

A New Era for Teaching Heritage Languages to Bilingual Children in France

Hülya SÖNMEZ L. LE GAC¹

Abstract: After the Second World War, a significant wave of immigration to France began, accelerating the spread of bilingual and multicultural societies within the country. This phenomenon has introduced a two-sided medallion issue concerning heritage language (minority language) education for the new generation of immigrant origin. On one side of the medallion is the necessity of providing heritage language education to bilingual children of immigrant origin, regardless of the circumstances. On the other side is the challenge of aligning heritage language education with France's educational policies and objectives while avoiding potential issues stemming from this phenomenon. This study evaluates the recent developments in heritage language education for bilingual children in France from these two perspectives. To examine these developments from different angles, the transition from ELCO (Enseignement des Langues et Cultures d'Origine) to EILE (Enseignement International de Langues Étrangères) has been analyzed. A literature review identified that certain variables significantly influenced this transition, including political attitudes and approaches, the approach of teachers and educational infrastructure, changing educational objectives and the needs and expectations of immigrant families, the basic principles of education, and the dominance of French over regional and minority languages. To determine the impact of these factors, a detailed literature analysis was conducted, and the findings were used to explain these variables. Based on the results, the reasons for the transition from heritage language education to foreign language education were explored. Ultimately, the identified variables were found to play a significant role in shaping the EILE framework, which has fundamentally altered heritage language education. The analysis concluded that there is a need to develop student- and family-focused teaching processes to enhance EILE education, involving collaboration between France and the heritage (origin) countries.

Keywords: Bilingual, France, Heritage Languages Education

Fransa'daki İki Dilli Çocukların Miras Dilli Öğretiminde Yeni Bir Dönem

Öz: İkinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra, Fransa'ya önemli bir göç akını başlamıştır. Göçler, iki dilli ve çok kültürlü toplumların Fransa'da yaygınlaşmasını hızlandırmıştır. Bu durum, göçmen kökenli yeni neslin miras dili (azınlık dili) eğitimine ilişkin iki yönlü bir madalyonu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Madalyonun bir yüzü, göçmen kökenli iki dilli çocuklara koşullar ne olursa olsun miras dili eğitimini sağlamaktır. Madalyonun diğer yüzü ise Fransa'nın eğitim politikası ve hedefleri doğrultusunda miras dili eğitiminin nasıl sağlanacağı ve aynı zamanda bu fenomenen kaynaklı potansiyel sorunlardan nasıl kaçınılacağıdır. Bu iki yönü ile bu çalışmada Fransa'daki iki dilli çocuklar için miras dili eğitimindeki güncel gelişmeler değerlendirilmiştir. Miras dili eğitimindeki gelişmeleri farklı açılardan incelemek amacıyla ELCO'dan EILE'ye geçiş süreci incelenmiştir. Literatür taraması kapsamında siyasi tutumlar ve yaklaşımlar, öğretmenlerin yaklaşımı ve eğitim altyapısı, değişen eğitim hedefleri ile göçmen ailelerin ihtiyaçları ve beklentileri, eğitimin temel ilkeleri ve Fransızcanın bölgesel ve azınlık dillerine karşı baskınlığı değişkenlerinin bu geçiş sürecini etkilediği belirlenmiştir. Bu değişkenlerin etkisini belirlemek amacıyla literatür incelemesi yapılmış ve bu kapsamda ulaşılan verilerle değişkenler açıklanmıştır. Ulaşılan sonuçlara bağlı olarak miras dilinden yabancı dile geçişin nedenleri ele alınmıştır. Sonuç itibarıyla belirlenen değişkenlerin miras dili eğitimini köklü bir şekilde değiştiren EILE eğitiminin oluşumunda etkili oldukları belirlenmiştir. İnceleme sonucunda Fransa ile miras dili (menşe dili) ülkesi arasında EILE eğitiminin geliştirilmesine ilişkin aile ve öğrenci odaklı öğretim süreçlerinin geliştirilmesi gerektiği belirlenmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İki Dillik, Fransa, Miras Dili Eğitimi

Received: 19.06.2024

Accepted: 04.09.2024

Article Type: Research Article

¹ Muş Alparslan University, Education Faculty, Turkish Education Department, Muş, Türkiye, hulya.sonmez@alparslan.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4495-284X>

To cite/Atıf için

Sönmez L. Le Gac, H. (2025). A new era for teaching heritage languages to bilingual children in France. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim*, 39(1), 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.33308/26674874.2025391786>

In France, HL (heritage language) is taught in two ways: local languages-dialects and immigrant origin. Educational policy for the teaching of local languages and dialects dates back to the French Revolution. Drawing on Jacobin language policies from the French Revolution, France postponed the instruction of regional languages other than French from its educational framework until the 1950s. As the need to preserve and protect local languages began to gain importance, the educational policies regarding their instruction also changed. Therefor teaching of other languages spoken in France (Breton, Basque, Catalan, Occitan, Corsican, Tahitian, Melanesian) took a pedagogical turn with the adoption of the so-called Deixonne Law “allowing the use and the teaching of ‘local languages and dialects’”. While this law originally applied only to Breton, Basque, Catalan and Occitan” in 1951 (Garcia, 2015).

