment of the free market’.
I - PART ONE

1 - CONTEXT

"The human condition is evolving in a political, economic and social context which is influencing the education policies of a pluralist Europe. The present context, which involves greater challenges and changing requirements, is influencing the action taken by the European Union (EU) and the Member States in the field of education. It is dominated by processes such as the free movement of persons within the EU, the internationalization of the labour market, the continuing increase in immigration flows, etc. These factors mean that we must think about the way in which the various education systems can cooperate and respond to the new requirements - the educational requirements of children who are exposed, inter alia, to a more culturally diverse environment.

Despite the diversity that is a feature of education systems in Europe, they are undoubtedly faced with similar challenges, due not only to the pressure of economic and social changes but also to the very development of European integration. Moreover, the number of immigrants' children in Europe's school population is on the increase. The changes in the types of migration which occurred in the 1980s mean that all EU Member States have now become immigration countries. We can therefore speak of a general development in the linguistic and cultural diversity of the Member States and hence of the emergence of new linguistic and cultural communities, which means that teaching systems and educational establishments need to provide an educational framework for all pupils which ensures equal opportunities and maximum success for all, while at the same time respecting specific cultural identities. This partly explains the underlying strategies of the new programmes launched by the EU, which are aimed at supporting transnational cooperation in particular as a way of finding solutions tailored to the particular education requirements of each country, region or district through exchanges of experiences.

The aim is therefore to explore the possibilities offered by intercultural education and the factor of change brought about by the presence of groups of immigrants in schools, which could be of lasting benefit to all children. This appears to coincide with the desire already expressed by education authorities and schools to modernize school syllabuses, prompted by the internationalization of exchanges and communications.

In addition to this reforming spirit, the advantage of intercultural education lies in the fact that it is aimed at all children, particularly in the context of the development of European citizenship which, for Community immigrants, lessens the distinction between immigrants and local inhabitants, and also in the context of a growing concern about the increase in social exclusion and racism in Europe.

---

6 Socrates Vademecum, 1995, p. 11.
This concern also reflects the context in which migratory movements are taking place and education policies are being formulated. In Western Europe, the massive influx of immigrant workers began during the boom years of the 1960s. After the 1973 oil crisis and the recession which followed, foreign workers were encouraged to return home. After dropping in the early 1980s, the proportion of foreigners among the population has steadily risen. However, unlike the 1960s, this latter growth boom, which has been fuelled by family reunification and the fact that second- and third-generation migrants with full residence rights have reached adulthood, has taken place against a background of rising unemployment which is aggravating social tensions and generating xenophobia.

It was in 1992, therefore, that the EU officially acknowledged this dimension and included intercultural education among its priorities for combating the rise in racism and xenophobia and combating social exclusion. At the 1992 Edinburgh Summit, the European Council declared that vigorous and effective measures must be taken to combat acts of aggression against foreign immigrants, both through education and legislation. This was the context in which the Socrates programme was launched and the idea of the European dimension in education took root. The programme talks about the importance of flexibility within socio-cultural systems in order to ensure the political, economic and cultural integration of the immigrant population to counter any feeling in the host country that immigrants are a threat to cultural identity, public policies and the stability of the labour market.

In its resolution on 1997, the European Year against Racism, the Council expressed concern that the continued existence of racism and xenophobic attitudes was prejudicing economic and social cohesion in the EU and could constitute an obstacle to the effective exercise of the rights of free movement. It spoke of the need for such attitudes to be tackled at local, national and regional level, inter alia through education.

---

8 According to the Commission, racism and xenophobia are beliefs or attitudes based upon stereotypes or irrational fears of ‘the other’. Racism is ‘a belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacity and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race’, and xenophobia is ‘fear and hatred of strangers or foreigners or anything that is strange or foreign’. Commission, Legal instruments to combat racism and xenophobia, December 1992, Luxembourg 1993.


2 - CURRENT SITUATION

A - SOME FIGURES ON MIGRATION

For a more detailed picture of the context in which the EU is taking action, we must first look at the characteristics of the migrant population, as illustrated by the following statistics.

Table I shows that, in the early 1980s, nearly all the EC Member States had immigrant populations. The countries with the highest rates were Belgium, France, Germany and Luxembourg, which therefore have more experience when it comes to the social integration of immigrants. There was also a major increase in the number of immigrants in the Netherlands, one of the most active Member States as regards developing mechanisms for the integration of immigrants through education.

Table I: Global statistical review of the presence of immigrants and ethnic minorities in the EC Member States in the 1980s. Foreign population as a percentage of the overall population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table II shows how the number of migrants in the Member States has changed, with the figure for the EU as a whole in 1994 three times higher than in 1970. In the case of Belgium, Germany, Spain, Italy and the United Kingdom, the tendency towards immigration (which was noticeable and went on increasing) occurred mainly in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Luxembourg and the Netherlands, which have a longer tradition of hosting immigrants, underwent increases mainly in the late 1980s. However, Ireland appears to be a country from which the population has emigrated. These trends are reflected by and large in the instruments set up by the Member States to implement Directive 77/486/EEC which, as mentioned earlier, are highly developed in the Netherlands and Luxembourg, developed to differing degrees in the other countries and virtually non-existent in Ireland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU 15</td>
<td>-390 044</td>
<td>294 403</td>
<td>588 360</td>
<td>155 500</td>
<td>1 030 211</td>
<td>787 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-32 718</td>
<td>24 636</td>
<td>-2 436</td>
<td>-1 036</td>
<td>19 961</td>
<td>18 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>21 113</td>
<td>-10 273</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>9 794</td>
<td>8 553</td>
<td>10 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-271 686</td>
<td>-210 023</td>
<td>304 410</td>
<td>67 166</td>
<td>656 166</td>
<td>315 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>-46 222</td>
<td>58 550</td>
<td>50 105</td>
<td>6 005</td>
<td>71 135</td>
<td>27 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-50 479</td>
<td>14 181</td>
<td>112 659</td>
<td>-18 612</td>
<td>1 532</td>
<td>26 648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>182 509</td>
<td>13 626</td>
<td>43 974</td>
<td>38 000</td>
<td>80 000</td>
<td>50 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>-2 796</td>
<td>17 295</td>
<td>-492</td>
<td>-32 875</td>
<td>-7 667</td>
<td>-6 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-107 276</td>
<td>22 424</td>
<td>4 914</td>
<td>-20 405</td>
<td>24 212</td>
<td>150 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1 084</td>
<td>3 488</td>
<td>1 344</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>3 937</td>
<td>4 049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>32 516</td>
<td>70 347</td>
<td>50 557</td>
<td>20 165</td>
<td>48 730</td>
<td>20 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10 406</td>
<td>-24 543</td>
<td>9 357</td>
<td>9 934</td>
<td>71 913</td>
<td>13 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-121 951</td>
<td>346 972</td>
<td>42 123</td>
<td>-27 373</td>
<td>-60 068</td>
<td>10 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>-36 381</td>
<td>-3 786</td>
<td>-2 180</td>
<td>2 229</td>
<td>8 604</td>
<td>3 611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>46 644</td>
<td>16 327</td>
<td>9 663</td>
<td>11 087</td>
<td>34 817</td>
<td>50 859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>-14 807</td>
<td>-44 818</td>
<td>-36 208</td>
<td>90 758</td>
<td>68 386</td>
<td>92 284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table III gives a breakdown of the origins of the migrant population which shows that the overall number of immigrants in the EU from third countries is greater than the number of migrants within the EU (1.5% are non-nationals of other EU countries and 3.2% are from third countries). The free movement of persons and the resulting mobility account for smaller numbers than immigrants from third countries. If we look at the figures showing the origins of immigrants, it can be seen that, although there are larger numbers of immigrants from within the EU in certain countries, relative growth is lower than that of immigrants from third countries. Migration within the EC took place mainly in the 1970s, and these immigrants are now the 'second and third generation' immigrants at whom Directive 77/486/EEC was targeted, to whom must be added the current immigrant population which is mainly from third countries.
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Table III: Population per nationality as at 1 January, 1985-1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Nationals of other EU countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR 15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-nationals of non-EU countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR 15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV also shows that there is a general tendency towards an increase in the number of immigrants from third countries. The situation of each Member State presents specific characteristics in this respect depending on the actual origin of the immigrants, which is often the result of geographical and historical factors.

Table IV: Immigrant population, 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Non-EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Finally, one other general feature of the immigrant population in the EU is the unemployment rate among immigrants compared to the nationals of some Member States, which is a key factor as far as the education and social integration of immigrants is concerned.

Table V: Relative unemployment rate per nationality 1994 (all nationalities = 100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nationals</th>
<th>Other EU nationals</th>
<th>Non-EU nationals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table V shows that the unemployment rate is two to three times higher among immigrants, especially those from third countries. This only highlights the importance of combating poor performance at school, which is one of the other reasons why unemployment is higher among children from deprived backgrounds. Failure at school, heralding lack of success in society, only reinforces the inferior status which immigrants are often perceived as having.
Immigration appears to be the result of the sudden technological and economic changes precipitating socio-cultural changes in the country of origin which have forced people to emigrate to the industrialized countries in order to survive. However, their experiences in the host society often show immigrants that their inferior status is merely a reflection of the inferior status accorded to their countries of origin in the current international political and economic order. By way of conclusion, therefore, it can be said that immigrants in the EU are mainly from third countries and that those immigrants are generally affected by unemployment to a greater extent than nationals or immigrants of European origin.

B - THE SCHOOLING OF MIGRANTS' CHILDREN

Children and young people today account for the majority of the world population: one-fifth of the world population is aged between 15 and 24. Although the number of children and young people is decreasing and will continue to decrease in the next few years in the wealthier countries (the growth in this age group will be accounted for largely by immigrants), there will be a substantial increase in this age group in the developing countries, to the extent that it will account for over half the population. Moreover, the current trends in migration show that the majority of school pupils of immigrant origin remain in the host country. These global trends are reflected in the EU.

Table VI shows the percentages of non-nationals per school age group. The highest rates are to be found in Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Austria.

---

The teaching of immigrants in the European Union

The figures are even higher in towns and cities, where there is greater diversity and where problems of segregation are more acute. See Annex 7.

Table VI: Non-nationals per age group 1994 (percentage of the total population of each country per age group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Tables VII and VIII also show the extent of the immigrant population among the total school population.12

Table VII: Foreign pupils in primary school as a % of the school population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


12 The figures are even higher in towns and cities, where there is greater diversity and where problems of segregation are more acute. See Annex 7.
Table VIII: Foreign pupils in secondary school as a % of the school population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Beyond these indicators, it can be concluded that there are no precise figures available at European level on the academic performance of immigrant pupils. However, several documents and reports stress that the level of school failure is consistently high among immigrants. Moreover, there are no figures available at European level to make a comparison between the percentage of immigrant children staying on in secondary education beyond the age of compulsory schooling and that of children who are nationals of the countries in question. However, these are important statistics, given that the lack of schooling and school failure are further causes of unemployment, failure to adapt and social marginalization.

The school failure rate, which seriously affects immigrant groups, is a factor which, in the current economic climate, seriously jeopardizes the chances of such young people taking up vocational training and finding work. It is therefore necessary to look at the differences between the children of immigrants and the local population as regards the acquisition of qualifications at various levels, the numbers of pupils repeating a year or giving up their studies and the opportunities for access to secondary schooling or vocational courses.

**C - EU ACTION**

Lastly, to complete the picture of the education of immigrant children in Europe, we must analyse the action currently being undertaken by the EU to ensure that immigrant children receive the best possible schooling.

Firstly, we would stress that no European education policy or policy on migration can be said to exist. On the one hand, the number of different situations, education systems and migration policies existing in each Member State would appear to make any attempt at harmonization very

---

**Notes:**


14. Factors which determine the academic performance of such children are the language spoken at home, the size of the family, the parents’ level of education and the degree of pre-school education they have received.

15. Here we are talking about immigration from third countries, as the free movement of persons within the EU means that there is no need for any other migration policy.
difficult while, on the other hand, the two issues form part of the Member States' fundamental prerogatives in terms of sovereignty.

The commitments entered into by the Member States, while not very great, begin at international level. All the Member States are signatories to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. This UN document, which dates back to 1989, is important as it serves as a basis for the 'education' chapters of international agreements.

Secondly, there are several instruments for action at EU level. One of the primary instruments, by reason of its legal force, is Directive 77/486/EEC. The last report issued by the Commission on the implementation of that Directive in the Member States dates back to 1988 and gives a fairly negative picture. There have been no other reports (a report was published in 1994 but did not specifically assess the implementation of the Directive) and, in the meantime, the Commission has adopted a new approach. It is nevertheless interesting to look at the findings of that report, which are shown in Table IX, bearing in mind the figures given earlier on the proportion of immigrants in the various Member States.

