MULTILINGUAL MATTERS

Urban Multilingualism in Europe

Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School

Edited by
Guus Extra
and Kutlay Yağmur

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS

Contents

Part II
Multilingual Cities Project: national and local perspectives

11 Multilingualism in Lyon

MEHMET-ALI AKINCI & JAN JAAP DE RUITER

In this chapter, we present the outcomes of the *Multilingual Cities Project* (MCP) on the home language use and practices of primary school children in Lyon and its environs. For an extensive overview, we refer to Akinci *et al.* (2004). Section 11.1 deals with the status of immigrant minority (henceforward IM) groups and their languages in France. In Section 11.2, information is given on the teaching of languages other than French and on French language policy, with relevant statistics on home language instruction (henceforward HLI). In Section 11.3, the findings of the home language survey (henceforward HLS) amongst primary school children in Lyon are presented. In Section 11.4, nine parameters that are relevant to HLI at primary and secondary schools in France are presented. Section 11.5 contains conclusions and a discussion of the outcomes of this study.

11.1 Immigrant minority groups and their languages in France

In spite of increasingly strict immigration policies in most European Union (henceforward EU) countries, the numbers of IM populations continue to increase, due in particular to the rising numbers of political refugees, the freedom of movement of people inside the borders of the EU, and political and economic developments in Central and East Europe. It has been estimated that, in the year 2000, at least one third of the population aged less than 35 years in the urban zones of Western Europe had an IM background (Extra & Gorter 2001).

For various reasons, it is difficult to obtain reliable demographic information on IM groups in EU countries. For some groups and communities, no recent information is available. In addition, official statistics only reflect the presence of IM groups which have a legal status. Another element of disparity relates to the diversity of the systems of data collection. At the same time, as there is a steady growth in the number of naturalisations and as new IM children are born in EU countries, the criteria mostly used for statistics, i.e., nationality and country of birth, become more and more unreliable. Finally, it should not be forgotten, in particular in the case of France, that the majority of migrants from the former colonies already had the nationality of the host country, i.e., France, before their migration.

Complementary or alternative criteria for the identification of IM groups have been used in non-European countries with a longer history of immigration. In English-dominant immigration countries, such as the USA, Canada, and Australia, the question of identification was established in terms of self-categorisation and home language use (Broeder & Extra 1998).

In France, French nationality is acquired by ancestry, right of blood, birth, 'right of soil', or acquisition. The right of blood implies that any child is French, who has at least one French parent. By birth, any child who is born in France is French if at least one of its parents was born in France. In the last case, it is necessary to add the following requirements. Any child born in France before January 1, 1994, of a parent born in a former French territory overseas before its acquisition of independence, is fully French. This also holds for a child born in France after January 1, 1963, of a parent born in Algeria before July 3, 1962.

French nationality can be obtained in four different ways. First, important here because of its relevance to the pupils who participated in our survey, is the acquisition of French nationality on the basis of birth and residence in France. A French law of March 16, 1998, states that any person born in France of foreign parents acquires French nationality if, on this date, he/she resided in France and if his/her usual residence had been in France for a continuous or discontinuous period of at least five years since he/she reached the age of eleven years. The acquisition of French nationality can also be obtained by naturalisation. One of the conditions of naturalisation is to have had a residence permit in France during the five years that precede the application. Double nationality is in theory impossible for French nationals.

It is necessary to explain the French definition of the concepts of foreigner and immigrant: "Any person who does not have French nationality is foreign. An immigrant is a person born abroad but who lives in France. A foreigner is not necessarily an immigrant, and an immigrant is not inevitably a foreigner." Table 11.1 presents a historical overview of the numbers of foreigners living in France, based on their countries of origin during the period 1930-1990. Over time, a (strong) increase can be seen in the numbers of people originating from Maghreb countries, Portugal, Africa, Asia, and Turkey. At the same time, a (strong) decrease is visible in the numbers of people originating from European countries such as Italy, Spain, Germany, and Poland. After 1994, there was a significant fall in the entries of foreigners, related to the legal changes in 1993 which regulate the conditions for entry of foreigners to France (Obin & Obin-Coulon 1999). Table 11.2 presents the numbers of foreigners in France according to the most recent censuses, those of 1990 and 1999.

Countries or regions	1931	1954	1968	1975	1982	1990
Maghreb countries	3.2	12.9	23.6	32.3	38.8	38.7
Portugal	1.8	1.1	11.3	22.0	20.7	18.1
Italy	29.8	28.7	21.8	13.4	9.2	7.0
Africa	0.7	0.1	1.2	2.3	4.2	6.7
Asia	1.9	2.0	1.4	1.5	4.5	6.3
Spain	13.0	16.4	23.2	14.5	8.8	6.0
Turkey	1.3	0.3	0.3	1.5	3.3	5.5
USA	1.2	2.8	1.1	1.2	1.4	2.0
Belgium	9.3	6.1	2.5	1.6	1.4	1.6
Germany	2.6	3.0	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.5
Poland	18.7	15.2	5.0	2.7	1.7	1.3
Overseas islands	1.2	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