Since 1925, foreign language teachers have taught *L’enseignement des Langues et Cultures D’origine* (LCO) [Teaching of Heritage Languages and Cultures] as a modern language or living foreign language. There were two important classes in this education system, (*Classe d’Initiation*) [CLIN] which refers to a class designed to introduce students to a new subject or field of study, often aimed at providing foundational knowledge and skills. And an adaptation class (*Classe d’Adaptation*) [CLAD] which is refers to a class designed to help students adjust to a new educational environment or curriculum, particularly for those who need additional support to integrate successfully. Therefor this education system was also created as CLIN and CLAD to deal with the issue of languages of origin and culture and to facilitate the integration of students into traditional classrooms (Rachidi, 2011). With a circular (July 12, 1939), these courses continued to be taught until the 1970s. This circular has changed the content and scope of the courses. As a result of this change, content on the country's history and geography was added to modern language classes outside school hours (*Inspection générale de l’éducation Nationale*, 2006). This way, modern language classes in HL education focus on two content areas: language and culture. Per this regulation, HL education was provided under the *Enseignement des Langues et Cultures d’Origine* (ELCO- The Teaching of Languages and Cultures of Origin) from 1970 to 2016. Along with ELCO education, HL education was introduced at different levels of education in 1989 under the name *L’enseignement d’initiation aux langues vivantes étrangères* (The teaching of introduction to foreign living languages). In 1974 Girard drew a report in which he identified significant shortcomings and problems in teaching these languages. These main problems are the lack of competent staff and appropriate teaching materials, the lack of national controls in primary schools and colleges, and the widespread teaching of modern languages. In order to solve these problems, it was determined that primary school teachers should provide introductory training offered in teaching modern languages.

ELCO education was introduced to meet the need for mother tongue education for the children of immigrants due to the increasing number of immigrants with the labor migration in France after 1960 due to the Second World War. Education in the language and culture of origin has become necessary for integrating immigrant workers' children into French culture and for their future repatriation. In response to this need, ELCO education agreements have increased over time between France and countries wishing to offer heritage language. Portugal was the first to sign an ELCO education agreement. Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia followed suit. Verbal agreements (*procès verbal*) were also concluded between France and Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia, and Türkiye. In addition to these developments, the Council of the European Communities issued directives (July 25, 1977) on HL education for the children of migrant workers in order to prevent them from forgetting their mother tongue and to protect their right to mother tongue education. Therefore, the HL education of children of migrant workers in France has become more critical.

ELCO classes aimed to overcome the problems of immigrant children growing up in French culture in adapting to France and the French education system because the waves of immigration after 1970 created communication and educational problems for the new generation in France (Bertucci, 2007). Contrary to expectations, the immigrants did not return to their home countries and settled permanently in France. Therefore, teaching French culture has also been an essential topic in ELCO classes. The integration of members of the new bilingual and bicultural generation into French culture has been added to the content of ELCO classes. With this regulation, ELCO classes aimed to enable students to discover both their language and culture of origin and French culture (Haut Conseil à l’intégration, 2010). To this end, ELCO classes have

been delivered as integrated or deferred courses since 1975. Integrated courses were offered three hours a week in primary school and during school time as part of learning activities. These courses were then offered outside of school hours, and again as deferred courses in schools (Petek, 2004). Included in regular school activities, ELCO classes were offered free of charge in certain schools. ELCO teachers are appointed and paid by their countries of origin (Domergue, 2004). The ELCO course, which continued until 2016, was gradually transformed into *d'Enseignements Internationaux de Langues Étrangères* (EILE) [International Teaching of Foreign Languages]. Based on this fundamental change, this study examined the educational policy of changing the teaching of immigrant languages (heritage language) to foreign languages in France. The research question is as follows: What factors have affected the transition from teaching immigrant languages (heritage language) to teaching foreign languages (from ELCO to EILE) in France?

Method

The study on the teaching of heritage languages in France was conducted in accordance with the document review model. In the document analysis method, existing records and documents are examined to access the research data. Therefore, document analysis encompasses the processes of finding, reading, taking notes, and evaluating sources in line with the research objective (Karasar, 2005). The examined documents involve the review and evaluation of printed and electronic materials that contain information about the phenomenon or phenomena targeted for investigation (Bowen, 2009; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). In this context, any written material that provides information on the subject of the intended research is considered a document (Balci, 2016). The analysis of documents consists of several stages, including finding appropriate documents, checking the authenticity of the documents, establishing a systematic approach to coding and cataloging, and performing data analysis (Merriam, 2009).

Purpose of The Method

The rationale for selecting document analysis in this study is to examine the results of recent scientific studies and educational reports on minority language (heritage language) education in France. Thus, based on the information, guidelines, and data provided in these documents, the study aims to reach general conclusions about minority language education policy in France. In line with the purpose of this research, it has been determined that the document analysis method is suitable for the research objective.

Limitations of The Study

Data were collected from various sources, including reports prepared by the French Ministry of National Education on minority language (immigrant languages, heritage languages) education, theses, and research articles related to minority language education in France. The following key criteria were used to determine the scope limitations of the data:

- ✓ The focus on minority language (immigrant languages, heritage languages) education in France, including comparisons between France and other countries in terms of minority language teaching.
- ✓ The inclusion of theses, research articles, and reports prepared by relevant educational institutions.
- ✓ Coverage of research and educational reports published since the year 2000.