---

16 See Annex 3.
17 The Commission had drawn up another report in 1984 on the pilot projects set up by the Commission between 1976 and 1982, citing those projects as examples. The Commission begins at that point to entertain the notion of intercultural education for all – COM(84) 0054 final.
18 The aspects relating to teacher training will be dealt with in a later chapter.
Table IX: Report on the implementation of Directive 77/486/EEC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Measures and Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Same reception measures since 1982. Dutch–speaking Belgium: 18% of immigrants’ children in primary education receive integrated or deferred tuition in their language of origin; only 10% secondary schools offer this tuition. French–speaking Belgium: 10% of immigrants’ children receive such tuition at primary level, but it is virtually non-existent at secondary level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Same reception measures as in 1982. Around 17% of all children of migrant workers receive reception education and over 55% of them are taught their own language and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRG</td>
<td>Progress in pre-school education. Many achievements in the teaching of languages and cultures of origin, which still have to be given more emphasis in secondary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Same reception measures as in 1982. Progress in the specific sphere of teaching French to pupils who do not speak the language and are too scattered to benefit from reception facilities. Little progress in teaching the language and culture of origin. Inadequate bilateral agreements with the Community Member States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Reception measures and the teaching of language and culture of origin are targeted solely at the children of Greek workers returning to Greece after living abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Reception measures only in primary and lower secondary education. Some progress in the teaching of languages and cultures of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Satisfactory reception arrangements in primary education, but inadequate arrangements in secondary education. The teaching of languages and cultures of origin takes place mainly outside school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Good reception education facilities. Very good provisions for the teaching of languages and cultures of origin in primary education, but the measures for secondary education lag behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>Satisfactory reception arrangements in primary education but not in secondary education. Few local arrangements for the teaching of languages and cultures of origin. Where such arrangements do exist, tuition takes place outside school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These commitments entered into at EEC level did not give rise to national legislation and, in some cases, were mainly implemented through pilot schemes beginning in the late 1980s. The Commission has ceased to bring proceedings against the Member States for failure to apply the Directive and has adopted a strategy of promoting cooperation schemes and specific pilot projects already in operation. Hence the recent implementation of the Socrates programme, with a specific scheme for the children of immigrants, gypsies and occupational travellers under the Comenius action programme, which will be analysed in greater detail in Part Two.

Table X shows the number of projects subsidized by the Commission under Comenius in 1997 (the third year of activity) and their lines of action. The projects for the children of migrants are...
considered along with those for the children of gypsies, etc. There is no longer any specific treatment of children of migrant workers as in the previous projects based on the Directive.

Table X: Comenius 2 – Transnational projects in intercultural education 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of action</th>
<th>Number of applications</th>
<th>Number of projects for which funding was granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural education</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies and travellers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational travellers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is interesting to bear in mind the participation and activism of the various Member States under Comenius Action 2, even though the figures on the number of projects do not allow any conclusions to be drawn as to the priority accorded to immigrants' requirements. However, the projects, which are coordinated and monitored by the ad hoc group on intercultural education set up by the Council of Ministers of Education, are set up with the involvement of employers' and workers' representatives and schools.

*Table XI shows the number of projects coordinated by each participant country. Each country also takes part in other projects coordinated by other countries, and the number of projects in operation in each country is therefore higher.*

Table XI: Projects per coordinator country 1995-1997.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BE</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>LUX</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>GB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of projects approved = 95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These figures are based on Comenius Action 2. They therefore include intercultural education projects and projects aimed at the children of gypsies, travellers and occupational travellers. Not only are the projects targeted at different beneficiaries, but their content varies quite considerably. In conclusion, any detailed action programme targeted specifically at the needs of immigrant children would require a higher level of legislation. The failure to apply Directive 77/486/EEC is proof of the ineffectiveness - and the Member States' rejection - of such an approach.

---

19 The comprehensive nature of this scheme means that it is difficult to assess those projects specifically involving immigrant children.
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The EU’s action also includes cooperation with third countries. Article 126(3) of the Treaty on European Union stipulates that 'the Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organizations in the field of education, in particular the Council of Europe'.

Cooperation with third countries is certainly crucial if immigrant children are to receive an education tailored to their real requirements while at the same time preserving their identity. Moreover, while the industrialized countries can help the developing countries by positive experiences, technologies and financial and material resources, Europe can in turn learn ways of transmitting cultural heritage and devising different approaches to the socialization of children and, above all, to different cultures and lifestyles.
II - PART TWO

1 - OBJECTIVES AND INSTRUMENTS

A - OBJECTIVES

The EU’s recent action in the field of education is in line with its overall aim of promoting intercultural education for all. This is based on past experience and therefore does not affect the content of education or the way in which it is organized. It consists in fostering cooperation between schools as regards the teaching of languages and innovation in teaching methods through multilateral projects and partnerships and increased exchanges of information and experience.

Generally speaking, intercultural education, as introduced into EU action, can be described as the ultimate development of a pedagogical approach which, while respecting cultural specificity, tries to overcome the compartmentalization of educational methods and institutions, not by the well-worn expedient of targeting information at those involved in teacher training but instead by the introduction of methods aimed at fostering mutual understanding between opposing groups.

Socrates introduces action at the level of schools for the first time in the Community's education programmes. School is deemed to be a key place for encouraging young people to have confidence in their identities and to be aware that they belong to a wider, more open-looking European Union. Early schooling can contribute towards promoting equal opportunities and overcoming the initial handicaps of poverty and a disadvantaged social and cultural background. Indeed, the aim of action at this level is also to help children become aware of their environment and encourage social participation in their communities. The education of immigrants helps them to become integrated into society, which is a key element in combating racism and xenophobia.

B - INSTRUMENTS

The Commission and the Member States have devised various instruments to tackle the issue of educating the children of migrants. These instruments have evolved from the early years of independent experiments in each Member State up until the present day, when the key to their effectiveness is seen to lie in making the most of the results and successes of projects implemented in other Member States.

The Commission has funded around 40 multiannual pilot projects in the Member States since 1976. Some of these have contributed very significantly to the further development of educational and organizational models. The Member States have accounted for their problems
in applying Directive 77/486/EEC and adapting it to the constantly changing requirements of education, saying that such action must be reviewed on an ongoing basis and theories on education policy must be constantly updated. The idea of intercultural education for all is precisely the result of a desire to place the various education schemes into a European and international context for the purposes of reviewing and updating them.

This approach, which forms the basis for the new programmes, had already been envisaged back in 1984 in the Conclusions of the Council of Education Ministers. The Council urged the Member States to base their action on the conclusions drawn from the comparative assessment of pilot schemes, thereby contributing to the further development and improvement of an education policy in favour of the children of migrant workers. It called on the Commission to continue and expand the programme of pilot projects, within the limits of the financial resources available.

In 1990 the Commission stopped providing funding for national projects and concentrated on cooperation between the competent bodies of the Member States. A new financing scheme was introduced in 1991 which operated on the basis of national quotas for subsidies for intercultural education projects, without placing undue emphasis on the dimension of European cooperation. Until 1993 Member States continued to implement schemes according to their own priorities without seeking partners elsewhere. After 1993, subsidies began to be granted under the Comenius programme, where it is compulsory for schemes to be implemented via networks.

**SOCRATES**

The Socrates programme, based on the lines of action proposed by the Green Paper on the European Dimension of Education in Schools (29 September 1993), is a comprehensive programme incorporating all previous projects as well as new projects. Comenius is the first new scheme in the programme, introducing Community cooperation in school education through support for partnerships between schools, teacher exchanges and updating the skills of educational staff. The whole programme has been established for the period 1995 to 1999. Comenius Action 2 includes a section specifically dealing with the education of the children of migrant workers, in order to respond to their specific requirements and help them to become integrated. The programme stresses the importance of teaching practices which genuinely take account of cultural differences, and the importance of integrated teaching of pupils' languages of origin. It may be said that Socrates as a whole is an instrument targeted at the education of migrants' children, as all its programmes are dominated by two major aspects, namely, the European dimension of education and intercultural education. The Commission thereby departs from the approach which consisted in stressing the need for different policies for the children of immigrants and the children of nationals.

It is not just Comenius Action 2, therefore, which must be monitored and put into practice - the overall Socrates framework also offers many potential lines of action, particularly as the intercultural aspect has been deemed to be a priority. One example is the package of horizontal measures under the Lingua programme on cooperation in the teaching of languages[^21], which is

[^21]: As the EP explains in the report by Mrs Dührkop – Dührkop on cultural plurality and the problems of school education for children of immigrants in the EC (A3 – 0399/92 of 21 January 1993), Lingua, as a programme for the teaching of foreign languages, should also promote the teaching and learning of the language of the host country, including the training of mother – tongue teachers of immigrant children and teaching in the mother tongue.
of key importance in the integration and education of migrants and of all children in general. Another example is the Arion programme, involving study visits for education policy decision-makers.

COMENIUS

Table XII gives a summary of the Comenius Action 2 programme\(^\text{22}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comenius – Action 2, Education of the children of migrant workers as well as the children of occupational travellers, travellers and gypsies; intercultural education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial assistance may be allocated to transnational projects aiming to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- promote as full a participation as possible in school activities and equal opportunities for children of migrant workers, occupational travellers, travellers and gypsies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improve their schooling and the quality of the education they receive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- meet their specific educational needs and capacities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- promote intercultural education for all schoolchildren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These projects may include in particular:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the exchange of information and experience especially on all aspects referred to in the first paragraph,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the design of specialized course and teaching material,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the introduction of intercultural teaching practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The action is organized along three general lines:

- the promotion of intercultural education in schools and the school environment,
- teaching the language and culture of the host country, with the aim of developing new teaching instruments and exchanges of methods under cooperation schemes and study visits to other Member States,
- teaching the language and culture of origin, involving teacher training programmes and study visits, devising new curricula and teaching instruments and, above all, stepping up contacts with partner organizations in the countries of origin.

Obviously, the projects are generally aimed at schools with pupils/teachers from different cultural groups and they have consisted mainly of a comparative study of experiences, with the beginnings of cooperation in introducing specific innovatory schemes, language teaching exchange programmes, etc. Although they have not been in existence very long, the projects have received a favourable assessment from the Commission, which welcomes their extended content and the progress that has been made in devising teaching materials and in teacher training.

As regards the systematic organization of and decisions on the order of priority for all these measures, thematic seminars have constituted the only action in this area to date. They are held by the Commission in conjunction with the national agencies with a view to identifying priorities, swapping experiences and fostering partnerships, and are clearly for promotion purposes. At least 10% of the overall funding for the Socrates programme is to be earmarked for school education projects.

As far as the selection criteria for Comenius Action 2 projects are concerned, selection is on the basis of the programme’s priorities and national assessments. The aim is to strike a thematic and geographical balance and also a balance between the types of organizations or associations running the projects. The main difficulty in fulfilling these criteria lies in the recently-imposed condition that each project must be the result of collaboration between at least three countries, with a minimum of two institutions per country. Thanks to transitional measures, most of the projects funded in 1995 were national or bilateral projects. The number of partners in the projects is steadily increasing with a view to forming European networks, one of the priority objectives of the Commission’s recent action.

The Commission can also encourage exchanges of information, the design of teaching material and cooperation between teacher training establishments as a result of the resolution on the European dimension in education adopted by the Council on 24 May 1988. Since 1988, the Commission has implemented a number of measures in application of that resolution to encourage teacher exchanges (TEX) and set up a network of teacher training institutions (RIF) and multilateral partnerships between schools (PSM).

The Socrates programme can be said to confer an important social role on education as a means of developing civic-mindedness. It therefore involves other initiatives which also use the same strategies of cooperation through networks, exchanges, etc., such as combating violence in schools, and various projects making use of the possibilities offered by multimedia communication.

2 - APPROACHES

A - A POLITICAL ANALYSIS

See Annex 6 for a general table of criteria.

The main reasons for rejecting a project are lack of information or, as the Technical Assistance Office of DG XXII explains, insufficient information on the management of the project, no clearly defined content or objectives, budgets which do not tally with the programme of work, etc. (Commission, DG XXII, Note on the Selection of Projects under Comenius Action 2, Socrates & Youth, Technical Assistance Office, 27 June 1997, p. 2).

This is the most difficult condition to fulfil in terms of partnerships.

These partnerships are extremely useful in that, as stated in the Presidency Note on Cultural and Linguistic Diversity, “the educational situation of a child in a Rotterdam school may have more in common with that of a child in a school in Berlin than with that of a child attending a village school in the Dutch province of Brabant”, General Secretariat of the Council, Presidency Note on Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in the Education Systems of the EC – The challenges of the 1990s, SN 4134/91 (EDUC), 14 novembre 1991.
Tension between the Member States and the European Union

Overall, the political aspect of the education of immigrants in Europe has been characterized by the tension between, on the one hand, the principle of giving effect to the right to freedom of movement, which must be backed up by better educational policies for the children of migrants and, on the other hand, the importance of education, particularly primary education, for the Member States as a political and cultural issue. The Member States have certainly preserved their power more in the field of primary and secondary schooling than in the field of university education. Any harmonization is prohibited in the interests of respecting national, regional and local jurisdiction in this area. Accordingly, depending on its particular situation, each country has developed its own traditions and procedures, fairly independently, as regards the education of migrants’ children. However, we have already seen how nowadays all the EU Member States are immigration countries, all facing the same challenge of being host to immigrants, although situations vary widely. The principle of subsidiarity, which is the basis for Community action in the field of education, is therefore crucial here as, ‘in order for action in the educational sphere to be coherent and useful, the diversity of national systems must be fully appreciated and the differences between and similarities in those systems must be fully understood’.