Table 11.1 Foreigners in France according to their countries of origin in the period 1930-1990 (in %) (source: INSEE 1994)

	1990		1999	
Nationality	N	%	N	%
Total population	56,651,955		58,520,688	
Total foreigners	3,598,602	100.0	3,263,186	100.0
Total nationalities from Europe	1,459,113	40.6	1,334,412	40.9
of which: EU (15)	1,321,529	36.7	1,195,498	36.6
Germans (ex - FRG)	52,723	1.5	78,381	2.4
Belgians	56,129	1.6	66,666	2.0
Spaniards	216,047	6.0	161,762	5.0
Italians	252,759	7.0	201,670	6.2
Poles	47,127	1.3	33,758	1.0
Portuguese	649,714	18.1	553,663	17.0
(former) Yugoslavs	52,453	1.5	50,543	1.5
Other European nationalities (except ex-USSR)	132,161	3.7	187,969	5.8
Ex-USSR	4,661	0.1	17,249	0.5
Total nationalities from Africa	1,633,142	45.4	1,419,758	43.5
Algerians	614,207	17.1	477,482	14.6
Moroccans	572,652	15.9	504,096	15.4

Nationality	1990		1999	
	N	%	N	%
Tunisians	206,336	5.7	154,356	4.7
Other nationalities from Africa	239,947	6.7	283,824	8.7
Total nationalities from America	72,758	2.0	81,293	2.5
Total nationalities from Asia	424,668	11.8	407,450	12.5
Turks	197,712	5.5	208,049	6.4
Other nationalities	226,950	6.3	199,401	6.1
Nationalities from Oceania and not specified	2,260	0.1	3,024	0.1

Table 11.2 Foreigners in France according to the censuses of 1990 and 1999 (source: INSEE)

The differences between the statistics for foreigners and immigrants are obvious if the total numbers of immigrants in Table 11.3 are taken into account.

Country of birth	N	Country of birth	N
Algeria	575,740	Poland	98,566
Portugal	570,243	Belgium	93,395
Morocco	251,059	(former) Yugoslavia	75,144
Italy	380,798	Great Britain	74,683
Spain	316,544	Vietnam	72,318
Tunisia	201,700	Senegal	53,859
Turkey	175,987	Kampuchea	50,526
Germany	125,227		

Table 11.3 Distribution of immigrants in 1999, based on country of birth (source: INSEE)

In 1999, there were approximately 3,260,000 foreigners in France, of whom 510,000 were born in France and 2,750,000 abroad. In addition, 4,310,000 people were qualified as immigrants; 1,560,000 of these were born abroad but had French nationality by acquisition and 2,750,000 were born abroad (these are the same 2,750,000 as in the first group). Members of the last group can thus be labelled as both immigrants and foreigners.

Berthoz-Proux (1973) and Gardin (1976) provide highly relevant historical studies on the use of IM languages in France. Heredia-Deprez (1976) complemented this earlier work. Berthoz-Proux (1973) observed an increasing discrepancy

between school success in the French school system and proficiency in the mother tongue: pupils who were so-called 'integrated' into the French school system acknowledged that they were unable to interact in their mother tongues. In similar cases, Heredia-Deprez (1976) affirmed that many children of Arabic origin did not speak in their mother tongue with their parents. Reporting on an investigation carried out in the Paris area, Heredia-Deprez stated that Spanish children had more success in the French school system and interacted better in their mother tongue than Arabic-speaking children. She explained this variation by the status of the languages involved: a standardised language written in Latin characters was considered more effective and prestigious. In many other comparative studies of the relationship between dominated mother tongues and dominant mainstream languages, it was concluded that those children who speak French with their peer group and the home language with their parents may reach a high level of bilingualism. From a language survey among 300 children, carried out in the Paris area by Deprez (1994), the following conclusions can be derived:

- French has penetrated the domestic domain of IM children; yet, three quarters of the children in the sample stated that they still understood and spoke the languages of their parents;
- the home language of the parents is relatively dominant in intergenerational family communication in the case of Arabic-, Kabyle-Berber-, and Portuguese-speaking children;
- immigrant mothers, and especially mothers from the Maghreb countries, use their mother tongues more with their children than immigrant fathers.

In the same study, Deprez (1994) showed that, out of 532 bilingual children in the final grade of primary school in Paris, more than 70 different home languages could be identified.

The 'Family investigation' census on language practices in French, carried out at the same time as the national census in 1999, included 380,000 people selected independently of their ethnic or national origins in areas like Flanders, Brittany, and Corsica in order to gather data on the regional languages of France. To the question in which languages, dialects, or *patois* their fathers and their mothers usually spoke to them before they were 5 years old, 26% of the adults remembered a language other than French. Six times out of ten, these languages were transmitted at the same time as French; in 50% of the cases, these languages were regional languages, and in the other half of the cases, they were IM languages like Arabic. In this investigation, nearly 400 languages other than French were identified (Héran *et al.* 2002). However, if the intergenerational transmission of languages is taken into account, a retreat of almost all regional and foreign or IM languages can be observed from one generation to the next. In this study, 20% of the adults said that

they sometimes spoke with close friends in languages other than French; 2,725,000 people mentioned English, which is much more than the 938,000 people who mentioned Arabic.