Data Analysis Process

Three sources were used to collect data. Education reports related to the teaching of minority languages (immigrant languages, heritage languages) were accessed on the official website of the French Ministry of National Education. The scientific articles and theses found using the keywords were selected according to the three criteria mentioned above. The identified education reports, articles, and these were analyzed in accordance with document analysis. Keywords such as "minority language teaching policy in France", "minority language education in France", "immigrant languages teaching in France", "heritage language teaching in France", "ELCO" and "EILE" were entered into search engines on the internet. The following steps were followed when analyzing the documents: Relevant sources were classified according to the topics. Sub-

research topics (findings, results, evaluations, etc.) related to minority language teaching were identified within these topics.

In this context, the following subtopics were identified: Political attitudes and approaches, teachers' approach, educational infrastructure, changing educational objectives, needs and expectations of immigrant families, the basic principles of education, the dominance of French over regional and minority languages. The data collected on how the heritage languages of minorities in France are taught were analyzed and evaluated under these subheadings.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the data analysis process, 10 selected documents were submitted for expert evaluation. Two experts examined the main topics and subtopics of these documents. Both experts identified the main topics and subtopics of the relevant documents similarly. Following the expert evaluation, 22 articles and (Garcia, 2015; Gülden et al., 2023; Gülden, 2023; Helot & Young, 2002; Kerzil, 2002; Koenig, 2005; Lanier, 2010; Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015; Petek, 2004; Poggeschi, 2003; Qureshi & Janmaat, 2014; Resnik, 2010; Schedel, 2020; Schwartz, 2013; Sicard, 2007; Smythe, 2022; Soehl, 2016; Sönmez & Akıncı 2022; Sönmez, 2022; Thomaske, 2011; Young & Helot, 2003; Young, 2017), 7 educational reports (Ministre de l'Éducation Nationale, de la Jeunesse et des Sports, 2020; Académie de Strasbourg, 2014; Haut Conseil à l'Intégration, 1995 and 2010; Direction des services académiques de l'éducation nationale, 2019; Direction des services départementaux de l'éducation nationale, 2021; Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale, 2016), 1 international education agreement (Milletlerarası Andlaşma, 2021) and 1 thesis (Castellotti, 2010), all determined to be in line with the research objective and examination criteria, were analyzed.

Results

The factors that have emerged in related research as leading to the change in HL education in France include political attitudes and approaches, the approach of teachers and educational infrastructure, changing educational objectives and the needs and expectations of immigrant families, the basic principles of education, and the dominance of French over regional and minority languages. The results related to these variables are explained in the following sections.

Political Attitudes and Approaches

When HL and foreign language education are compared, it is found that France, gives more importance to teaching a foreign language from a very early age in kindergarten (Young & Helot, 2003). Therefore, HL education has been provided in some periods as the language of origin and other periods as a foreign language. In particular, HL education within the scope of ELVE (L'enseignement de Langue Vivante Étrangère) [The Teaching of a Foreign Living Language] has continued to be offered as a foreign language for many years. In practice, the aim was to make ELCO classes, typically attended by migrant children, available to all students and transform them into foreign language courses (Kerzil & Vinsonneau 2004, cited in Resnik, 2010).

After the 1990s, France adopted a new approach to education policy. Moreover, different social actors put the function of ELCO education on the agenda. Therefore, HL courses were re-evaluated (Qureshi & Janmaat, 2014; Petek, 2004). After 46 years, France has made an important regulation in HL education by transforming immigrant languages and culture education into foreign language education. Before this change, France's approach to immigrant language education policy had been criticized on the grounds that France was indifferent to minorities and minority languages and unwilling to meet their teaching needs (Helot & Young, 2002; Sicard, 2007). France has been criticized for not providing enough support for the institutional and educational recognition of heritage languages, despite being an immigrant-receiving country because although it has recognized some immigrant languages by signing the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in 1999, it has not yet ratified it. Therefore, it has been stressed that the transmission of immigrant languages is often limited to families and that immigrant languages are lost in the current education system (Schedel, 2020).

Teachers' Approach and Educational Infrastructure

Looking at the implications of languages of origin in school, 'languages of origin' were perceived as the main obstacle to learning French and a source of learning difficulties (Helot & Young, 2002). Therefore, some French teachers thought that children should not speak languages other than French at home (Helot & Young, 2002; Young, 2017). Those teachers were criticized on the grounds that they knew little about bilingualism and did not develop intercultural competence (Young, 2017). Moreover, many French teachers were criticized for being unaware of ELCO classes or knowing little about ELCO (Lanier, 2010). Teachers who did not know enough about immigrant children believed that those children failed academically because of HL. However, after a few years, it was realized that French students failed as much as immigrant children. As a result of this recognition, teachers stopped seeing migrant children as a special and problematic segment and focused on what measures should be taken to support their academic performance (Kerzil, 2002). This change in perception was also reflected in the teaching staff, as some language teachers took a more positive approach to mother tongue education. Teachers stated that integrating children from different linguistic backgrounds was not a problem, as children learned French shortly after starting kindergarten. Therefore, they emphasized that it was good to value and respect children's mother tongues as they would enrich children and facilitate integration (Thomauske, 2011).