Because of the need to respect the principle of subsidiarity and diversity, the EU's action is therefore limited to providing encouragement. The Treaty on European Union, on which the current programmes are based, does not seek to develop a common education policy, and most powers in this sphere remain in the hands of the Member States. The EU’s policy allows for coordination and encouragement measures at all levels of education, from primary school through to university. In the sphere with which we are concerned, all projects subsidized by the Commission, be they priority or complementary measures, are coordinated by the ad hoc group on intercultural education.

Following the failure to apply the 1977 Directive, the Commission has moved from acting in a supervisory capacity towards more of an evaluation role. Its last report on the subject states that the Commission has adopted a gradual approach, based on a mixture of persuasion, cooperation and pressure. Rather than criticizing the lack of implementing measures, it has funded pilot projects in conjunction with the Member States to facilitate implementation of the Directive. The Commission organizes (non-compulsory) seminars for promotion purposes and invites national agencies and other bodies to take part.

By the same token, the Council speaks of action at all levels, entailing a fundamental European dimension based on exchanges of information and experience, cooperation and consultation on measures taken at every level. It also calls on the Member States to implement certain promotion schemes.

In the case of Comenius Action 2 projects, the role of the Member States is more important as the partnership project coordinators do not engage in direct dialogue with the Commission - instead, it is the national agencies which select the projects deemed eligible for Commission funding. There have been positive developments from that point of view as far as the project selection process is concerned, such as consultation between the national agencies, but this is not widespread and the evaluation carried out by the national agencies is often very limited, making

---

the Commission's task of evaluation very difficult. This shows that the national authorities have a considerable margin of manoeuvre compared with other bodies involved, such as the schools themselves.

**Other bodies involved**

Article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty stipulates that Community action shall be aimed inter alia at 'promoting cooperation between educational establishments' and 'developing exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the education systems of the Member States'.

As far as the pilot projects on intercultural education and the education of migrants are concerned, head teachers have played a crucial role in instigating cooperation with other partner schools and in developing the content of the projects along with all educational staff. This fruitful participation by those involved at school level has been accompanied by a move towards greater autonomy for schools and a general decentralization of education systems. It is not just the school population which is becoming diversified; this is also true of the school environment and school situations. In many education systems in Europe, awareness of this fact is resulting in greater autonomy and implementing powers for schools. This is particularly true of schools in large metropolitan areas, where cultural and linguistic diversity is increasing so rapidly that urgent action is needed.

In this context, the latest Unesco reports stress the need for decentralization of education policies and more democratic decision-making when it comes to those policies. This would enable ordinary people to have a say in such matters and maintain the social codes or values of the local community, and also help strengthen political stability, particularly in countries which have several ethnic or religious groups.

This is the reasoning behind the notion of *openness* - a new concept of education which maintains that schools can no longer fulfil their task by themselves. It is leading to more flexible operating methods and greater autonomy for educational establishments, which is essential if partnership measures are to be successfully implemented. Governments must therefore take account of this diversity and devise ways of ensuring the participation of local communities, teachers and parents' associations. In other words, they must be prepared to adapt to local realities and be open to change.

**Third countries**

Even taking into account the progress made at the Amsterdam Summit on immigration issues (a modest pledge to define in a few years' time the conditions for residence in the EU of

---

immigrants from third countries), the Member States' different policies on migration form an obstacle to the formulation of strategies and objectives at EU level for the reception of immigrants from third countries. The initiative must come independently from each Member State and, even in the case of unilateral agreements, difficulties remain and are exacerbated by the contradictions inherent in a Europe which is in the process of abolishing its internal borders. Experience shows that partnerships and cooperation schemes with third countries require several years before they can be properly up and running, involving negotiations, meetings, drafting joint educational projects, identifying schools, etc. Conditions vary according to the bodies running the projects - often embassies or similar institutions but also, increasingly, the minority communities themselves. The complex political situation in many immigrants' countries of origin can make it difficult to develop projects. Effective support from local or national authorities for the institutions responsible for such schemes (be they embassies, consulates or independent professional groups) is therefore crucial. The EU's education policies, therefore, nearly always include chapters on cooperation with third countries, particularly since the children of third country migrants have been recognized as having the same rights as the children of European nationals. However, a fundamental problem remains in that such children, treated in the same way as children of European origin, will not have the same rights as conferred by European citizenship - a notion whose substance is highly developed but which has limited scope in relation to persons for European nationals.

B - A LEGAL ANALYSIS

Tension at the political level is reflected at the legal level, between the EU legislative framework and the national legislative framework. The main legal instruments at Community level are Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68, Directive 77/486/EEC and the provisions of the TEU. The latter form the legal basis for the new programmes, given the mediocre results of the previous instruments which were more binding and wider in scope but less effective.

Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 on the free movement of workers is based on an approach involving formal equality for and the assimilation of immigrants into the host society. The rights thus recognized were extended by the 1977 Directive which focused on three objectives (subsequently taken up in the notion of intercultural education): teaching of the language of the host country, teacher training and teaching of the language and culture of origin. Like all Community legislation based on Article 49 of the EEC Treaty, its aim is to protect workers from the Member States (and their families) who wish to exercise their right to freedom of movement in the EC. The Member States must provide educational facilities adapted to children's needs. The Directive lays down minimum rules guaranteeing the same standards as the measures required by national circumstances and legal systems for the children of nationals, and creates individual rights. It enables Member States to devise whatever education policy they wish. Accordingly, the Directive requires children to receive qualified bilingual teaching, while leaving it up to the Member States to determine the level of qualification required of teachers, etc. However, with the creation of individual rights, the Directive rules out setting quantitative restrictions in the application of measures. This raises practical problems which, combined with the political reservations of the Member States and the ambiguities of the Directive itself (it
requires a vague commitment on the part of the Member States to promote teaching in the
mother tongue), mean that it is difficult to implement.

In the 1980s, the Commission and the EP continued their efforts to have the Directive applied.
The EP played an active role in this, for example by calling for proceedings to be instigated
against Member States for failure to act. The Commission eventually abandoned its
confrontational approach. There was a change of tone in the reports drawn up by the EP and
the Commission in the 1990s, which focused on promotion and cooperation, thereby signalling
their acceptance of the limitations imposed by politics in this area.

Before the TEU, the EC’s powers to dictate policies in the sphere of the education of immigrants
were implicit ones derived from its powers to ensure the free movement of persons in the context
of the common market. Articles 126 and 127 of the TEU conferred explicit powers on the EC
to dictate measures in the field of education, with the inclusion of primary and secondary
education. Policy on the education of immigrants was henceforth included in the EU’s overall
policy on education, which has taken the form of increased cooperation between states rather
than recognition of positive rights. It is this which forms the basis for the Socrates
programme (specifically, Article 126(1) and Article 3b of the Treaty) which includes action for
immigrants. While not imposing legal obligations on the Member States, Socrates calls on them
to promote measures to develop the three instruments (language of origin, language of the host
country and teacher training) set out in the Directive.

As mentioned earlier, the main problems occur in the scope in relation to persons. Before the
TEU, the fact that education policies were linked to the completion of the single market had led
to a distinction being made between immigrants from third countries and those of Community
origin. A restrictive definition is given in Article 1 of the ‘target group’ protected by the
Directive, namely, only employees’ children up to the age when schooling is compulsory. There
is no mention of children of Community citizens returning to their country of origin or children
from third countries.

After the legislation was extended to include the children of immigrants from third countries,
this distinction applied only to adults, and families which were not recognized as having
European citizenship rights continued to have problems. Moreover, where cultural cooperation
chapters were included in agreements with third countries (such as Lomé and Mercosur), they
were not accompanied by special budget headings for that purpose.

Bearing in mind the relatively recent nature of the positive action undertaken under the
Comenius programme, which requires the projects to be developed much further if they are to
achieve a degree of success, it can be said that equal access to education, as recognized
previously under Community law, is not enough to ensure that immigrants are successfully
integrated into society. Ample proof of this can be seen from the current situation of immigrants
on the labour market and in the education system.

**C - A SOCIETAL ANALYSIS**

---

See Annex 1 for a description and list of resolutions.


The 1974–1976 action programme heralded the extension of Community action to include workers
from third countries (Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 applied de jure only to citizens of Member
States).
The economic context

Before proceeding to a societal analysis, we would like to refer once more to the figures showing the situation of immigrants on the labour markets, which highlight the need to tackle school failure among immigrant children. Such failure is leading to a waste of human resources in the Member States and hence to distortions in the labour market and a reduction in social mobility. This means that there is a danger not only that productivity will be lowered but also that we will see the emergence of ethnically-segregated labour markets, social marginalization and increased ethnic violence. These aspects merely serve to demonstrate the benefits of investing in education.

The Member States have pointed to the importance of the changes in the labour force in the EC, explaining that the long-term requirements of the European economy will only be met if there are changes in the reproductive behaviour of the European population, or changes in the rates of participation in the labour market or if immigrant labour is used. Analyses show that the third option is the only feasible one, hence the need to respond to the needs of immigrants in the various education systems to ensure that they obtain professional qualifications for the future.

The insecure situation of immigrants is not only due to cultural and linguistic difficulties. The economy also acts as a mechanism of social exclusion - i.e. there is a socio-economic basis which makes it even more difficult for them to succeed in society. Any lack of qualifications leads to a risk of social exclusion which is all the greater as the economy stagnates.

The notion of intercultural education

If we wish to analyse the societal aspects of these issues, we must first understand the basis of the projects funded by the Commission. Most of these focus on developing teaching methods and modules for the teaching of mother tongues, with provision for teacher training. The projects are therefore based on the notion of intercultural education, backed by a new emphasis on preserving the child's cultural background which is not necessarily linked to the prospect of return to the country of origin. The projects under the Comenius programme are aimed at fostering an understanding of cultures, exchanges of pupils and teachers and establishing and developing contacts between the education systems and migrant communities.

The intercultural approach is targeted at all children. Accordingly, the most recent projects appear to be moving towards general measures for all children, often as part of the campaign against racism and xenophobia.

36 See Annex 5.
38 See Annex 4.
39 This is an objective which was set by the Council back in 1984, when it stated that the development of migrants’ cultures in the host environment (2nd and 3rd generation) was an issue which education systems would have to address – Conclusions of the Council and of the Ministers of Education meeting in the Council of 4 June 1984.
This approach is based on methodologies aimed at ensuring the personal development of all pupils, through schemes such as adapting the language in which lessons are taught, new approaches to teacher training, etc. Many organizations in this field are now opting to replace the term 'immigration' by the adjective 'intercultural'.

Intercultural teaching is defined as teaching which 'is aimed at all pupils to encourage supportive interaction which respects cultural diversity and not just the reception of migrant pupils'. It can therefore be concluded that 'practising intercultural teaching does not mean introducing special teaching practices'. Assimilation and multicultural segregation are therefore ruled out in favour of dialogue and interaction of cultures. In practice, this means rejecting any measure leading to segregation, such as the customary way in which the reception of immigrant children is organized either in the school system of the host country or through separate educational establishments which allow for few contacts with local schools. At another level, this notion is also based on the idea that there must be no specific teaching of the cultures represented in an educational establishment in that this is a culturalist, determinist practice which does not allow for interaction and is hence a harmful measure which reinforces young people's feeling of being different and gives them only a stereotyped view of their culture of origin.

This means that the fundamental principles of intercultural education must be respected: equal opportunities and child-centredness, developing all children's potential to a maximum degree, implementing any special measures needed to help immigrant children in ordinary lessons, showing openness towards the culture of migrants, breaking down the barriers between society and school and watching out for signs of racism.

An interesting initiative in the field of intercultural education has been implemented in some EU schools, consisting in introducing human rights studies into school syllabuses, thereby instilling an awareness in children of the universality of rights and cultural pluralism.

**Language teaching**

The importance of language as a distinguishing feature of a particular culture is being highlighted at a time when we are seeing national cultures being swamped by transnational influences. The teaching of languages of origin and the languages of the host countries is a central plank of the EU's action as regards the education of immigrants, i.e. teaching in the mother tongue to facilitate education in the host country and acquisition of the language of the host country as a prerequisite for integration and success at school and in society.

Learning two languages, the mother tongue and the foreign language, helps to broaden the mind and instil respect for the other culture. It is particularly important at the level of nursery school,

---

41 For example, the Centre Bruxellois de l’Action Interculturelle (the Brussels Centre for Intercultural Action), which before 1993 was called the Centre socioculturel des immigrés de Bruxelles (the Brussels Sociocultural Centre for Immigrants).


43 Individuals today must fashion their identities through various forms of cultural integration as a result of the rapid structural changes in all aspects of daily life and social relations. It is becoming increasingly irrelevant to try to pin categories of individuals into rigid cultural contexts on the grounds of wanting to respect their cultural identity, when all around the social reality is reflected in mobile, fluid and constantly – changing social constructions.
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which has been described as the key to social integration and language learning. Moreover, it has been shown that children who have attended nursery school achieve better results at primary school, and that the education gap between them and local children is very narrow.