Other research projects carried out in Grenoble (Dabène *et al.* 1988, Merabti 1991, LIDIL 1990) provide more detailed insight into how majority and minority languages were used by Spanish- and Arabic-speaking people. Merabti (1991) distinguished three categories, i.e., active bilinguals, semi-active ones, and inactive ones. In Grenoble, second-generation Algerian immigrants most commonly spoke French and/or a mix of Arabic and French with their family members as well as with neighbours. They rarely used Arabic only in communication with family members.

11.2 The teaching of languages other than French

The teaching of languages other than French in French primary education is carried out in two forms. The first form is called *Education de Langue et Culture d'Origine* (ELCO), and is given by a teacher who is sent to France for a period of 4-5 years by the country of origin. The second form is the so-called early language teaching (*Enseignement precoce des langues* or ELT) and is carried out under the supervision of the French educational authorities. These two types of language teaching co-exist at the national level.

ELCO

Like in most other Western European countries, immigration to France started on a temporary basis, and eventually became permanent. As a result of French legislation allowing family repatriation, many of the immigrant workers' spouses and children came to France as well. This reunion of families led to the necessity to school these children. In the early 1970s, the children were given the opportunity to learn their languages and cultures of origin, which happened also at the request of the countries of origin. To establish such classes, bilateral agreements were concluded between France and, in chronological order, Portugal (1973), Italy (1974), Tunisia (1974), Morocco (1975), Spain (1975), Yugoslavia (1977), Turkey (1978), and Algeria (1982). Table 11.4 gives the total number of pupils participating in ELCO during the 1999/2000 school year. The table is split up into numbers of pupils in primary and secondary education, according to data provided by educational authorities in France and the respective source countries.

Country	Primary education		Secondary education	
	French data	SC data	French data	SC data
Algeria	8,600	11,700	–	–
Spain	1,327	1,327	–	–
Morocco	27,279	31,596	3,665	3,359
Portugal	10,625	10,625	–	–
Tunisia	5,457	11,120*	739	*
Turkey	12,883	12,883	3,665	–

Table 11.4 Distribution of pupils following ELCO in 1999/2000, based on source-country and French data (* not split up for primary and secondary education) (source: Relevement des Conclusions 2000)

Table 11.4 shows inconsistences between French and source-country data for pupils from Algeria and Morocco; in both cases, the latter present higher numbers for primary education. Moreover, instruction in Arabic and Turkish in secondary schools was only provided by source countries in the cases of Morocco, Tunisia, and Turkey. It is interesting to compare these numbers from a longitudinal perspective (Masthoff 1998:45-46). Table 11.5 shows that the total number of ELCO participants in primary schools strongly decreased over time.

Country	1984/1985	1990/1991	1997/1998	1999/2000	2000/2001
Algeria	36,345	12,000	9,421	8,600	7,948
Morocco	10,427	28,000	28,451	27,279	23,514
Tunisia	8,471	9,100	5,831	5,457	5,110
Spain	8,364	3,200	1,366	1,327	1,072
Italy	14,398	12,700	10,173	11,322	8,102
Portugal	41,419	22,000	10,105	10,625	9,371
Turkey	14,783	16,500	13,934	12,883	11,464
(former) Yugosl.	3,325	1,650	188	–	30
Total	137,532	105,150	79,469	77,493	66,611

Table 11.5 Distribution of pupils following ELCO in primary education in France (Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale 2001a)

Foreign languages at primary schools

In Bulletin 89-065 of March 6, 1989, the Ministry of National Education announced the setting up of a controlled experiment on the teaching of foreign languages at primary schools at the national level. This provision was in principle limited to the last year of primary schooling (second year of *Cours Moyenne*; CM2). The appendix to the mentioned bulletin, under the title *Teaching objectives and priorities*, starts with the negative statement that the early teaching of non-mother tongue languages cannot be a top priority in the early education of bilingual children. The text continues as follows: teaching over two school years (CM1 and CM2) with a weekly schedule of maximally three hours has other goals than linguistic, psychological, and cultural goals, and the goal of learning and practising a language. This early teaching should serve the later learning of a foreign language. At the same time, it should contribute to general learning in primary school, i.e., promote school success. Such teaching should allow children to enrich their capacities in hearing and articulation; to become aware of the differences between a foreign language and the mother tongue; and to be able to handle basic structures and use a simple vocabulary. The purpose should also be to create and develop in children a taste for a foreign language, which should be perceived as another means of communication and expression, and to open the minds of children to the realities of a foreign world that children should learn to like and know better.