Despite the large number of bilingual immigrant students in France, it is a moot point whether the infrastructure for HL education is adequate. Despite improvements in the working conditions of French teachers, the problems of ELCO teachers and education related to material conditions (integration of ELCO teachers into the teaching teams of schools, cooperation with them and taking into account the work done in these courses, the heating of ELCO classrooms, difficulty accessing teaching materials, etc.) have not been solved (Lanier, 2010; Sicard, 2007). France differs from some countries in terms of mother tongue education policies and practices. For instance, unlike in New Zealand, migrant students who start school in France are treated in the same manner as their peers and are expected to engage with intensive course content despite their limited language proficiency. This approach reflects France's educational philosophy of *égalité - pas de différence entre élèves* (equality - no difference between students). Therefore, New Zealand and France provide different teaching environments tailored to the learning needs and characteristics of migrant students (Smythe, 2022). Additionally, while Germany recognizes mother tongue education as a cornerstone of its integration policies, these courses have received little attention in France. In Germany, most mother tongue teachers are employed as civil servants under the education authorities of the Länder and receive their salaries from these institutions (Garcia, 2015).

Changing Educational Objectives, Needs and Expectations of Immigrant Families

Migrant families in France have been offered ELCO education to meet their needs for mother tongue and cultural education. In this context, the main objective of ELCO education is to help migrant families learn their mother tongue and culture in case they return to their countries of origin. Therefore, ELCO was a special inclusive education to promote workers' repatriation. To that end, France signed or made verbal agreements with countries of origin. Migrant families did not return to their home countries and settled permanently in France, which paved the way for a new generation of immigrant French born and raised in France. The development of this new generation in line with France's educational planning and goals has influenced changes in educational policies (Sönmez, 2022; Sönmez & Akıncı, 2022).

French education is reflected in the language of communication of immigrant families and communities as French has become the dominant language among immigrants, further accelerating their detachment from the L1 (HL) (Helot, 1997 cited in Helot & Young, 2002). Concerning this, three out of every five immigrants speak to their children only in French, while two out of every five immigrants mention their mother tongues but relegate them to the background (Soehl, 2016). Over time, fewer and fewer children have learned their mother tongues in family settings. Some languages (Arabic, Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian in particular) have been degraded over generations and replaced by French (INSEE, 2002, cited in Thomauske, 2011). In fact, parents are aware that the current language policy on HL education is weak because how they monitor their

children's bilingual development is an integral part of language practice and management (Schwartz, 2013). Tomlinson (1984, cited in Schwartz, 2013) highlights that this may lead to certain challenges, as tensions and misunderstandings can arise between parental expectations and what education provides.

The Principle of Basic Education

Secularism is an essential dimension of the French Republic, guaranteeing freedom, equality, and fraternity. Under the 1881 and 1882 Ferry Laws and then the 1886 Goblet Law, secularism was the founding principle of public schools before it was extended to the entire Republic in 1905. Today, secularism is the founding bond of the Republic and schools (*Ministre de l'Éducation Nationale, de la Jeunesse et des Sports*, 2020). ELCO education included cultural issues to ensure that migrant children could quickly adapt to their cultures if they returned to their countries of origin. Over time, ELCO classes were criticized for not being secular for various reasons. First, France received waves of migrants from many Muslim countries, especially from the Maghrébien countries (Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia). Second, some related issues have brought the sensitivity of secularism in education to the forefront (Resnik, 2010; Koenig, 2005). Third, due to France's sensitivity regarding secularism, the headscarf became an important issue. Fourth, some ELCO teachers demanded less heterogeneous classrooms (Kerzil, 2002). All these issues have raised concerns about a shift away from secular education. Thus, the ideological and pedagogical problems of intercultural education institutions such as ELCO have been raised (Kerzil, 2002). These problems have made the continuity of cultural issues in ELCO classes controversial. Therefore, ELCO teachers have been warned to protect secularism in ELCO classes (Académie de Strasbourg, 2014).

Another reason for changing educational policies is the relationship between national citizenship identity and the role of schools since schools are central institutions that help students acquire a national identity. Due to this central role, the school was conceptualized as monolingual in relation to the monolingual characteristic of the state. The ideology that linguistic diversity is a problem for national unity has become an object of debate (Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015). French ethnocentrism has been further strengthened by the vital interests of teachers' unions and republican socialization of teachers (Resnik, 2010). Authorities stated that HL education should be provided to all children regardless of nationality to prevent marginal nationalistic movements. It was also unacceptable that the teachers teaching these language courses did not speak French. It was emphasized that teachers should be integrated into the French education system (*Liens culturels et intégration*, 1995).

The issue of whether or not cultural content will be taught in EILE classrooms, or how this content will be taught, is also being evaluated. This is because there is no explanatory article regarding the teaching of cultural topics in the EILE Agreement (Milletlerarası Andlaşma, 2021). This ambiguity makes it difficult for EILE teachers to understand how to teach cultural topics. The concept of culture, which has been ambiguously removed from HL courses, has led to uncertainty about what is considered cultural or not. It has been emphasized that EILE teachers feel the need to necessarily refer to and draw upon HL culture in language teaching, while at the same time feeling as though they are doing something illegitimate by doing so (Gülden, 2023).