The language of origin

Despite the reservations expressed earlier about exclusive-type practices, we would nevertheless stress the importance of maintaining the language and culture of origin in a multicultural society. The best form of openness towards other languages and cultures is total mastery of one's own culture as the instrument of expression and communication. Denationalization of education does not mean that all cultures will merge into a soulless, multilingual melting-pot; on the contrary, it requires greater rigour and appreciation of what language and expression entail, as they are the sole means of understanding others, understanding their differences and grasping the complexity of their proximity and the fact of sharing things in common with other cultures. Teaching the language of origin must be seen as a psychological factor which enhances the self-esteem of immigrant children and at the same time offers them the opportunity to acquire knowledge of another language, which gives them an extra advantage on the labour market. If the school does not provide teaching of the mother tongue, the child eventually sees the host country as the only cultural model, underestimating or disregarding that of his/her family which, given the family’s social status, is already weak.

The mother tongue is a major contribution to the development of a cultural and linguistic identity and of a positive self-image. It may also have a beneficial effect on the conceptual and linguistic attainments in the language of the host country. It must be taught by suitable methods which are different from those used for the host language, as the linguistic, social and cultural environment of the migrant child is totally different from that of a child learning his or her national language in his or her own country.

Since the early 1980s, teaching of the language and culture of origin has been devised with a view to developing the child’s personal and cultural identity in a perspective of integration into the new social and educational environment and of mutual respect for cultural differences. It must also serve to facilitate any reintegration into the education and social systems of the countries of origin.

Since the entry into force of Directive 77/486/EEC, the promotion of such teaching has been primarily incumbent on the education authorities of the host country, which must cooperate with

---

44 Commission report – COM(84)244 final, p. 10.
46 G. Fragniere, Problèmes d’éducation dans une Europe en transition, College of Europe, Bruges, 1995, p. 15.
48 COM(84)244 final, p. 15.
49 These have been the guidelines for the Commission’s action since the early 1980s.
50 Report from the Commission to the Council on pilot schemes for the education of the children of migrant workers – COM(84)244 final, 27 April 1984.
the authorized representatives of the countries of origin. Various models for such teaching have been developed:

- *integrated teaching*, i.e. teaching whose methods and content are coordinated with ordinary teaching, imparted during normal school hours;
- *deferred teaching*, i.e. teaching whose methods and content are coordinated with ordinary teaching, imparted immediately before or after normal school hours;
- *teaching of the mother tongue as a foreign language*, given as a compulsory or optional subject in the normal secondary education curriculum;
- *extrascholastic teaching*, imparted outside school hours by private associations or consulates, for which the educational authorities in the host country are not responsible.

Of these four models, only the latter was deemed not to meet the requirements set out in the Directive. However, only the first model has yielded positive results, while putting it into practice has created most problems.

**The language of the host country**

The importance of the host country's language lies mainly in the fact that it is a key instrument for combating the school failure of immigrant children. An inadequate grasp of the language is a major factor at crucial moments such as entering secondary education and the transition from basic education to the different types of vocational teaching.

In recent years the teaching of the host country language has often been linked to the possibilities afforded by the Lingua programme. However, the teaching of languages under Lingua is related more to the idea of fully exploiting the potential of the single market. Student mobility is therefore one of its major goals. As far as teaching the host country language to immigrant children is concerned, the primary aim is to ensure that they receive a normal education in the host country as a precondition for success and integration into society - a stage which precedes that of mobility. Reception teaching is organized in different ways in each country, but falls into five basic categories:

- *language immersion*: children are put in the normal class for their age, and are given separate intensive tuition in the host language, individually or in small groups, at least once a day;
- *mixed reception classes*: children of different nationalities are put into special classes with a smaller number of pupils for 1 or 2 years where they receive intensive tuition in the host language;
- *national reception classes*: children from the same country are placed in a special class with a normal number of pupils for 1 or 2 years, where they receive intensive tuition in the host language and general education in their own language, to help them move on to an ordinary class;
- *bilingual national classes*: children of the same nationality attend these classes for 4 to 6 years, their education being given partly in their own language and partly in the host language;
language support: remedial or compensatory education is provided for foreign pupils placed in ordinary classes, to improve their knowledge of the host language\textsuperscript{51}.

Clearly, all these types of teaching fulfil different requirements as, in order to be effective, language teaching must take account of the variety of languages involved and must develop strategies to cope with real communication situations such as those encountered in the teaching process.

Reception teaching is extremely important at pre-school level, which affords opportunities for the socialization and development of children, inter alia through play and early-learning activities. Pre-school education can clearly help children to learn and acquire behaviour patterns and attitudes which will be beneficial for their future education. France has placed considerable emphasis on reception teaching for children from 2 years onwards, particularly those from deprived backgrounds. Similarly, Spain and Portugal have made great efforts to increase access to pre-school education since the reforms to their education systems.

Problems

There are many practical problems when it comes to language teaching, such as whether it should be made compulsory or optional, whether languages of origin should be included in normal syllabuses, etc. All too often immigrants' children are taught their languages of origin only after they have received all their schooling in the host language, and so the impact of such language tuition can be limited. Similarly, there may be classes in which the language being taught is more or less the language of origin for some pupils, which they speak at home, while it is a totally foreign language for other pupils in that same class. Such organizational problems affecting classes once more raise the question of the autonomy of schools.

The Commission has particularly urged that schools avoid extra tuition which involves later hours, transport difficulties, giving up breaks or games, etc.

The problems are more acute in the case of children from third countries as they involve both practical and political issues. Associations of immigrants from third countries, such as Turks or North Africans, whose members include opponents of the current regimes, often refuse to allow the authorities of those countries to be involved in the internal affairs of the immigrant communities. Immigrants' associations linked to the regimes in the countries of origin use teachers sent by those countries. Partisan groupings of immigrant communities which are totally independent of the countries of origin refuse to have anything to do with teachers from those countries and use teachers from among the immigrant population.

The problem is that the majority of teachers have no pedagogic training. Consequently, the majority of courses in the culture of origin taught by teachers who not possess the necessary skills result in stereotyping which bears no relation to the changes which have occurred not only in the immigrant communities but also in the culture of the social groups in the country of origin.

Generally speaking, successful teaching of languages of origin and of the host country depends largely on the political will to conclude agreements and framework measures with the states of origin or the bodies concerned, on the freedom of schools to organize such teaching in line with their requirements and on the existence of qualified teachers.

The training of experts and teachers

Under the resolution on the European dimension of education, the teacher exchange schemes launched at the prompting of the EP have become a useful instrument, enabling over 400 teachers each year to participate in bilateral exchange schemes which also help pave the way for future cooperation between educational establishments. Moreover, a network of teacher training institutes (RIF) was set up in 1990, and there are now 170 participants. It is a network made up of sub-networks working on different topics, the primary aim being to introduce a European dimension into teacher training. Teaching is one of the most highly organized professions in the world and teachers' associations can therefore play a key role in many areas.

Even before those initiatives, the Member States had taken steps in the field of teacher training, thereby following the guidelines laid down in Directive 77/486/EEC, with mixed results. Table XIII illustrates the situation in 1988, the year when the Commission drew up its report assessing the implementation of the directive.
The teaching of immigrants in the European Union

Table XIII: Progress in implementing Directive 77/486/EEC as regards teacher training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Inadequacy of in-service training courses organized by a few private institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Increase in the number of student teachers opting for courses on immigration-related subjects during their studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRG</td>
<td>Increase in the number of foreign teachers employed by consulates who attend training sessions arranged by the German authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Satisfactory measures as regards initial teacher training. Expansion in training schemes with intercultural options. Progress in cooperation with embassies and consulates on the in-service training of foreign teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>No progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>The only training that has been set up is for Italian teachers who are to work with the children of Italian workers abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Satisfactory initial training, no formal structure for the in-service training of teachers responsible for the children of immigrants, need for additional training to be offered to foreign teachers working in Luxembourg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Satisfactory initial training provisions, excellent in-service training courses and arrangements for the specific training of foreign teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Very satisfactory initial, further and in-service training. All the training available is open to teachers who have the status of qualified teachers. Lack of provision for the joint training of British teachers and teachers with consular status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Initial teacher training is one of the most successful forms of training in the Member States, as Table XIII shows. It is incumbent upon Member States to provide such training, which is organized along various lines:

- **basic training modules**, designed as an introduction to the problems of foreign children and teaching methods;
- **additional specialist training**, such as specialization in teaching the host language as a second language or in intercultural education;
- **in-service training**, to make staff more aware of the problems of immigration or to provide further training in teaching methods suited to the needs of the children of immigrants.\(^{52}\)

The ideal would be a combination of all three models enabling new teachers to be training and existing teachers to receive special training to deal with new intercultural requirements. General training should be complemented by specific training to meet the particular requirements of each
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school, involving not only an introduction to the socio-cultural, psychological and language problems experienced by foreign children and the introduction of an intercultural education methodology into a multiracial and multinational school environment but also the study of the culture, society and history of the country of origin and the causes and effects of migration. It is the general belief of experts that intercultural training must not be a form of further training restricted to education specialists, nor must it replace teachers’ knowledge of basic educational skills. It must be integrated effectively into teacher training and must not focus exclusively on the transmission of facts, otherwise it will not adequately provide teachers with the range of teaching skills they need.

Any study into the content of courses necessarily entails a study into attitudes of mind. How can teachers be expected to adopt an intercultural approach aimed at developing a capacity for intercultural understanding among young people if they have not been trained in this themselves? There is a great danger that, however well-intentioned, such training may result in ‘pseudo-folkloric stereotyping’ which makes intercultural education an easy target for criticism.

Immigrants are not only taught by teachers who are nationals of the host country. One of the reasons for this is the lack of suitable training in the host country. Moreover, the presence of teachers and others who speak the children's mother tongue helps to boost learning skills and facilitate integration into society.53 Cooperation between the host country and the country of origin is crucial as regards not only the organization of in-service training for teachers but also the recognition of qualifications. The legal and administrative obstacles encountered must be overcome and it must be made easier for professional status to be recognized in order to create optimum conditions for effective cooperation between national and foreign teachers. While it is incumbent on the country of origin to train the teachers it sends abroad, it is also incumbent on the host country to grant them the same professional status as that enjoyed by local teachers. The recent projects carried out under the Comenius programme often consist of teacher exchanges leading to the development of partnership schemes and fostering awareness of other cultures and experiences.54

Lastly, we would emphasize the growing importance of educational advisers and instructors. Although there is an increasingly flexible separation between school and the outside world, teachers must also make efforts to take the learning process outside school. That is one of the roles of educational advisers and instructors, who must also act as intermediaries to establish fruitful dialogue between pupils, teachers, the educational authorities and parents.55 That role has been defined as, on the one hand, helping parents to achieve a better understanding of the operating rules of the school and better supervision of their children's work and behaviour and,
on the other hand, helping teachers to have a better understanding of the problems involved through a deeper knowledge of family cultural factors\textsuperscript{56}.

**New educational instruments**

In the overall context of reviewing content and methods, history, geography and social studies would appear to be subjects ideally suited to an intercultural approach involving course content which overcomes cultural divisions. At primary level, several projects have applied to good effect unconventional teaching methods such as drama, songs and painting which develop a positive approach to diversity. In actual fact, children accept diversity: their first response is curiosity, and schools can easily encourage such a positive approach. Educators must promote the idea of citizenship by illustrating its significance to everyday life, otherwise children will not appreciate its importance\textsuperscript{57}. The teaching of new subjects such as human rights can therefore be combined with practical exercises on situations of cultural diversity, minorities, etc. Certain publications exploring such avenues already exist, together with educational material which in many cases has been developed by transnational schools’ partnerships and is therefore targeted at a mixed audience. These schemes are at the experimental stage and are yielding positive results which should lead to them becoming more widespread, although this still seems to lie a long way ahead.

**Social relations**

As education in citizenship and democracy is, by its very nature, a form of education which is not limited to the time and place of formal education, it is important for families and other members of the community to be directly involved.

**Parents**

The family unit is the framework within which the child can find the psychological and material support which are so crucial throughout his or her schooling. Many studies indeed show that the causes of school failure often lie outside the school context, particularly in the family environment. When it comes to the education of migrant children, it is particularly important to preserve the educational role of the family environment. Immigrants’ parents are generally ill-informed about the education system of the host country, the different types of education available, the system of assessment, selection criteria, their rights as parents and the possibilities of appeal. The participation of parents and other mediators helps to ensure that such children become integrated into school and society and helps overcome the feelings of frustration and failure they often experience, which are linked to their personal

\textsuperscript{56} La Médiation Scolaire: une collaboration équipes éducatives, élèves, parents, Ministère de l’éducation, de la recherche et de la formation de la Communauté Française de Belgique, Commission 1993, p. 14.

experiences and also to their family situation, i.e. exile, unemployment, low socio-economic status, etc.

Schools, bodies providing schools and career advice, social welfare services for immigrants, trade unions and immigrants' associations must all be encouraged to cooperate in providing better information for families on the aims and importance of education and vocational training. Most of the Member States recognize the importance of involving the family in the education process and more specifically in combating school failure, and have set up various forms of institutional representation. As a general rule, the trend in most countries is for parents to take part in the management of the school, in conjunction with other partners. Whether through elected bodies or local parents' associations, families accordingly have an essentially consultative role in the management of the school. The extent of their participation appears to vary according to the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the educational establishments in question. Parents play an important role in school management in countries such as Denmark and the United Kingdom. They are now playing an increased role, although this is still not very great, in countries whose education systems are in the process of being decentralized, such as Spain and Portugal 58.