An Official Bulletin of 7 January 1999 with respect to the 1999/2000 school year announced the extension of foreign language teaching (henceforward FLT) to all five levels of primary schooling (Ministère de l'Education Nationale 2001b). Below, we present the numbers of pupils in primary education per language group (Table 11.6) and grade (Table 11.7) for the 1998/1999 school year. Only 0.3% of the total number of pupils received instruction in Arabic, 0.2% in Portuguese, and 3.3% in Spanish. The majority of the pupils took English lessons, i.e., 1,086,509 pupils (75.4%). During the 1994/1995 school year, the proportion of primary school pupils learning a foreign language was 10.2% in the public sector and 11.9% in the private sector (CNFP 2000). In general, a considerable increase in participation can be observed between the 1994/1995 and 1998/1999 school years.

Language	Public primary education		Private primary education	
	Total	%	Total	%
German	262,735	18.2	33,315	8.5
English	1,086,509	75.4	346,500	88.4
Arabic	4,042	0.3	66	–
Spanish	48,196	3.3	4,721	1.2
Italian	26,941	1.9	971	0.2
Portuguese	3,461	0.2	112	–
Other languages	9,315	0.6	6,206	1.6
Total	1,441,380	100.0	391,891	100.0

Table 11.6 Distribution of pupils in public and private primary education per language group in 1998/1999 (source: CNFP 2000:160)

Grade	Public primary education		Private primary education	
	Total	%	Total	%
Pre-elementary year	21,026	1.0	23,953	8.0
1st year (CP)	30,721	4.6	21,385	19.8
2nd year (CE1)	274,451	39.9	71,175	63.6
3rd year (CE2)	288,607	44.1	77,471	68.7
4th year (CM1)	337,275	51.9	92,016	79.3
5th year (CM2)	486,950	74.9	105,148	86.3
Other	2,350	4.3	643	14.1
Total	1,441,380		391,891	
Total % learning a foreign language		26.4		44.7

Table 11.7 Distribution of pupils in public and private primary education per grade in 1998/1999 (source: CNFP 2000:160)

With respect to the teaching of regional languages, Marty (2002) presents the following figures for the 2000/2001 school year.

Language	Number of pupils
Occitan	71,912
Corsican	27,875
Breton	20,697
Basque	8,969
Catalan	8,907
Alsatian	7,453
Dialects of La Moselle Dept.	5,823

Table 11.8 Distribution of pupils participating in the learning of regional minority languages in the 2000/2001 school year (source: Marty 2002)

When Tables 11.6 and 11.8 are compared, the primacy of English as a foreign language becomes clear, followed by German. Apart from these languages, only Occitan, Spanish, Corsican, Italian, and Breton were represented by more than 20,000 pupils.

Language teaching in secondary schools

In the 2000/2001 school year, more than 99% of pupils in France and in the overseas departments (DOM; *Departements d'Outre Mer*) learned one foreign language, which is compulsory in France in almost all forms of secondary education. Slightly over 75% of the pupils learned a second foreign language (see Table 11.9). Non-European languages like Arabic, Turkish, and Chinese were learned by only 0.2% of the total number of pupils as first foreign languages and by 0.86% as second foreign languages.

Language	As first foreign language	As second foreign language
German	491,519	520,652
English	4,913,086	331,839
Spanish	42,412	1,841,690
Italian	–	163,257
Other languages	12,679	24,713
Total	5,459,696	2,882,151

Table 11.9 Distribution of pupils (except pupils in EREA or Regional Centres of Adapted Teaching) learning a first and a second foreign language in 2000/2001 in secondary education (Ministère de l'Education Nationale 2001c:117)

In France, it is also possible to take an exam in an elective language without having had formal instruction at school in this language. Today, there are more than 30 such examination programmes, which are primarily in the languages of former colonies of France, such as Peulh, spoken in West Africa; Kampuchea, spoken in Cambodia; dialectal Arabic, spoken in North Africa and the Middle East; and Berber, spoken in North Africa. In the 1998/1999 school year, more than 12,000 pupils took such exams. Among the languages chosen, dialectal Arabic holds a prime position with 75% of the candidates.

11.3 Home language survey in Lyon

The HLS in Lyon was carried out with the collaboration of the School Inspection Department of Lyon. Around 60,000 questionnaires were sent to primary schools in Lyon and its surroundings. Unfortunately, out of 173 schools, only 42 cooperated and returned 11,647 completed questionnaires. This constituted a low number compared to the objective laid down at the beginning of the project. Two reasons for this outcome can be mentioned. On the one hand, the investigation took place at a time when the directors of primary schools were on strike and, therefore, refused to open mail from the School Inspection. On the other hand, due to a lack of financial means, there was an insufficient number of research-assistants for a more extensive realisation of the survey. To put the results of the Lyon survey into perspective, Table 11.10 gives the distribution of population groups in the Rhône area, of which Lyon is the capital.

Population groups		National	Rhône
French		52,903,200	1,259,832
Foreigners		4,323,008	170,676
European Union countries	Spanish	213,518	7,939
	Italian	303,543	12,625
	Portuguese	778,256	22,647
Maghreb countries	Algerian	777,332	59,313
	Moroccan	663,731	10,512
	Tunisian	224,096	20,696
Turkey		262,652	11,556

Table 11.10 Distribution of population groups in France and in the Rhône area (INSEE 1999)

According to Table 11.10, the proportion of the foreign population in the Rhône area in 1999 was 13.5%, whereas at the national level this was 3.14%. The Rhône area has, thus, a relatively high percentage of inhabitants coming from abroad. Among the IM communities listed in the department, two groups are most prominent, i.e., people from Maghreb countries and from Portugal.