The Dominance of French Over Regional and Minority Languages

French is regarded as the cornerstone of the nation and the common means of expression that unites all citizens. There is a strong connection between the French language and the values of the French Republic. This strong official status of French is reflected in the political approach regarding the relative importance of other languages in France. In relation to the uniqueness (*unicite*) of the French people, the Constitutional Council has never recognized collective rights (origin, culture, language, and belief) to any community (Poggeschi, 2003). It was also projected that the multilingual approach to education in France would not be easy and that it might encourage communitarism. Communitarism denotes the ideology or practice of emphasizing the distinctiveness and interests of specific communities or groups within a society. This emphasis can sometimes lead to the prioritization of community interests over those of the broader society. Frequently encountered in discussions of multiculturalism and integration, communitarism can carry a negative connotation,

suggesting an excessive focus on group identity that may undermine social cohesion. Therefore, it is stated that integration in France should take place through the French language (Thomasske, 2011). Another reason for the dominance of French is the close relationship between national identity and the official language of instruction at school. French is conceptualized as the only school language because the state is monolingual (Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015). In addition, the fact that French is seen as the "language of priorities" and that, despite linguistic diversity, French retains its importance as a single and indivisible language in the secular paradigm has also been an influential factor (Helot & Young, 2002; Castellotti, 2010). This dominant power of French over other languages caused teachers to develop negative attitudes towards languages other than French (Young, 2017). At the same time the idea of protecting the language of the state from other languages was regarded as France's international prestige (Poggeschi, 2003).

The 1995 report of the *Haut Conseil à l'Intégration* (High Council for Integration) addresses integration from both its positive and negative aspects. According to the report, the ideal communitarian logic in integration may initially serve as a stabilizing factor, but it is emphasized that it could eventually turn into a source of division. Due to the fact that this factor can lead to ghettos, separation, and ultimately exclusion, the High Council for Integration underscores its commitment to the French model, which has enabled the integration of the most diverse populations into the national community.

“L'intégration : réponse à la diversité culturelle

Le modèle français d'intégration se fonde sur l'indifférenciation entre les hommes, c'est en ce sens qu'il est universaliste. Chaque être vaut pour lui-même indépendamment de la communauté à laquelle il appartient. L'intégration suppose que l'étranger se joigne à la communauté nationale dans l'égalité des droits et des devoirs. L'étranger conserve ses particularismes mais aucun n'entre en considération pour l'exercice de ses droits et pour l'accomplissement de ses obligations. La République ne reconnaît de droits qu'à l'individu, libre à l'égard de ses liens communautaires. L'État est neutre, et pose le postulat de la liberté de choix de l'individu auquel seul est reconnu des droits. Cette liberté ne fige pas l'individu.; elle lui laisse la possibilité de vivre ou non, plus ou moins fortement, dans des rapports communautaires, de s'y insérer ou d'en sortir. La logique communautariste se veut inverse. Elle enferme l'individu dans son groupe au regard duquel il se définit et dont il tire des droits et obligations. Les situations sont ainsi figées et l'individu reste enfermé dans sa communauté. Pour le Haut Conseil à l'intégration, si cette logique communautariste peut dans un premier temps être un facteur de stabilisation, elle est dans un deuxième temps un facteur de rupture. Cette logique est alors celle du ghetto, de la séparation et donc de l'exclusion. Le Haut Conseil réaffirme son attachement au modèle français qui a permis l'intégration dans la communauté nationale des populations les plus diverses qu'elles soient ou non attachées à leurs particularismes.

...

Integration: A Response to Cultural Diversity

The French model of integration is based on the principle of non-differentiation between individuals; in this sense, it is universalist. Each person is valued for themselves, independently of the community to which they belong. Integration assumes that the foreigner joins the national community on an equal footing with respect to rights and duties. While the foreigner retains their particularities, none of these are considered in the exercise of their rights or the fulfillment of their obligations. The Republic recognizes rights solely for individuals, who are free from the constraints of their communal ties. The State is neutral and assumes the principle of individual freedom, granting rights only to individuals. This freedom does not restrict the individual; it allows them the possibility to live within communal relationships, to engage with them more or less deeply, or to withdraw from them. The logic of communitarianism takes the opposite approach. It confines the individual within their group, defining them by it and deriving their rights and obligations from it. As a result, situations become fixed, and the individual remains trapped within their community. According to the High Council for Integration, while this communitarian logic may initially serve as a stabilizing factor, it eventually becomes a source of division. This logic results in ghettos, separation, and ultimately exclusion. The High Council reaffirms its commitment to the French model, which has enabled the integration of the most diverse populations into the national community, whether or not they are attached to their particular characteristics.”

The impact of this report lasted until 2016 because, on April 3, 2016, the French state introduced an important new regulation on the education of immigrant children in two languages of origin and culture. This new regulation has gradually changed ELCO education into international foreign language education (EILE). Thus, HL education has been transformed into international foreign language education.