Several recent EU projects have a 'parents' chapter with the aim of making schools more aware of intercultural issues, by seeking to improve relations with pupils' parents, particularly those from immigrant groups, in order to be able to take account of the wishes of those parents as regards their children's education and to clarify the educational choices underlying the project 59. There are also projects under way in which psychologists, educators and artists from different cultures work side by side to give new emphasis to the richness of each other's culture, as the biggest problem for most families is often that they have lost their cultural roots 60.

Employers' and workers' representatives

Employers' and workers' representatives also have an important role to play as grassroots liaison bodies and relayers of information. As in the case of parents' associations, immigrants' associations, trade union organizations and teachers' associations must be consulted and made aware of these matters.

The community to which a person belongs exerts a powerful educational influence because of the opportunities it affords to cooperate with others and acquire active experience of citizenship. Experience has shown that cooperation between schools and the social services has an excellent effect not only on extracurricular activities to promote social integration but also on the attendance and motivation of pupils at school 61.

Examples of such activities are: the immigrant community's participation in devising syllabus content, in conjunction with teachers, in committees or working groups or the participation of those with a knowledge of the local area and the necessary skills to help in the process of

58 Eurydice, La lutte contre l'échec scolaire: un défi pour la construction européenne. p. 76.
59 Expérience pilote d'éducation interculturelle – a charter established by the Communauté Française de Belgique, Ministère de l’éducation et de la recherche scientifique, and the Commission, May 1990.
60 Experts claim that children feel torn between feeling ashamed of their parents, who find it very difficult to integrate into the host culture, and sensing the hostility of an environment which tends to marginalize them. Conflict can easily arise within the family, as the parents want their children to succeed but are unable to give them the necessary support – Report on the study days for French—speaking European countries on the rights of children in exceptional situations, March 1996, Switzerland.
61 Pilot project, COM(84)244 final, p. 11.
devising syllabuses. Using members of the community in question as auxiliary teachers in the education system can also be a form of participation by the immigrant community. Under the Comenius Action 2 programme, there is a wide range of participants in each project, involving a fairly large number not only of schools but also of non-profit-making associations and public authorities\textsuperscript{62}. On the other hand, it appears necessary that intermediate education authorities, such as school inspection services, should also be involved to ensure that the projects are at least organized in an orderly and systematic way in accordance with the guidelines and objectives of national or regional education policy, as appropriate.

By the same token, we would emphasize the important role of those in charge of school building and town and regional planning projects, who must also bear in mind the distribution of the immigrant communities.

\textsuperscript{62} See Annex 8 for a breakdown of participation in Comenius Action 2 per type of organization.
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III- CONCLUSIONS

1 - EVALUATION

An analysis of the current immigration situation in the EU leads us to conclude that:
1. immigration into Europe cannot be halted;
2. the majority of immigrants wish to remain in Europe;
3. failure to achieve the integration of those immigrants is a danger for society as a whole.

Any policy directed at immigrants must therefore form part of an overall legal framework and include participation in the labour market and specific education policies.

. The EU has devised instruments to help meet the educational needs of immigrants. The Member States have failed to implement the most binding of those instruments, Directive 77/486/EEC, and this, together with the principle of subsidiarity, has led to a change of approach as reflected in the EU’s most recent action in this field.

The Member States have pointed to their budgetary difficulties and the problems in adapting to a rapidly-changing situation involving an increasing number of immigrants. The Commission, for its part, has opted for an effective approach entailing a comprehensive framework for action in respect of immigrants in the field of intercultural education. The EU has therefore focused on the transnational nature of partnership schemes and exchanges of experience, drawing on the positive results yielded by the pilot projects of the 1980s.

. This change of approach is reflected in the Socrates framework programme, which involves a move towards intercultural education without imposing obligations on the Member States. The programme attempts to provide a response to the situation described by the Council whereby, even when attempts were made to implement intercultural education policies, those attempts were limited by political uncertainties and/or specific local situations, with the result that there was an undue emphasis placed solely on the needs of immigrant or ethnic minority pupils. The question of intercultural education was not accorded a high enough priority and so no initial framework was set up to ensure that diversity would have a positive impact on all pupils. The Socrates programme provides an opportunity to disseminate those schemes which have had the best results, this being the basis for the current approach adopted by the Commission, which maintains that interculturalism requires consultation and coordination and that ‘during the next stage we should concentrate on the identification, dissemination and generalization of good, successful practice.

As far as dissemination is concerned, the existing mechanisms and instruments would appear to be satisfactory. Teachers' networks, for example, have played a major role in identifying best practice and in passing on innovatory educational techniques.

---

64 Commission, Report on the education of migrant children in the EU, COM(94) 80 final.
However, this is not true when it comes to the generalization of results. Intercultural education practices are admittedly becoming more widespread throughout the Member States and there is likely to be growing participation in the EU's programmes. However, the lack of supervision mechanisms and clearly-defined objectives at European level means that no judgment can yet be passed on the extent to which the aim of generalization has been achieved. The problems relating to the generalization of good practice can be partly explained by the type of action aimed at school-age immigrant children under the Comenius programme. Comenius Action 2 is too diversified, amounting to a melting-pot of measures which makes it difficult to pursue specific objectives. Despite the fact that this is a field in which the Member States are legally committed to take action, the end result and overall effectiveness are unsatisfactory. Before any assessment can be made of whether immigrants’ needs are being met, it will be necessary for the projects to be extended and the practices to become widespread.

Another basic problem reported by schools is the lack of rules and structures for implementing intercultural measures. Schools often do not have the resources to introduce the teaching of other languages or new educational material, such as the study of human rights. The lack of any institutional basis is a major obstacle, and things need to be put on a formal footing or the national authorities must find new ways of ensuring that partnerships are given the means to act. This also applies to projects with partners from third countries which often do not have any institutional backing.

Looking more particularly at the EU-funded projects, it must be stressed that these specific partnership schemes are undoubtedly a success. The very different experiences are a source of richness and educational openness which have also helped to secure the involvement of immigrant parents, develop independent local initiatives and ensure the participation of various bodies.

In addition to the basic problems illustrated above, certain difficulties are also experienced in setting up and renewing projects, for example:
- organizational problems, such as timetables, the lack of qualified staff, requirements that measures in favour of immigrants' children are conditional upon a school having a certain number of children of the same nationality irrespective of that school's actual needs, etc.,
- lack of interest on the part of parents,
- purely theoretical cooperation between schools and partners, which cannot be put into practice given the lack of an institutional basis,
- problems in introducing new subjects into school syllabuses,
- problems concerning the recognition of qualifications not only for the purposes of teachers' mobility but also with regard to the child's school career.

2 - OUTLOOK

The problems discussed above should be taken into account in the future, which will be a time of growing diversity and mobility within European societies and, as far as education is
concerned, of more transnational projects and greater autonomy for schools as operators within networks.

Bearing in mind the basic issues regarding the procedures for action and the legal and political issues mentioned earlier, the following lines of action can be seen as priorities for the future.

They fall into three categories:
1. Dissemination, evaluation and research.
2. Developing the notion of intercultural education.
3. Developing new types of action at local level, in schools, in conjunction with third countries.

1. The mechanisms for disseminating the results of projects consist primarily of symposiums and meetings of administrators, researchers and teachers from all the Member States, enabling them not only to obtain information on educational practices but also to listen to critical opinion. It is highly desirable that the Council of Europe and Unesco should be represented at such meetings, given their experience in this field, particularly when it comes to minorities from third countries.

Better information on the expanded networks and greater ability to evaluate and analyse results will help education administrators to raise the level of primary and secondary education systems and extrascholastic education schemes. Expanding the networks requires communication to be horizontal (i.e. between the heads of educational establishments and district officials) as well as vertical (between education administrators at different levels of the system).

It would also be beneficial to include the use of new technologies, especially the Internet, as a mechanism for fostering exchanges and intercultural communication.

Dissemination will be effective if accompanied by a comprehensive exercise in evaluation. As we have already seen, the national agencies are mainly responsible for evaluating and selecting projects. Such evaluation is carried out at national level in line with the principle of subsidiarity and hence of effectiveness, as uniform solutions cannot be prescribed for differing situations. However, if programmes carried out at European level are to be successfully implemented, such evaluation needs to be forwarded to and carried out in direct consultation with the other Member States and the Commission. The seminars and promotional events organized by the Commission should therefore ensure full participation by both the Member States and the partnership representatives. There should be regular, effective evaluation mechanisms in situ, without trespassing on schools' freedom to adapt the projects in line with their specific requirements.

This objective of dialogue between the various bodies concerned requires crucial flanking measures, namely, research and the exploration of innovatory methods, particularly in a field whose prevailing features are diversity and constantly-changing situations. Government and educational authorities must be aware not only of the current needs of foreign pupils but also of the way these needs change according to the nature of immigration. It is also important to compile accurate statistics on assistance at school for immigrant children, school failure rates, the number of such children going on to higher education, etc. The Eurydice network can play a key role as a source of information exchanges on education systems and national policies.

2. When we talk of developing the notion of intercultural education, we do not mean trying to teach every single thing which appears necessary for an understanding of other cultures or piling on extra subjects (languages, expanding the course content of subjects such as history or literature, etc.). Such a quantitative challenge should be turned into a qualitative challenge, as the aim is not to accumulate knowledge but to create a state of mind, for example by adopting an intercultural approach to existing subjects.
On the one hand, the intercultural approach must be developed in such a way that it informs every aspect of school life, above and beyond subject content - enrolling pupils, devising syllabuses and organizing extracurricular activities must be based on intercultural dialogue on equal terms, while respecting the fundamental rights of the child. On the other hand, immigrant children must not be viewed as possessing a 'biculturalism' which is a factor in school failure. The official view often tends to devalue the culture of origin, which is seen merely as a necessary accompaniment in order to accede to the host country's culture. The child is often torn between the culture of origin and the host country's culture, as conveyed in particular through school. If two cultures are viewed as two independent, external systems confronting each other through the child, this takes no account of the fact that the child participates in those two cultures which each influence the other.\(^{65}\)

3. The new lines of action to be developed mainly involve relations with third countries and the role of those involved at local level and in schools.

As far as the field of education is concerned, relations with third countries have not received the attention they deserve. Leaving aside the agreements with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, collaboration with third countries takes place only on a sporadic and piecemeal basis. However, it is the key to fostering the kind of cultural and social understanding which helps develop political, technological and trade relations.\(^{66}\)

Moreover, the phenomenon of migration must be properly understood by means of agreements with the countries of origin, projects and programmes enabling migration to be seen as a vector for development by all the parties concerned. A definition of common interest must be sought and found, and immigration must be seen as a factor of development furthering that interest. The importance of local involvement, particularly given the variety of situations, has been stressed throughout this paper. While such variety is clear from the point of view of the political authorities of the Member States, it is less so from the point of view of children living in large urban centres. A child in a school in Paris is nowadays in a situation more similar to that of a child in Brussels than to that of a child in another part of France. Hence the need for local bodies and city authorities to be given the means to develop transnational networks.

Neighbourhoods also provide the ideal setting for a fruitful combination of conventional teaching and extracurricular activities which help to develop civic-mindedness in children and an awareness of the three dimensions of education: the ethical and cultural side, the scientific and technological side and the economic and social side.

These are all factors which come into play at school. In the majority of Member States today, schools are calling for autonomy in order to be able to meet all those needs and are also asking to be modernized so that such autonomy can be given substance. The process of modernizing schools currently under way in Europe consists mainly of:

- coresponsibility,
- partnership,
- consultation,
- work cycles,
- teaching involving projects and workshops,

\(^{65}\) Eurydice, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

- continuous formative assessment,
- a style of management which provides team leadership, is responsible for educational organization and training and delegates administrative tasks,
- an intercultural approach\textsuperscript{67}.

School cannot be viewed as a fixed, unchanging structure; it is an organic part of the overall social structure and as such must take on board the changes conditioning the attitudes and behaviour of members of society.

These three lines of action are ways of developing schemes that are beneficial to the education of immigrants on the basis of the instruments available and of immigration trends.

Whatever the circumstances, the objective of the social integration of immigrants cannot be achieved by means of specific sectoral policies, as this is above all a socio-political issue which requires global action. Education must not be viewed solely as a means of ensuring that immigrant children gain the qualifications needed for the labour market but also as a means of making the idea of European citizenship a reality.

We have seen how EU action in the field of education has ceased to differentiate between immigrant and local children and how it is now guided by the notion of intercultural education. This notion seeks to overcome discrimination based on people’s origins and the fundamentally ambivalent attitude to foreigners who are seen as being both within and on the fringes of society, within political and legal boundaries and yet outside social and symbolic boundaries.

This approach, however positive, will only yield results if the specific educational needs of immigrant children are taken into account. These needs have been apparent since the 1970s and there is a danger that we will lose sight of them amid the variety of projects implemented under Comenius.