Concerning the distribution of pupils across age groups, Table 11.11 shows that most pupils who participated in the survey were aged between 6 and 11 years.

Age group	Total	Proportion
4 and 5	62	–
6	1,634	14%
7	1,735	15%
8	2,074	18%
9	2,483	21%
10	2,562	22%
11	666	6%
12 and 13	71	–
Unknown	370	3%
Total	11,647	100%

Table 11.11 Distribution of pupils across age groups in the survey

Birth country	Pupil		Mother		Father	
France	10,184	87%	6,148	53%	5,490	47%
Algeria	355	3%	1,511	13%	1,629	13%
Tunisia	107	1%	595	5%	684	6%
Turkey	92	1%	399	3%	414	4%
Morocco	83	–	408	4%	423	4%
Bahamas	39	–	49	–	40	–
Portugal	39	–	236	2%	260	2%
Spain	26	–	91	1%	124	1%
Eq. Guinea	22	–	65	1%	93	1%
(former) Yugosl.	22	–	38	–	40	–
Albania	20	–	29	–	36	–
Cameroon	19	–	47	–	37	–
Iraq	18	–	20	–	21	–

Birth country	Pupil		Mother		Father	
St. Vincent	18	–	96	1%	83	1%
Senegal	17	–	74	1%	81	1%
Cambodia	15	–	108	1%	107	1%
Guinea	14	–	36	–	40	–
Kosovo	14	–	16	–	17	–
Somali	14	–	19	–	18	–
Vietnam	14	–	76	1%	81	1%
Italy	13	–	105	1%	140	1%
Brazil	12	–	8	–	5	–
Comoros	11	–	43	–	38	–
Other	186	2%	516	4%	590	5%
Unknown	293	3%	914	8%	1,156	10%
Total	11,647	100%	11,647	100%	11,647	100%

Table 11.12 Distribution of pupils and their parents across birth countries

As Table 11.12 shows, most pupils were born in France (87%). These percentages were much lower for their parents: 47% of the fathers and 53% of the mothers were born in France. In descending order, the other most important birth countries of pupils were Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, and Turkey. It should be noted that a number of pupils did not mention the country of birth of their parents. Especially the very young children did not know the answers to these questions. Among the 11,647 pupils who filled out the questionnaire, 53.5% reported that one or more languages other than or next to French were used at home. In Table 11.13, a list of the 66 reported home languages is presented in descending order.

Nr	Language	Frequency	Nr	Language	Frequency
1	Arabic	2,914	36	Sango	6
2	Turkish	480	37	Akan/Twi/'Ghanese'	5
3	English	435	38	Romani/Sinte	5
4	Spanish	365	39	Soninke	5
5	Portuguese	273	40	Thai	5

Nr	Language	Frequency	Nr	Language	Frequency
6	Creole	268	41	Rwanda	4
7	Italian	265	42	Turoyo	4
8	Berber	149	43	Hungarian	3
9	Cambodian	118	44	Polish	3
10	German	94	45	Czech	2
11	Vietnamese	93	46	Douala	2
12	Albanian	65	47	Ewe	2
13	Somali	53	48	Fulani/Peulh	2
14	Laotian	51	49	Macedonian	2
15	Comorian	48	50	Mina	2
16	Armenian	41	51	Roumanian	2
17	Kurdish	41	52	Tahitian	2
18	Chinese	38	53	Azeri	1
19	Wolof/'Singhalese'	36	54	Bangui	1
20	Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian	27	55	Bulgarian	1
21	Malagasy	20	56	Chaldean	1
22	Lingala	16	57	Danish	1
23	Maori	16	58	Georgian	1
24	Bambara	15	59	I(g)bo	1
25	Bulu	15	60	Saami	1
26	Tamil	14	61	Sardinian	1
27	Afrikaans	13	62	Swahili	1
28	Dari/Pashtu/'Afghan'	12	63	Swedish	1
29	Russian/Belorussian	12	64	Tshiluba	1
30	Ivrit	11	65	Urdu	1
31	Farsi	8	66	Yoruba	1
32	Greek	8			
33	Japanese	8			
34	Malay	8			
35	Hmong	6			
Total of tokens					6,106

Table 11.13 Ranking list of references made to languages

Only 14 languages were reported by more than 50 pupils, while 22 languages were reported by only one or two pupils. The top-19 languages, which are discussed in more detail below, were mentioned by 93.5% of the participating pupils. Table 11.14 contains references to countries or areas of a country (like Kosovo and Corsica) of which only four could be identified as languages.