Conclusion and Discussion

Countries' attitudes and ideologies about multilingual education influence their educational policies. Attitudes and ideologies play a central role in designing, delivering, constraining, and shaping multilingual education programs (Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015). Ideologies and attitudes in education policies also determine L1 (HL) teaching strategies, such as educational knowledge and experience and global developments (war, economic crisis, pandemic, ecological changes, terrorist attacks, technology, sociological and demographic problems, etc.). Depending on these indicators, countries revise their education policies according to their educational needs and goals. In this framework, France has recently revised its HL education agenda (policies). The main reason for this revision is the incompatibility of ELCO, which was initiated according to the goals and needs of nearly 50 years ago, with current teaching practices, educational needs, and educational goals.

As a result of the massive labor migration after the Second World War, ELCO had two main educational goals: Integrating migrant children into France and providing them with native language and cultural education to enable them to return to their country of origin. Because ELCO was a system based on both integration and shadow education strategies. Thus, in this respect, ELCO education was an education for *guest students*. As France did not need more workers, some workers, mainly Portuguese, Italian, and Spanish, returned home, which was in line with the purpose of ELCO education. However, many families, especially Arab and Turkish laborers, settled permanently in France. For third-, fourth-, and fifth-generation immigrants, France is no longer a guest country but the country where they were born and raised. There seems to be a mismatch between ELCO's early educational goals and student profile and its more recent educational goals and student profile because children of immigrant origin are French citizens, subject to French law and living in harmony with French culture according to the fundamental rights of citizenship (free, equal, and fraternal). In other words, the integration, separation, and adaptation strategies no longer apply to them. ELCO education is, therefore, no longer in line with current needs.

Certain factors such as political attitudes and approaches, teachers' attitudes, expectations of migrant worker families, educational infrastructure, changing educational goals and needs, the principle of basic education, and the dominance of French over regional and minority languages further accelerated the termination of ELCO education. Moreover, these factors were the harbingers of the strategies on which education after ELCO would be based because the issue of how to teach immigrant children their mother tongues and cultures (LCO) was addressed after ELCO. These discussions were imbued with concerns about the adverse effects of this education more than the interests of multilingual and multicultural society (Lucchini, 2007). For this reason, the authorities did not consider it justified to continue to call the languages by their original name as this could cause problems. Thus, it was stated that ELCO classes should cease to be called LCO (Lucchini, 2007). The most prominent feature of this change is that language education is an international and foreign language education that appeals to children of all origins and languages, with no specific language or origin. While some countries of origin have accepted this radical change, others have not because the EILE course registration forms for the last years show that some countries have withdrawn from EILE education (Direction des services académiques de l'éducation nationale, 2019; Direction des services départementaux de l'éducation nationale, 2021). At the same time, the issue of training teachers in accordance with the EILE education agreement criteria from countries of origin can also be considered within this context. In a study, the reason why countries do not continue education has been associated with difficulties in finding teachers (Sönmez, 2022). Because changes were made to teacher qualifications (French B2 qualification) (Milletlerarası Andlaşma, 2021). However, it is important to identify and evaluate these and other reasons. Therefore, studies are needed to determine the reasons why countries do not continue EILE education. In this context, more research is warranted to determine countries' needs and educational policies.

The student profile is the most interesting aspect of EILE education. Although these courses provide foreign language education, most students are target language (HL) speakers (Sönmez, 2022). Given this fundamental issue, it is critical to address how daily language is compatible with the language of education. Therefore, the following question becomes all the more important: How well is the mother tongue at home

being taught as a foreign language at school in line with students' language proficiency and needs? EILE education needs to be organized according to this question because if it is not, the following teaching-related problems are likely to resurface:

- ✓ How to deal with the problem of referring to a foreign culture and blocking the mother tongue by assuming the possession of a foreign language? (Lorcerie, cited in Lorreyte, 1988).
- ✓ How to synthesize the assumed cultural gaps between children's cultures and school culture? (Kerzil, 2002).

Recommendations

The settings and stories of students' learning of the target languages (HL) and instructional services provide important data about what EILE education should look like. These data are related to the following factors fundamental to EILE education: HL learning needs of bilingual and multilingual students, the characteristics of bilingual education, bilingual teaching materials (curriculum), and the reality of multi-grade classes. It is necessary to focus on how these factors can be used effectively in the EILE education process. In this context, the effects of these factors on the target language education of bilingual children in France were emphasized (Sönmez, 2022). These factors and some suggestions for their effective use are described below:

Since EILE education involves different languages, a common teaching model should be followed, including teaching activities, material preparation guidelines, assessment and evaluation tools, and criteria. This could offer a guide for teachers with not much knowledge and experience in teaching EILE. This common instructional model will allow for a more targeted assessment and evaluation of teaching. It will also provide realistic data for inspectors to inspect teaching.

The reality of multi-grade classrooms: Students from different grade levels (CE1 - CM2) and age groups receive education from the same teachers in the same EILE classrooms. Multi-grade classrooms are organized into four grades (CE1/ First grade, CE2/ Second grade, CM1/ Third grade and CM2/ Fourth grade). It has been determined that multi-grade class structures consisting of different language and age groups in EILE classrooms create problems in terms of teaching-learning efficiency (Gülden, et al., 2023). Although very rare, some classrooms are mono-grade classrooms. The main determining feature of EILE classrooms as mono-grade or multi-grade classrooms is the number of students and teachers. EILE classrooms are often multi-age classrooms, as these courses are mainly for target language (HL) speakers, and speakers of origin show a dispersed demographic in France. Therefore, EILE classrooms need to be organized according to multi-grade classroom features.