By way of a final conclusion, it might be said that any action in the field of education for immigrants in the EU must be based on the premise that nowadays education takes place against as background of interculturalism and mobility. In order for education to be an instrument for changing society and not a system for reproducing social structures\textsuperscript{68}, these two aspects must be seen, not as destabilizing factors but as the vectors for new historic possibilities and new values.

\textsuperscript{67} D. Sensi, \textit{Enquête sur les pratiques de partenariat avec les enseignants de langue et de culture d’origine} (ELCO), University of Liège, July 1995.
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ANNEX 1

EC LEGAL INSTRUMENTS


Article 12: 'The children of a national of a Member State who is or has been employed in the territory of another Member State shall be admitted to that State's general educational, apprenticeship and vocational training courses under the same conditions as the nationals of that State, if such children are residing in its territory. Member States shall encourage all efforts to enable such children to attend these courses under the best possible conditions.'

Scope of Article 12: Article 12 of Regulation (EEC) No. 1612/68 ensures that the children to whom it applies are placed in a condition of equality as regards all the rights deriving from admission. It refers not only to rules relating to admission, but also to general measures intended to facilitate educational attendance.

In this connection, reference should also be made to the case-law of the Court of Justice:

  In its judgment the Court accepted that access to education under the same conditions as nationals also includes the same opportunities as regards financial assistance by the host country.

  In its judgment the Court confirmed that the child has an independent right to integration into the host country and hence to continue his education there, even if the parents return to the country of origin.

  In its judgment the Court upheld the principle of the integration of the child into the host country, confirming the child's status and rights in that country even if he leaves the host country in order to pursue his studies in the country of origin.


In this resolution the Ministers express the will of the Member States to promote, for the benefit of the nationals of Member States and of non-member countries, and of their children, the following actions:

- organizing and developing a reception system which would include intensive study of the language or languages of the host country;
- providing more opportunities as appropriate for teaching these children their mother tongue and culture, if possible in school and in collaboration with the country of origin;
- providing more information for families on the training and educational opportunities available to them.

To do this, the following measures are to be implemented at Community level:
- exchange of information and experience concerning the organization of suitable types of teaching .......... and cooperation in the training of teachers ....;
- pedagogical studies and research.


Scope of the Directive: limited to children who are dependants of any worker who is a national of another Member State, where such children are resident in the territory of the Member State in which that national carries on an activity as an employed person.

A declaration by the Council confirmed the political will of the Council and the Member States to extend the aims of the Directive to include the children of migrant workers from third countries.

Article 1: the beneficiaries of the Directive
The Directive applies to children for whom school attendance is compulsory under the laws of the host state.

Article 2: reception tuition
Member States shall, in accordance with their national circumstances and legal systems, take appropriate measures to ensure that free tuition to facilitate initial reception is offered in their territory........, including, in particular, the teaching - adapted to the specific needs of such children - of the official language or one of the official languages of the host state.

On the question of teacher training, Member States shall take the measures necessary for the training and further training of the teachers who are to provide this tuition.

Article 3: teaching of the mother tongue and culture of the country of origin
Member States shall, in accordance with their national circumstances and legal systems, and in cooperation with states of origin, take appropriate measures to promote, in coordination with normal education, teaching of the mother tongue and culture of origin for the children of migrant workers.

Binding force:
The Directive is binding upon all the Member States to which it is addressed as to the result to be achieved, while leaving the national authorities free to decide on the form and methods of implementation.

As far as Articles 2 and 3 in particular are concerned, the wording used in Article 3 ('Member States shall.... take appropriate measures to promote ....') is such that the text only obliges Member States to make efforts to achieve the desired purpose.


In several resolutions the European Parliament calls on those Member States which have shown a considerable delay in implementing the Directive to take measures to bring their statutory and administrative provisions into line with the provisions of the Directive as soon as possible, and asks the Commission to bring proceedings before the Court of Justice, under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, against those Member States which have failed to fulfil their obligations ten years after the adoption of the Directive. It points out how important it is for the Directive to be applied as a whole if effective equality is to be established for the citizens of the Europe of tomorrow, 'wherever their place of residence and whatever their nationality of origin'.

ANNEX 2

IGC – AMSTERDAM EUROPEAN COUNCIL

NEW TITLE IN THE TEC
Free Movement of persons, asylum and immigration

Article C
The Council, acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in article G, shall, within a period of five years after the entry into force of this Treaty, adopt:

3. Measures on immigration policy within the following areas:
   a) conditions of entry and residence, and standards on procedures for the issue by MS of long term visas and residence permits, including those for the purpose of family reunion;
   b) illegal immigration and illegal residence, including repatriation of illegal residents.

4. Measures defining the rights and conditions under which nationals of third countries who are legally resident in a MS may reside in other MS.

Amendment to Article 128(4) of the TEC
The Community shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of this Treaty, in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures.
ANNEX 3

INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

International laws on migrants' right to education

Outside Community law, immigrants' rights to a particular type of education poses a problem in that international law does not recognize immigrants as a group whose collective identity must be protected. Minorities have been recognized as being entitled to preserve their identity under Article 27 of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights and also under the 1993 UN Declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national, ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities. The definition of the concept of 'minority' would often appear to imply at the outset that members of the minority are nationals of the state, the aim being to prevent migrants from demanding cultural rights. The assimilation of migrants by the host state is therefore held to be legitimate. As a result, minorities and migrants are subject to different arrangements.

- **IL Convention No. 143, Migrations in Abusive Conditions and the Promotion of Equality of Opportunity and Treatment of Migrant Workers, 1975**
  This convention was the first to recognize specifically rights to education. It attempts to protect migrant workers settled in the host country, but includes a compromise intended to facilitate the possible return of migrants to their country of origin.

- **UN International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, 1990**
  This convention establishes migrants' rights in the field of education by a guarantee of access to national educational establishments. It makes provision for, but does not guarantee, reception teaching and teaching in the language of origin.

- **Council of Europe - European Convention on Human Rights**
  Article 2 of Protocol 1 establishes a general right to education, with the aim of guaranteeing access to the educational facilities of the host state rather than guaranteeing a particular type of education.

- **European Convention on the Right of Establishment, 1955**
  This was the first effort at regional level to regulate the rights of migrant workers, with emphasis on the right of access to education.

- **European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers**
  This was a more determined effort than the previous convention. The two conventions apply only to migrant workers who are legally resident in one of the signatory states. Article 15, which refers to the education of migrant children in their mother tongue, does not speak of rights but rather of intergovernmental cooperation, mentioning the possibility of repatriation. The only recognized right is that of access to education, under Article 14.

Other provisions on the rights of the child
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1994
This Declaration aims to guarantee the right to education for all by applying a twofold principle, namely, compulsory, free primary education. The Declaration also prohibits states from taking discriminatory measures when implementing the right to education. It essentially sets out the objectives to be pursued by the signatory states but does not enable individuals to invoke prerogatives.

Article 28 of the Convention proclaims the general right to education while stressing certain aspects such as making primary education compulsory and available free to all. The wording of that article does not allow it to have any direct effect.

Article 29 stipulates that:
1. States Parties agree that the education of the child shall be directed to
   (a) The development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential;
   (b) The development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;
   (c) The development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own;
   (d) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin;
   (e) The development of respect for the environment.

The convention has no actual legal force in international law, but this does not mean that it is devoid of any coercive effect. It can be a political argument in the balance of power between States.
ANNEX 4

IMMIGRATION PER NATIONALITY GROUP IN THE EU - 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of the total immigrant pop.</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>Non-EU</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>EFTA</th>
<th>Central and Eastern Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of the total immigrant pop.</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>The Americas</th>
<th>USA Canada</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Australia Oceania</th>
<th>Med. countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Developed countries</th>
<th>Developing countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5

IMMIGRANTS AND THE LABOUR MARKET

According to the estimates drawn up on the basis of these tables, labour market requirements are expected to be met by immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working age population (15-64) in the EC/EU 12 countries (1988=100)</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people (0-14) in the EC/EU 12 countries (1988=100)</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Eurostat.*
Projections for the EC labour force based on the situation in 1985 (figures in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>2,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>24,553</td>
<td>25,309</td>
<td>25,934</td>
<td>26,319</td>
<td>24,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>4,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>22,970</td>
<td>23,743</td>
<td>24,140</td>
<td>23,965</td>
<td>19,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>6,311</td>
<td>6,312</td>
<td>5,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>5,227</td>
<td>5,417</td>
<td>5,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13,980</td>
<td>14,735</td>
<td>15,353</td>
<td>15,713</td>
<td>15,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>27,676</td>
<td>28,325</td>
<td>28,362</td>
<td>28,535</td>
<td>27,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28,684</td>
<td>29,181</td>
<td>28,577</td>
<td>27,805</td>
<td>21,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR 12</td>
<td>140,585</td>
<td>144,988</td>
<td>146,771</td>
<td>146,873</td>
<td>131,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EC labour force broken down by age for 1985 - 2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>28,911</td>
<td>27,767</td>
<td>24,445</td>
<td>22,134</td>
<td>19,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>68,692</td>
<td>73,775</td>
<td>76,638</td>
<td>77,176</td>
<td>60,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>41,479</td>
<td>41,728</td>
<td>43,797</td>
<td>45,650</td>
<td>49,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>2,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140,588</td>
<td>144,987</td>
<td>146,771</td>
<td>146,873</td>
<td>131,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurostat.
# OUTLINE OF COMENIUS ACTION 2

**ACTION 2: EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN OF MIGRANT WORKERS, OCCUPATIONAL TRAVELLERS, TRAVELLERS AND GYPSIES; INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition and objectives</th>
<th>Improving the quality of education for the groups concerned. Promotion of the intercultural dimension with a view to facilitating the integration of such children into a culturally- and linguistically-different society. Combating racism and xenophobia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transnational projects for intercultural education – Thematic guidelines</td>
<td>A. Projects for the education of the children of migrant workers, travellers and gypsies and occupational travellers. B. Promotion of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile, coordination and management</td>
<td>Projects which evaluate, apply or disseminate innovatory methods, based on the agreement of partners. Participation of at least 2 organizations from at least 3 countries (one organization to act as coordinator).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations and institutions</td>
<td>Private or state schools offering general or technical education or vocational training. Universities and other higher education establishments. Institutions for training teachers and childcare workers. Local and regional authorities. Parents' associations, teachers' unions, youth organizations, organizations campaigning against racism, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>The exchange and dissemination of information and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria and priorities</td>
<td>Major issues, participation of all pupils, diversity among promoters, a link with other aspects of the SOCRATES programme. Specific priority areas such as equality of opportunity between boys and girls, meeting the needs of disadvantaged pupils, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>Maximum subsidy allocated for 3 years, subject to annual evaluation, on average: 25 000 ECU per annum, max. 50% of the annual cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General table showing the criteria used for the selection of projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives, priorities and activities</td>
<td>• consistency with the action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consistency between objectives and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach, methodology and technology</td>
<td>• Consistency with the objectives and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and management</td>
<td>• roles and responsibilities in the partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• projections for project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European issues</td>
<td>• geographical scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• complementarity of expert opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and formal aspects</td>
<td>• consistency between budget and work scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• additional subsidies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Manuel Sélection / Renouvellement TCP Socrates - February 1997*
This table shows us that the number of partners in each country is tending to balance out, with countries which, for linguistic and cultural reasons, generally focus on partners from the same geographical area.

### PROJECTS SELECTED – FINANCIAL DATA
**COMENIUS Action 2 – 1997 – 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator country</th>
<th>Number of applications</th>
<th>Total cost in ECU</th>
<th>Amount of subsidy granted</th>
<th>Subsidy as a % of the total cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>257,740</td>
<td>96,620</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>402,313</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>887,710</td>
<td>175,470</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>566,530</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>837,739</td>
<td>332,894</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>682,510</td>
<td>229,186</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,986,418</td>
<td>723,950</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>720,385</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>371,351</td>
<td>162,988</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>443,809</td>
<td>170,043</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>751,782</td>
<td>189,141</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>450,864</td>
<td>123,750</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,637,026</td>
<td>608,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160,321</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>388,545</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech rep.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,272,355</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,212,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,643,042</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 8

### PARTICIPANTS IN COMENIUS ACTION 2

**PER TYPE OF ORGANIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>No. of coordinators</th>
<th>No. of partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further or adult education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of universities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-university institute</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-prof.-mak. org. -</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-prof.-mak. org. - reg. / nat.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other orgs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company (industry)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company (services)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authority (local)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authority (nat.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authority (reg.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institute</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>861</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLES OF COMENIUS ACTION 2 PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovatory teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of parents / employers' and workers' representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Global projects**

Communication and In-service Training via Internet  
Proyecto de Educación Global  
Interventions Éducatives pour Immigrants qui présentent des Symptômes d’Inadaptation scolaire
DESCRIPTION:
Projet dans le Jutland, région danoise aux frontières de l'Allemagne, qui est une région bilingue (allemand-danois) qui accueille depuis 1986 de nombreux réfugiés notamment Palestiniens, Turques et Tamoul. Sur base de l'expérience acquise au niveau de l'enseignement du bilinguisme allemand-danois, le projet vise à intégrer au mieux les élèves des nouvelles families immigrées (turques, ....) à la société danoise en leur enseignant la langue et la culture danoise tout en maintenant et en développant leur background culture! antérieur et leur langue maternelle. À travers l'échange d'expériences, d'idées et de matériel, ainsi qu'à travers la création d'un réseau de bases de données pour les écoles et les professeurs de collèges. le projet vise à établir des coopérations entre élèves et professeurs bilingues, pour promouvoir la communication interculturelle, le développement de matériel didactique dans le domaine du bilinguisme et d'outils pour l'apprentissage du danois comme seconde langue.