Reference to country/region	Language	N
1 Congolese	Unknown	35
2 Guinean	Guyanian/Guyanian Creole	27
3 Kosovar	Albanian	11
4 Gabonais	Unknown	10
5 Indian	Unknown	10
6 Mayotte	Comore	8
7 Béninois	Unknown	5
8 Togo	Unknown	5
9 Côte d'Ivoire	Unknown	4
10 Moroccan	Unknown	4
11 Malian	Unknown	3
12 Reunion	Creole	2
13 Caledonian	Unknown	1
14 Corsica	Corse	1
15 Canadian	Unknown	1
16 Nigerian	Unknown	1
17 Tchadian	Unknown	1
18 Sierra Leone	Unknown	1
Total tokens		130

Table 11.14 Ranked references to countries and regions with their possible derivations

A surprising outcome is the large number of pupils who referred to the use of English at home. When the birth countries of these pupils are examined, it appears that 87% of them were born in France, as were 60% of their mothers and 57% of their fathers. According to the list of other languages used at home in addition to English, 70 pupils mentioned Arabic, 64 Spanish, 44 Italian, and 27 German. These families may consist partly of couples of different origins. English was reported frequently as a home language in other cities too (see other chapters in this Volume).

In the list of languages most often mentioned, we find two languages whose use in France could be attributed to recent immigration, i.e., Arabic and Turkish, with 46.5% and 7.5% of the total number of pupils, respectively. In fourth and fifth positions are two languages whose use results from earlier immigration, i.e., Spanish and Portuguese. These two languages, formerly labelled as immigrant languages, currently enjoy a higher status in French FLT, in particular since Spain and Portugal became part of the EU. The status of Italian, which occupies the seventh position in the list of languages, was improved in a similar way.

It is remarkable to find Creole in the sixth position among the listed languages. The term 'Creole' is a common denominator for a variety of spoken Creole languages. It is essential to distinguish between French, English, and Portuguese Creoles. When we look at the birth countries of the pupils who mentioned this language, we note that 79% of them were born in France. The countries of birth of their parents provide more information on the various Creoles spoken by these pupils, i.e., Equatorial Guinea (Portuguese-based Creole), Saint Vincent and the Bahamas (English-based Creole), and the Island of Reunion (French-based Creole).

Lastly, in the list of the languages mentioned by at least 100 pupils, we find Berber in eight position and Cambodian in ninth position. Lyon, like Nice, also accommodates a large Vietnamese community.

Our analyses also provided a language vitality index for the top-19 languages mentioned by the pupils. For information on how we calculated this language vitality index (henceforward LVI), we refer to Chapter 6 in this Volume. Table 11.15 presents the vitality indices for the top-19 languages in descending order. In Lyon, Turkish was found to be the most vital language, followed by Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Armenian. German and Somali were the languages with the lowest indices. According to assumptions on ethnolinguistic vitality, mother tongues which have a high ethnolinguistic vitality tend to be maintained, whereas those which have a weak vitality tend to be replaced by the mainstream language of the particular country. In certain studies, however, it was established that the larger the typological difference between languages in contact is, the more the minority language is maintained (Kipp *et al.* 1995). Based on this last finding, one could argue that Turkish, Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Armenian are languages that have more chances of intergenerational survival than languages that show a closer resemblance to French. Concerning the high vitality of Turkish in this survey, an important factor may be the strong sense of solidarity among Turkish immigrants in France (Tribalat 1998), which enables them to practice their language in everyday life without having true contact with speakers of French (Akinci & Yağmur 2003).

Language group	Total pupils	Language proficiency	Language choice	Language dominance	Language preference	LVI
Turkish	480	95	82	38	47	65
Cambodian	118	92	69	20	42	56
Vietnamese	93	84	66	18	43	53
Armenian	41	77	51	42	43	53
Arabic	2,914	84	45	22	55	52
Laotian	51	90	46	20	46	50
Creole	268	87	35	24	53	50
Portuguese	273	86	30	19	58	48
Albanian	65	62	51	34	37	46
Berber	149	76	40	19	41	44
Comorian	48	82	30	14	33	40
Kurdish	41	65	32	26	25	37
Spanish	365	66	16	11	46	35
Wolof	36	65	24	8	37	33
Italian	265	61	14	10	47	33
Chinese	38	65	18	10	32	31
English	435	61	18	7	35	30
German	94	41	13	5	27	22
Somali	53	21	16	11	15	16

Table 11.15 LVI per language group and language dimension (in %, LVI in cumulative %)

11.4 Home language instruction in primary and secondary schools

In this section, we focus on nine parameters of HLI at primary schools. Where relevant, reference is made to language teaching in secondary schools as well.

(1) Target groups

As mentioned earlier, there is a distinction between HLI and ETL. In secondary education, one speaks of FLT. From a legal perspective, all children between 6 and 16 years old living in France have the right and the obligation to go to school. HLI is offered to IM children originating from source countries like Morocco, Tunisia, and Turkey. The languages currently offered in this programme are standard Arabic, Portuguese, Spanish, and Turkish. In accordance with the bilateral agreements between France and the countries of origin, HLI is offered only to children

originating from these countries. Children who do not have these nationalities or who do not originate from these countries have no access to HLI. For participation in HLI, it is necessary that the child has developed some proficiency in the home language. The reason for this is that HLI begins when the child is in the second grade of primary school. To establish HLI classes in any public school, a minimum of 12 participating pupils is required. Another factor that plays a role is the availability of teachers, as their weekly teaching times are limited. These classes, which cannot be more than three hours per week, are given in the periods after regular classes, on Wednesday afternoons or Saturdays, or early in the morning. Recently, ETL was introduced in all primary schools after the third grade. The dominant foreign language chosen by the children is English in 97% of cases.