In Conclusion

Before starting EILE education, most bilingual students already know the target language to some extent and live in environments where this language is used. Therefore, we should enrich EILE teaching activities. In this context, the Didenheim project before EILE is a successful example of supporting language and cultural diversity education. Within the scope of this project, families, teachers, and students get acquainted with eighteen languages and gain experience with them (Hélot & Young, 2005). The outputs of this project can provide insight into EILE education as a bilingual or multilingual instructional design process.

EILE education should be arranged according to the needs and difficulties of bilingual and multilingual students, bilingual education and bilingual curriculum, and multi-grade class factors. In addition, we must take measures to reduce adverse learning conditions. If these are not taken care of, these courses will eventually gradually lose their function and become isolated courses that only fulfill legal procedures. If France and the countries of origin pay attention to these factors, they can give successful bilingual teaching in EILE courses. Over time, EILE will strengthen its identity as an exemplary school providing bilingual education. Thus, France and the countries of origin will use the education budget more effectively. In addition, both countries will reach their educational goals more effectively on common ground.

At the same time, foreign language teaching activities should be used for foreign students in EILE classes. The content and teaching process of these activities should be given in accordance with the target language learning speed of the students. In this context, it can benefit from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which is also used as a reference in EILE education (Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de la Jeunesse et des Sports, 2016).

Declarations

Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions: This manuscript was prepared as a single-author.

Funding: No funding support was received from any organization for the design of this study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, or the writing of the manuscript.

References

- Académie de Strasbourg. (2014). *Mise en œuvre de l'enseignement de Langue et Culture d'origine (ELCO) guide du professeur D'ELCO*. <http://elco67.site.ac-strasbourg.fr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ELCO-67-Guide-du-professeur-ELCO.pdf>
- Balci, A. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Pegem Akademi.
- Bertucci, M.M. (2007). L'enseignement des langues et cultures d'origine: Incertitudes de statut et ambiguïté des missions. *Le français aujourd'hui*, 3(158), 28-38. <https://doi.org/10.3917/lfa.158.0028>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Castellotti, V. (2010). Les enseignements de "langues (et cultures) d'origine": Chronique d'une disparition opportune ? langue et intégration. Dimensions institutionnelle, socio-professionnelle et universitaire *Peter Lang, Coll. GRAMM-R*, 83-94. hal-01390216. <https://hal.science/hal-01390216v1>
- Direction des services académiques de l'éducation nationale. (2019). *Formulaire a retourner a l'école- formulaire d'inscription ELCO-EILE destiné aux parents-RS 2019*.
- Direction des services départementaux de l'éducation nationale (2021). *Annexe-3-Formulaire-inscription-EILE-RS-2020* » [Annex-3-EILE-RS-2020-registration-form]. <http://fourchambault-58.ec.ac-dijon.fr/wp-content/uploads/sites/14/Annexe-3-Formulaire-inscription-EILE-RS-2020.pdf>
- Domergue, J. (2004). *Au nom de la commission des affaires culturelles, familiales et sociales sur la proposition de résolution : De M. Thierry Mariani Et Plusieurs De Ses Collègues, tendant à la création d'une commission d'enquête sur l'application des conventions prévoyant l'organisation de cours d'enseignement de la langue et de la culture d'origine et les mesures susceptibles d'améliorer cet enseignement* Report No N° 1414). Enregistré à la Présidence de l'Assemblée nationale.
- Garcia, N. (2015). Tensions between cultural and utilitarian dimensions of language: A comparative analysis of 'multilingual' education policies in France and Germany. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1-2), 43-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2014.947015>
- Gülden, B. (2023). Fransa'da iki dilli öğrencilere Türkçe öğreten öğretmenlerin dil öğretiminde kültürden yararlanma durumları. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (AUJEF)*, 7(3), 548-569. <https://doi.org/10.34056/aujef.1213862>
- Gülden, B., Akıncı, M.A., & Kaplan, K. (2023). Fransa'daki iki dilli öğrencilerin Türkçe derslerindeki çok düzeyli birleştirilmiş sınıf uygulaması hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Ereğli Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5(Özel Sayı), 332-358. <https://doi.org/10.51119/ereegf.2023.47>
- Haut Conseil à l'intégration. (2010). *Les défis de l'intégration à l'école et recommandations du haut conseil à l'intégration au premier ministre relatives à l'expression religieuse dans les espaces publics de la République*. Collection des rapports officiels rapport au premier ministre pour l'année 2010 [The Challenges of Integration in Schools and Recommendations from the High Council for Integration to the Prime Minister Regarding Religious Expression in Public Spaces of the Republic. Collection of Official Reports to the Prime Minister for the Year 2010]. <https://www.vie-publique.fr/sites/default/files/rapport/pdf/114000053.pdf>
- Haut Conseil à l'Intégration. Secrétariat. (1995). *Liens culturels et integration: rapport au Premier ministre, juin 1995* [Cultural Links and Integration: Report to the Prime Minister, June 1995]. <https://www.vie-publique.fr/rapport/25050-liens-culturels-et-integration-rapport-au-premier-ministre-juin-1995>
- Helot, C., & Young, A. (2002). Bilingualism and language education in French primary schools: Why and how should migrant languages be valued? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(2), 96-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050208667749>