COORDINATOR:
Kultur-og Socialforvaltningen
Radhuset
DK-6400
SONDERBORG
Phone: +45/74/42.93.00
Fax: +45/74/43.49.13

Email:

CONTACT: Astrid JENSEN

PARTNERS:
Intercultural Education Partnership, GB
Teachers' College, DK
Heriot-Watt University, GB
Faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen, NL
Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, NL
The Sonderskov-School, DK
The objectives of this global education project are: 1) to put into practice and to defend actively human rights, 2) to see to it that cultural differences are appreciated and respected, 3) to contribute to the development of a society which is interdependent, 4) to learn from intercultural situations, 5) to enhance social participation and involvement in our society and 6) to improve the quality of life. These objectives will be reached through three sets of activities: a) the training of teachers through seminars and meetings at national and at European/international level, b) the use of the intercultural materials which will be designed within this project and c) to stimulate the human contribution of those who work as volunteers in intercultural education: foreign students, migrants and other non governmental organisations. The concrete contents on which the project will focus are the following: values education, intercultural education, education of youngsters to become volunteers and the raising of awareness at global level. The outcomes will be that through teachers pupils will be more attentive to intercultural issues, to environmental issues and to human rights; it is hoped that children will develop an intercultural perception of the world's problems. Thus the project is to contribute to the combat against racism and xenophobia.

COORDINATOR:
Intercultura España
Calle Dr. Guiu 19 B
E-28005 MADRID
Phone: +34/1/386.37.77
Fax: +34/1/373.70.05
Email: MCI-EMS: 586-0144-MBX: mcasado

CONTACT: Marisol CASADO

PARTNERS: Associazione Nazionale Presidi, IT
Intercultura Italia, IT
Intercultura Mediterránea, ES
Interculture Ireland, IE
Shannon CurriculumDevelopment Center, IE
The teaching of immigrants in the European Union


TITLE: Interventions Éducatives pour Immigrants qui Présentent des Symptômes d’Inadaptation Scolaire

DESCRIPTION:
This project finds its roots in the fact that a rupture exists between the educational model that migrant children experience in their families and the imperative educational model they are confronted with at school. The objective of this program, thus, is to adapt the socio-educative work to this reality. In collaboration with the families, it intends to create a pedagogical system that takes better into account the characteristics of these groups. Consequently, the project has three areas of intervention. The organisation of training courses for teaching professionals, first, aims to help the teachers manage problems of violence and interculturality. This represents 150 hours of intervention in a two-year period. The second kind of action consists of the training of parents in a "parents' school". The aim here is to try to compensate for the absence of a parent's educational model as compared to the Western construction of the concept of adolescence. At the same time, this is also an opportunity to increase the level of knowledge about these groups. This action represents 192 hours of intervention. Finally, the third held of intervention for this project is compensatory education for students. This aims to compensate for the loop-holes and educational ruptures caused by referential changes when exposed to a new reality. Generally speaking, this is about how to live interculturality in a modern social context. (138 hours)

COORDINATOR: APROSERS - Asociación de Promoción de Servicios Sociales
C/ Sierra, 6
E-23003 Madrid
Phone: +34/1/554.34.28
Fax: +34/1/553.90.74
Email: caim@bbs.grn.es

CONTACT: Michel Louwette

PARTNERS:
Ecole Jeanne d Arc, FR
Ecole Saint Marie - Fraternité,
BE
Institution Saint Joseph, FR
Ecole de la Reine, BE
**Language teaching**

Weiterqualifizierung von Muttersprachlichen Lehrkräften für den Fremdsprachenunterricht in Spanisch und Italienisch
MEET Multicultural European Educational Transfer
Educazione Linguistica nella Scuola Multiculturale Torino
Development for a Curriculum for Home Language Instruction for North African and Turkish Children in Europe in Primary and Secondary Education
REFERENCE: 26369-CP-1-96-1-DE-COMENIUS-C2

TITLE: Weiterqualifizierung von Muttersprachlichen Lehrkräften für den Fremdsprachenunterricht in Spanisch und Italienisch

DESCRIPTION:
As it is important for immigrant children to keep their native languages alive, the aim of the project is to give a group of teachers of Spanish and Italian in Hessen a three years' further education in these languages so that they can assist the pupils in the learning of those languages. The teachers will after the intensive in-service training be able to teach Spanish and Italian immigrant children in their mother languages from 7th to 11th class in the compulsory education system. An interesting element is the fact that the in-service education of the teachers will be set up according to the EU direction 89/48 of December 21st 1988 which focuses on a general system for the recognition of higher-education diplomas; in the present project particular attention will be given to the mutual recognition of teachers' qualification acquired through in-service education in the field of language teaching and learning.

COORDINATOR:
Wissenschaftliches Prüfungsamt der Univ. Frankfurt
Deutsches Inst. für Int
Schloßstr. 29
D-60486 FRANKFURT/ MAIN
Phone: +49/69/24.70.81.22
Fax: +49/69/24.70.84.44
Email:

CONTACT: Anne DICK

PARTNERS:
Universidad de Valladolid, ES
Università degli Studi di Perugia, IT
Développer l'interculturalité et l'interdisciplinarité, renforcer la maîtrise de la langue d'origine des élèves immigrés, favoriser l'égalité des chances scolaires, et former les futurs enseignants au travail interculturel sont les grands objectifs du projet MEET. Pour les atteindre, différents dispositifs d'intervention sont mis en place:

1. des laboratoires didactiques bilingues et interculturels qui ont pour ambition de maintenir et renforcer la langue d'origine d'élèves immigrés quel que soit leur niveau scolaire (de la maternelle à l'enseignement supérieur), tout en renforçant leur bilinguisme; le but étant à terme de leur permettre de dépasser plus facilement le simple point de vue ethnocentrique et de former leur connaissance et conscience interculturelle.

2. des laboratoires interculturels pour la formation d'élèves d'écoles supérieures appelés à travailler dans une société multi-ethnique

3. la rédaction de matériel didactique pour l'apprentissage de la langue et de la culture d'origine des groupes ethniques immigrés, pour démultiplier les expériences d'enseignement menées sur le terrain.

À travers les échanges d'expériences et de matériel, ainsi qu'à travers la conception en commun, la collaboration entre partenaires européens (italiens, anglais, français, belges et hollandais) permettra l'échange de méthodologies didactiques et la production de matériel à dimension européenne.

COORDINATOR: COSPE Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti
Via della Colonna, 25
I-50121 FIRENZE
Phone: +39/55/234.65.11 - Fax: +39/55/234.65.14
Email:

CONTACT: Maria OMODEO

PARTNERS:

I.T.I.S. A. Meucci, IT
Agate Neuhof Emploi Formation, IT
ELIM Basisschool, NL
Ecole Fondamentale Communale de Droixhe, BE
Intercultural Education Partnership, GB
I. Magistrale G. Capponi, IT
I. Prof. C.T. F. Datini, IT
"LITOS" - Educazione Linguistica nella Scuola Multiculturale Torino

Recherche-action sur le bilinguisme, qui se propose d'analyser les différentes situations pédagogiques (classe normale, classe normale avec laboratoire de seconde langue, enseignement bilingue) susceptibles d'être utilisées pour approfondir la capacité de diagnostic et d'apprentissage en matière d'éducation linguistique. L'objectif étant de mettre en place un modèle et un programme de formation pour enseignants pratiquant en milieu scolaire à forte population immigrée.
L'ambition est de définir un modèle pilote transférable qui résultera de la recherche action menée avec une équipe d'enseignants spécialisés, de séminaires internationaux d'échanges d'expériences, et de l'utilisation de bases de données de bonnes pratiques.

COORDINATOR: Provveditorato agli Studi di Torino
Via Coazze 18
I-10138 TORINO
Phone: +39/11/560.74.25
Fax: +39/11/54.28.74
Email:

CONTACT: Silvana Mosca

PARTNERS:
Local Education Autorty, GB
NALDIC, GB
Sovrintendenza Scolastica - Ufficio Ispettori Scuola Elementare, IT
Università degli Studi di Siena, IT
École Normale Supérieure de Saint Cloud, FR
Mosaïque , IT
Regione Toscana Dip. Politiche Sociali e del Lavoro, IT
Scuola Elementare Collodi, IT
Scuola Elementare Vamba, IT
Scuola Materna Statale, IT
Scuola Media St. G. Verga, IT
Technisch Instituut Glorieux, BE
King Alfred's College, GB
TITLE: Development for a Curriculum for Home Language Instruction (HLI) for North African and Turkish Children in Europe in Primary and Secondary Education

DESCRIPTION:
The partners in this project are developing a curriculum of HLI, Home Language Instruction, for the languages actually spoken at home in the largest immigrant groups in the 5 countries involved in the project: the Netherlands, France, Germany, Great-Britain and Spain. The immigrant groups concerned are: North African, Turkish/Kurdish communities. The curriculum will be available for primary and secondary education. For the first year of the project one domain of language acquisition will be the central focus, viz. vocabulary acquisition. In a later stage other areas such as grammar, syntax, text comprehension and semantics will be treated as well. Different themes to be treated will be chosen by the project partners according to the age group concerned, such as: the family, life, clothes, ceremonial feasts etc. There will be instruction guides for teachers and learning books for the pupils. As much as possible, use will be made of audio material, of video and computer equipment to get as much variation as possible in the programme. The idea behind the whole project is that a strong background in the mother tongue is required in order to be able to master a new language (a dominant language) of the country one lives in.

COORDINATOR:
Katholieke Universiteit Brabant
P.O. Box 90153
NL-5000 LE TILBURG
Phone: +31/13/466.26.40
Fax: +31/13/466.31.10
Email: jj.deruiter@kub.nl

CONTACT: Jan Jaap De Ruiter

PARTNERS:
Freie Universität Berlin - Seminar für Semistik und Arabistik, DE
Berlageschule, NL
Bevington Primary School, GB
De Cirkel, NL
Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, FR
Lycée La Hotoie, FR
School of Oriental and African Studies, GB
University of Granada - Department of Human Geography, ES
CEIP Salvador Espriu, ES
Teacher training

Intercultural Education in Initial and In-Service Teacher Training

EDIMS- Education in Multicultural Settings
Formation européenne d’enseignants en fonction dans le domaine de l’éducation interculturelle dans un milieu scolaire multiculturel

TITLE: **Intercultural Education in Initial and In-Service Teacher Training**

DESCRIPTION: This project, which focuses on the education of the children of migrants, has as the main objective to elaborate a model for initial and in-service education of teachers in the field of intercultural education. More specifically the project aims at: a) the development, implementation and evaluation of an experimental pilot programme for initial and in-service teacher education with the purpose of equipping them with the necessary skills to face effectively the difficulties they meet in multicultural classrooms; b) the establishment of a close co-operation between different institutions of H.E. in this field. It is hoped that this co-operation will lead to a better and global understanding of the issues concerning intercultural education in relation to teacher education. c) the development of instructional material for teacher education programmes. The innovations proposed in the present pilot programme are the following: 1) a scheme of a joint programme for the initial and in-service teacher education aiming at bringing together, at a certain stage of their training, two groups of trainees: student-teachers and teachers; this is an essential element in integrating a wide range of theoretical and practical concerns in intercultural education; 2) a co-operation of different institutions responsible for the professional training of teachers with the purpose to develop a shared framework necessary for defining intercultural education as a component of teacher education.; 3) a core element of the professional training of both groups of trainees is the investigation into the socio-cultural problems arising in multicultural schools. Some of the anticipated results are: a module for intercultural teacher education that can be used by other training institutions at national and European level., a series of studies relevant to the project and the development of a data base to create a corpus of information related to the experiences and practices in other countries concerning the development of an intercultural approach to education. as a domain of academic research and as a component of teacher education.

COORDINATOR:
University of Athens
Samou str. A. Ilioupolis
G-16342 ATHINE
Phone: +30/1/724.91.92
Fax: +30/1/724.89.79
Email:

CONTACT: George Markou

PARTNERS:
Department of Elementary Education, GR
Université Libre de Bruxelles, BE
London Institute of Education, GB
Department of Secondary Education, GR
SOCRATES COMPENDIUM 1996

REFERENCE: 26352-CP-1-96-1-NL-COMENIUS-C2

TITLE: EDIMS - Education in Multicultural Settings

DESCRIPTION:
The project aims to promote an intercultural dimension in education and training of teachers and social educators who have to work with migrant people and their children in urban areas. A three month course will be developed and set up in two of the institutions; a two-week course will be organised by the third partner and a conference will be organised by the last one. The students involved in the project will learn from each other and from the range of expertise existing in each institution. In addition the project will allow students to engage in local community visits and activities providing them with first hand practical experience. It is also the intention to stimulate further activities including the production of resources and the encouragement of research. The project will also widen awareness and provide impetus for fresh initiatives within and beyond the institutions involved and the communities which they serve.