FLT is offered to pupils from the first grade of secondary school on and continues to the end of secondary school. FLT is obligatory for pupils in secondary education. Pupils commonly continue to take lessons in the foreign languages that they had already chosen in primary school. For children who have recently come to France, there are special classes, named CLIN (*Classes d'initiation*) in primary schools and CLAD (*Classes d'adaptation*) in secondary schools. In these classes, intensive French instruction is provided so that recently arrived pupils can be placed in the grade appropriate to their age in the shortest possible time.

(2) Arguments

The history of minority language teaching in France and the motivation to provide it is interesting. The beginnings of minority language teaching date back to the early 1950s when regional language teaching (henceforward RLT) achieved a form of recognition, having earlier been marginally tolerated. However, it was only in 1982 that the French government started to organise RLT on a voluntary basis. In 1996/1997, nearly 100,000 pupils received RLT in primary schools. In the same school year, 155,000 pupils received RLT in secondary schools (Poignant 1998).

Regional languages are defined as the languages of culture of the Republic other than French. The qualification 'regional' differentiates them from the so-called 'foreign living languages' which are not 'territorialised' languages. These are languages used by foreigners (see Section 11.1) or French citizens of foreign origin. RLT has a longer history and tradition than the teaching of IM languages. It was only at the beginning of the 1970s that the Ministry of National Education showed serious concern about languages and cultures of foreign origin in France (LIDIL 1990). Until then, only migrant associations and consulates of various countries occupied themselves with these issues. The interest of the French government in the languages and cultures of IM groups led not only to the establishment of CLIN and CLAD classes (see above) but also to the installation of classes for HLI, which are

the responsibility of the countries of origin but controlled by the French educational authorities.

Originally, the arguments for HLI were that it would help foreign pupils integrate into the French educational system, while enabling them to maintain bonds with the languages and cultures of their countries of origin in preparation for a possible return to these countries. As it was recognised in France that the return of immigrants and their families is a myth, the present arguments for HLI focus on overcoming the possible marginalisation of new-coming children, and to a lesser extent second or third generation children, while at the same time enabling them to acquire the basics of their languages and cultures of origin.

(3) Objectives

Objectives have been spelled out only for the teaching of regional languages, both at the level of primary and secondary education. No such objectives have ever been formulated for the teaching of IM languages.

(4) Evaluation

In the French school system, the formal evaluation of pupils begins in the first grade of primary school. Every trimester, parents are informed about their child's performance and progress. Through these reports, teachers inform parents about the child's position at school, both academically, with grades for each subject, and socially. At the beginning of the third grade, all pupils take part in a nationwide written examination in French and mathematics. A similar evaluation takes place in the first year of secondary education. IM children who have participated in HLI receive a mark for HLI on their report every trimester. This evaluation, however, plays no role for later studies, and French teachers usually do not ask HLI teachers about their evaluation. This is due to the fact that there is little contact, and in some schools no contact at all, between HLI teachers and the French teaching staff. In this respect, there is a clear watershed in the French school system: the HLI teacher is always a foreigner, and, therefore, he or she is rarely invited to school staff meetings or pedagogic programmes.

In some secondary schools, where a French teacher does FLT, the HLI marks obtained are included in the report as a 'regular' subject and are as important as the marks for other core subjects. In the last year of secondary school (grade 9), pupils conclude their studies with an examination in all subjects. The first foreign language is evaluated in this examination as well. Actually, the marks given by the foreign language teachers in secondary schools have the same status as those given in primary school, that is, they have no consequences for admission to the next level in the educational system.

(5) Enrolment

The minimum enrolment rate in HLI classes in France as agreed between France and a number of source countries is 12 (see above). This causes a real problem for the teaching of those languages for which speakers are scarce in certain areas. In those cases, the minimum condition of 12 pupils cannot be met. On the other hand, the required number of 12 children can easily be reached in most areas by placing children from different grades and/or schools in one HLI class.

The languages taught in the second degree are offered in the form of one optional hour for all pupils. Moreover, a three hours option is offered to pupils in the 3rd and 4th degree. In secondary school classes 1 and 2, pupils can choose these languages as obligatory or optional lessons. There are no minimum enrolment requirements, and the existence of a foreign language class depends on such factors as teacher availability and demand from pupils.