- Hélot, C., & Young, A. (2005). The notion of diversity in language education: Policy and practice at primary level in France, language. *Culture and Curriculum*, 18(3), 242-257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310508668745>
- Inspection générale de l'éducation nationale. (2006). *L'enseignement de la langue et de la culture d'origine* [Teaching the language and culture of origin]. Rapport (2005), 090 Mars 2006.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kerzil, J. (2002). L'éducation interculturelle en France: Un ensemble de pratiques évolutives au service d'enjeux complexes. *Carrefours de l'éducation*, 2(14), 120-159.
- Koenig, M. (2005). Incorporating Muslim Migrants in Western Nation States – A comparison of the United Kingdom, France, and Germany. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 6(2), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-005-1011-8>
- Lanier, V. (2010). *Etat des lieux des enseignements de langue et culture d'origine en côte d'or* étude réalisée de 2008 à 2010. <https://credespo.u-bourgogne.fr/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/etat-des-lieux-des-elco-de-cte-dor-final.pdf>
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Taylor-Leech, K. (2015). Multilingual education: The role of language ideologies and attitudes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1-2), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2015.995753>
- Lorreyte, B. (1988). Français et immigrés : Des miroirs ambigus. *Presse et immigrés en France*, 165-166, 1-28.
- Lucchini, S. (2007). *L'enseignement des langues d'origine, à quelles conditions?" enseigner les langues d'origine- le français aujourd'hui*. (Edt. Armand Colin). 3 (158), 9-19. <https://doi.org/10.3917/lfa.158.0009>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Ministère de l'éducation nationale d'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche. (2016). *Note de service relative à l'enseignement des langues et cultures d'origine (ELCO), à leur mise en œuvre pour l'année scolaire 2016-2017 et au nouveau dispositif d'enseignements internationaux de langues étrangères (EILE)*. Direction générale de l'enseignement Scolaire Service de l'instruction publique et de l'action pédagogique.
- Ministre de l'Education nationale, de la jeunesse et des sports. (2020). *La laïcité à l'école* [Secularism at school] <https://www.cipdr.gouv.fr/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/202010-vademecum-laicite-web-1338068-pdf-1609.pdf>
- Petek, G. (2004). Les ELCO, entre reconnaissance et marginalisation. *Hommes et Migrations*, 1252, 45-55.
- Poggeschi, G. (2003). Language rights and duties in domestic and European courts. *Journal of European Integration*, 25(3), 207-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0703633032000133565>
- Qureshi, Y. F. & Janmaat, J.G. (2014). Diverging or converging trends: An investigation of education policies concerning the incorporation of ethnic minority children in England, France and Germany. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 44(5), 710-731. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.800782>
- Rachidi, A. (2011). *La valorisation du bilinguisme franco-arabe : Un avantage pour la réussite scolaire* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Université de Nantes.
- Milletlerarası Antlaşma. (2021). *Resmî Gazete* [Official Gazette]. Sayı: 31401, Karar Sayısı: 3563. <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2021/02/20210220.pdf>
- Resnik, J. (2010). Integration without assimilation? ethno-nationalism in Israel and universal laïcité in France. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 20(3), 201-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2010.516108>
- Schedel, L. S. (2020). L'éducation bilingue en France. Politiques linguistiques, modèles et pratiques. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(2), 253-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017>
- Schwartz, M. (2013). Immigrant parents' and teachers' views on bilingual preschool language policy. *Language and Education*, 27(1), 22-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.673626>
- Sicard, F. (2007). L'Enseignement des langues et cultures d'origine (ELCO) dans l'académie de Montpellier de l'article. *Les Langues Modernes*, 4, 2-3.
- Smythe, F. (2022). School inclusion, young migrants and language. success and obstacles in mainstream learning in France and New Zealand. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(7), 2543-2556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2056189>
- Soehl, T. (2016). But do they speak it? The intergenerational transmission of home-country language in migrant families in France. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(9), 1513-1535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.112617>
- Sönmez, H. (2022). The use and environments of teaching Turkish as a foreign language in France. *Research and Experience Journal (REJ)*, 7(2), 63-79. <https://doi.org/10.47214/adeder.1181790>
- Sönmez, H., & Akıncı, M. A. (2022). Fransa'daki iki dilli Türk çocuklarının Türkçe dil becerilerinin gözlemlenmesi (Paris ve Normandiya örnekleri). *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 10(4), 718-737. <https://doi.org/10.16916/adeder.1111145>

- Thomauske, N. (2011). The relevance of multilingualism for teachers and immigrant parents in early childhood education and care in Germany and in France. *Intercultural Education*, 22(4), 327-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2011.617425>
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (9. Baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Young, A., & Helot, C. (2003). Language awareness and/or language learning in French primary schools today. *Language Awareness*, 12(3-4), 234-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667079>
- Young, A. S. (2017). Non, moi je ne lui dis pas en Turc, ou en Portugais, ou en, j'sais pas moi en Arabe'. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 10(2), 11-24.