COORDINATOR:
Haagse Hogeschool
Diamanthorst 183
NL-2592 GD DEN HAAG
Phone: +31/70/383.85.00
Fax: +31/70/383.85.03
Email:

CONTACT: Gerard DE KRUIF

PARTNERS:
Højvang Seminariet, DK
University of Greenwich, GB
Lund Universitet- Lärärhögskolan i Malmö, SE
Holsbjergskolen, DK
Johannesskolan, SE
Engstrandskolen, DK
Archipelschool, NL
Springkilden, DK
SOCRATES COMPENDIUM 1996        COMENIUS ACTION 2


TITLE:    Formation européenne d’enseignants en fonction dans le domaine de l’éducation interculturelle dans un milieu scolaire multiculturel

DESCRIPTION:
Ce projet concerne l’organisation d’un séminaire européen sur le thème: "L’éducation interculturelle: ouverture à une société où l’intolérance et le racisme n’auront plus leur place", comprenant des ateliers d’échange entre enseignants, des conférences plénières et des visites d’écoles. Ce séminaire s’inspire d’une part de l’expérience acquise dans le séminaire ASEREP (Association Européenne de Recherche et d’Échanges Pédagogiques) d’Elewijt (Belgique) en février 1994. Ce séminaire, organisé avec l’aide financière de la TASK FORCE, portait sur "La prise en compte des cultures minoritaires dans l’enseignement catholique européen". Il s’inspire d’autre part des travaux de recherche réalisés à l’UCL et des expériences menées à la Commission de l’immigration de la Communauté flamande de Belgique. L’organisation d’un séminaire d’une semaine à Bruxelles avait pour but de donner une formation européenne à des enseignants en fonction dans le domaine de l’éducation interculturelle dans un milieu scolaire multiculturel allemand, belge, français et néerlandais. L’objectif concret en était de favoriser des partenariats scolaires transnationaux et d’étudier la possibilité d’organiser des activités pédagogiques ainsi que des activités d’information et de formation dans le cadre du programme SOCRATES (COMENIUS, Action II). L’ASEREP voulait mettre l’accent sur l’éducation interculturelle, dans laquelle la connaissance des langues, des cultures et des valeurs mutuelles peut être un facteur de lutte contre l’intolérance et le racisme. Ce séminaire consistait en quelques interventions académiques d’une part et informatives d’autre part, en visites d’écoles où se vit l’interculturalité, et en ateliers. L’ASEREP a l’ intention de développer à partir de ce projet des reseaux de coopération européenne dans le domaine de l’interculturel.

COORDINATOR:
Association Européenne de Recherche et d’Échanges Pédagogiques
Avenue Marnix 19 bte 6
B-1 050 Bruxelles
Phone: 32 2 5114774
Fax: 32 2 5114774
Email:

CONTACT:    Raf De Zutter

PARTNERS:
Union Nationale pour la Promotion Pédagogique et Professionnelle dans l’Enseignement Catholique, FR
Zentralstelle Bildung der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz, DE
Comité Européen pour l’Enseignement Catholique, BF:
Bureau Pédagogique du SeGEC, BE
Algemeen Bureau Katholiek Onderwijs, NL
Centre de Promotion de l’Enseignement Catholique en Europe, BE
Innovatory teaching materials

Development of Mother Tongue Materials and Intercultural Materials according to a New Curriculum
Anne Frank in the world
The teaching of immigrants in the European Union

SOCRATES COMPENDIUM 1996  COMENIUS ACTION 2


TITLE: Development of Mother Tongue Materials and Intercultural Materials According to a New Curriculum

DESCRIPTION:
The project 'Development of mother tongue materials and intercultural materials according to the new curriculum' plans to set up the following activities: 1) the development of mother tongue materials and intercultural materials and publications; 2) the organisation of seminars and conferences focusing on this topic.
The materials mentioned under 1) will be produced taking into account the new curriculum for mother tongue education; it will also take into account the new curriculum for Danish as a second language. Particular attention will be given to the development of materials which can be used in the so-called reception-classes. Alongside the preparation of the materials, in-service training sessions are being prepared by an appropriate in-service training institution having expertise in this field. The project links up with partners in Norway and France with whom it intends to exchange information and expertise. Attention is not only given to Danish as a second language or as mother tongue for bilingual pupils but also to other languages such as Arab, Turkish, Somalian, Persian and Vietnamese; co-operation is envisaged with other European institutions in those fields.

COORDINATOR:
Århus Skolvæsen
Frederiksgade 79
DK-8000 ÅRHUS C
Phone: +45/86/19.09.98
Fax: +45/86/19.75.49
Email:

CONTACT: Vicki Wurtz

PARTNERS:
Danmarks Lærerhøjskole, DK
Vågsbygd Skole, NO
Høegskolen i Agden, NO
Association Française des Arabisants, FR
Institut du Monde Arabe, FR
SOCRATES COMPENDIUM 1996


TITLE: "Anne Frank in the World", Stage II: Educational Programmes in at Least Three European Capitals

DESCRIPTION: Given the recent upsurge in support for racist and/or anti-democratic political organizations, also among young people in Europe, the present project has as the major objective to improve the educational impact of the anti-racists and anti-xenophobia activities of the "Anne Frank in the world"activities. The story of Anne Frank and her family gives the opportunity to youngsters to identify themselves with victims of a racist ideology and makes it possible to assess the value of an intercultural society where human rights are defended. The concrete activities scheduled within the project are: 1) the development of a new exhibition with interactive components focusing on Anne Frank and the problems of racism and xenophobia, 2) the development of a teachers' pack which goes with the exhibition, 3) the production of a standard set up for in-set seminars for teachers and guide training sessions to increase the pedagogical use of the visit to the exhibition, 4) the production of an international version of the Anne Frank Journal.

The project will result in a set of resources (exhibition panels, interactive elements, materials for teachers and pupils) that eventually will be available in all nine languages of the EU. The exhibition will be travelling all around Europe as already 55 cities have expressed interest in it. The exhibition should be available in several languages gradually as funding becomes available over several years.

COORDINATOR:
Anne Frank House
P.O. Box 730 - Keizersgracht 192
NL-1015 NH Amsterdam
Phone: +31/20/556.71.00
Fax: +31/20/620.79.99
Email: jan-erik@annefrank.nl

CONTACT: Jan Erik Dubbelman

PARTNERS: Universität Köln, DE
Southwark Cathedral, GB
Museen der Stadt Wien, AT
Gesamtschule Bonn-Beuel, DE
CSC, BE
ARCHÉ, AT
Participation of parents/employers' and workers' representatives

Learning to live in a multicultural society. Home-school Liaison
Participation of migrant parents
SOCRATES COMPENDIUM 1996 COMENIUS ACTION 2


TITLE: Learning to live in a multicultural society - Home-School Liaison

DESCRIPTION:
The project intends to produce a publication entitled 'Learning to live in a multicultural society: home-school liaison' which will address good practice in education dealing with the problems of migrant children and children of ethnic minorities. The publication will be produced in English, French and German.

The objectives of the project are: a) to allow a wider audience to participate in the debate on home-school liaison; b) to strengthen the European network of adult educators in their endeavours against xenophobia and racism; c) to develop a publication which can be used as a first modular element in the training of anti-racist trainers; d) to develop a publication which can be used in European approaches to build curricular elements and training modules around this topic; e) to raise the awareness of the general public on the need to foster efforts in fighting racism and xenophobia in order to enhance the foundations of European citizenship.

The conception and the collation of the document are the result of a process of exchange of experiences and the design of a joint European strategy on the issue of social exclusion and European citizenship. The whole process up to its final results and published outcomes are based on concerted European action co-ordinated and directed under the umbrella of the European Association for Adult Education.

COORDINATOR: Institute for International Cooperation of the German Adult
Obere Wilhelmstr. 32
D-53225 Bonn
Phone: +49/228/97.569
Fax: +49/228/975.69.55
Email: iiz-dvv-bonn@geod.geonet.de

CONTACT: Wolfgang Leumer

PARTNERS:
NIACE [National Institute of Adult and Continuing Education (England and Wales)], GB
European Association for the Education of Adults, ES
The project intends to focus on the involvement of migrant-parents in the education of their children as it is said to be too low. Schools and organisations working in the field of education of migrants' children should be invited to work more closely together. The project hence focuses on the following four elements: 1) the involvement and participation of parents from ethnic groups in primary, special and secondary education with respect to providing support at class/school level; 2) the participation of parents from ethnic groups in formal administrative bodies at school or community level; 3) involvement of local authorities in the promotion of migrant-parent participation and the role of organisations which can support the various groups of migrants; 4) the contributions that can be expected from the participating organisations in a European network with regard to the promotion of educational co-operation between professional educators and migrant-parents. The results of the project will be the creation of a network, the production of proceedings and mutual exchange of information between the 7 partners of the 4 countries involved.
City projects

Interfaith Education
Eurocities - Réseau DIECEC

TITLE: Interfaith Education

DESCRIPTION: The aim of this project is to develop the intercultural education through interfaith approaches in multicultural and multi-faith cities. It involves 5 cities - Bradford (UK), Birmingham (UK), Cork (Eire), Odense (Denmark) and Rotterdam (Netherlands). Representative teachers are to meet in April and September for study weeks at the Bradford Interfaith Education Centre. The partners also want to increase pupils' knowledge, understanding and awareness of different faiths and cultures so as to develop greater respect for and valuing of them. As the result they will produce additional teaching and learning materials relating to the above mentioned topic which will explain the basic beliefs, the rites, the customs and festivals of the major world religions. The project will provide opportunities for other cities to consider the work of the Center and it will be also useful for teachers from other cities to develop and translate the measures for use in different contexts.

COORDINATOR: Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Flockton House, Flockton Road
UK-BD4 7RY Bradford
Phone: 44 274 731674
Fax: 44 274 731621
Email:

CONTACT: Phil Green

PARTNERS:
Pollard Park Middle School, GB
Queensbury Upper School, GB
Pegasus Primary School, GB
Nab Wood Grammar School, GB
Maria School, NL
Humlehaveskolen, DK
Grange Road First School, GB
Da Costa School, NL
Cork Teacher's Centre, IE
Abildgardskolen, DK
Interfaith Education Centre, GB
Welford Primary School, GB
SOCRATES COMPENDIUM 1996


TITLE: Eurocities - Réseau DIECEC

DESCRIPTION:
Ce projet vise la coopération entre les grandes villes européennes en matière d'éducation interculturelle et ceci à partir d'un réseau DIECEC qui s'occupe du développement de l'éducation interculturelle dans des grandes villes européennes; DIECEC est un sous-groupe de EUROCITIES une association de grandes villes. L'objectif principal est de développer une approche urbaine à plusieurs niveaux en matière d'éducation interculturelle et donc d'améliorer l'intégration des migrants.

Du fait du grand nombre de communautés immigrées en leur sein, du fait de la nécessité d'améliorer leur intégration socio-économique, les villes développent des stratégies d'amélioration de l'éducation des jeunes de ces communautés dont la première langue n'est pas celle du pays d'accueil. Le projet DIECEC est né de l'initiative de villes membres d'Eurocities, réseau de grandes villes européennes. D'un projet-pilote en 94, DIECEC s'est développé en réseau avec une structure de coordination au sein d'Eurocities et un comité de pilotage. DIECEC mène des visites d'études, développe des échanges d'information et d'expérience au sein de groupes de travail, procède à l'échange de matériel, et publie une newsletter régulière.

Plusieurs visites d'étude sont programmées pour l'année 1996 afin d'améliorer la connaissance des situations réciproques des villes dans le domaine de l'éducation interculturelle.

Un séminaire est prévu pour le 1er juin à Anvers afin de consolider les acquis de visites d'études et de voir comment les acquis peuvent être transformés dans d'une part de nouvelles initiatives et d'autre part le renforcement d'actions existantes.

COORDINATOR: Developing Intercultural Education through Co-operation between European Cities
Birmingham City Council, Education Department, Margaret Stre
UK-B3 3BU BIRMINGHAM
Phone: +44/121/235.24.59
Fax: +44/121/235.53.05
Email:

CONTACT: Pratap Deshpande

PARTNERS:
Centro Documentazione Intercult. Via Libia 53, IT
Cork Teachers’ Centre Crawford Gallery Emmet Place, IE
Birmingham City Council Portland Centre PO BOX 2757 Birmingham B1784W, GB
Department voor Sport en Onderwijs Hofstraat 15, 2000, NL
Hôtel de Ville 13002, FR
Senatsverwaltung für Schule Berufsbildung und Sport, Storkower Strasse 133 10407, DE
Sovrintendenza scolastica Corso Matteotti 32/a, IT
Stedelijk Bureau Gondsesingel 84 Postubs 22366, 3003 DJ, DE
University of Athens 33 Hippocrates Str., GR
Bradford Education Flokton House - Flockton Road BDA 7RY, GB
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