(6) Curricular status

Since the bilateral agreements were made, no changes have occurred for HLI classes. In all cases, instruction is given for a maximum of three hours per week. However, this is most commonly one and a half hours because of the limited availability of teachers. HLI is usually offered outside school hours in the same school building, in the majority of cases in the late afternoon, between 16:30 and 18:00, on Wednesday afternoons and on Saturdays. HLI may also be offered during school hours, which is referred to as 'integrated courses'. This is rarely done, however, because it often results in children missing regular classes. The disadvantage of classes outside school hours is that both teachers and pupils are isolated. There is no communication with 'regular' teachers about what the children are working on in HLI, which confirms that HLI is an isolated activity that does not belong to the core programme. Integrated courses offer the double advantage of close co-operation between HLI teachers and regular teachers in the schools, and the participation of a greater number of pupils. Unfortunately, classes outside school hours are most common all over France.

In secondary schools, it is becoming more and more accepted that IM languages such as Arabic or Turkish can be chosen as a second or third foreign language. It is interesting to note that the former French minister for National Education proposed the creation of a new language-teaching system in primary education whereby the languages taught in HLI would be given the same status as the languages in ELT. At the present time, pupils follow, starting from the first year of secondary schooling, lessons in a foreign language. They can choose among the twelve following languages: English, German, modern Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, modern Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Dutch, Polish, Portuguese, and Russian. In the

third year of secondary schooling, pupils can choose a second language as obligatory or optional. To these twelve languages, Turkish and regional languages are added.

(7) Funding

The countries of origin finance HLI, that is, the teachers' salaries, the renting of classrooms, and all relevant costs. ELT is organised and financed completely by the French state.

(8) Teaching materials

Originally, nearly all teaching materials for HLI originated from the source countries. These materials soon proved inappropriate as they were intended for use in the teaching of these languages as mainstream languages and, of course, the contents did not at all reflect the cultural experiences of the children in the new country, France. This led, though only minimally, to the development of new teaching materials in France. According to official rhetorics, HLI teachers are invited to practice an open intercultural pedagogy, to take an active part in the various cultures of the pupils, and, if necessary, to play the role of intercultural mediator in case of difficulties in communication between parents/teachers and pupils/teachers. Each country defines its HLI programme on the basis of various bilateral principles. For example, the Moroccan programme aims at giving the children "through Arabic language teaching and Islamic education [...] the possibility of reading and writing the Arabic language", whereas the Tunisian programme aims at encouraging the child "to express himself/herself with ease in functional Arabic." Nevertheless, the organisation of HLI raises a number of issues which have consequences for the whole school community:

- all HLI programmes are prepared without taking into consideration the 'regular' programme of French schools and without dialogue with French teachers;
- HLI privileges the mainstream language of the country of origin without taking into account other home language varieties or linguistic practices specific to immigrant families;
- at the cultural level, the contents of the lessons commonly refer to the country of origin and, therefore, ignore the cultural transformations which individuals and whole social groups undergo in a context of migration;
- though considerable efforts may be made, HLI teachers, often not French-speaking foreigners, hardly cooperate with the local teaching staff.

(9) Teacher qualifications

HLI teachers are full-time teachers in primary and secondary education, who have been trained in their countries of origin. Often, they are sent to in France for four or five years, or even seven years in the case of Algerians. As a result of a ministerial circular of 1983, HLI teacher qualifications are the responsibility of both a French Academy inspector and an inspector from the country of origin.

11.5 Conclusions and discussion

The multilingual character of primary schools in Lyon is a well-known phenomenon, but in our sociolinguistic investigation we documented the extent of multilingualism in Lyon in much more detail. On several dimensions, our results are similar to those of earlier studies of language practices of immigrant families in France (Akinci 1996, 2003, Billiez 1990, Deprez 1994, Leconte 1998, Véronique 1998). Our study revealed, in addition, new data on the distribution, classification, and vitality of the languages spoken at homes by IM pupils.

It is important to note that many children from Arabic, Chinese, Creole, Turkish, and Vietnamese backgrounds want to learn their home languages. All of these languages, with the exception of Chinese, show high vitality, and they are also the languages of recent immigrants. Therefore, it is especially these languages that should appear in the ELT at primary school. When reinforced at school, ELT could oppose the loss of the languages of IM pupils born and growing up in France. With the ongoing integration of the EU, we are in need of individuals with bicultural as well as bilingual competences. Based on a study of the teaching of French and Arabic to primary school children of Maghreb origin in Grenoble, Billiez (1990:45) concluded that the simultaneous teaching of two languages constitutes an enrichment for the child, at least when a number of institutional and administrative prerequisites are met. In such a way, a true pedagogy of bilingualism would be promoted instead of the simple addition of a few erratic language teaching hours.

References

Akinci, M.-A. (1996). Les pratiques langagières chez les immigrés turcs en France. *Écarts d'Identité* 76, 14-17.

Akinci, M.-A. (2003). Une situation de contact de langues. Le cas turc-français des immigrés turcs en France. In: J. Billiez (Ed.) *Contacts de langues: modèles, typologies, interventions*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 127-144.

Akinci, M.-A., J.J. de Ruiter & F. Sanagustin (2004). *Le plurilinguisme à Lyon. Le statut des langues à la maison et à l'école*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Akinci, M.-A. & K. Yağmur (2003). Language use and attitudes of Turkish immigrants in France and their subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions, In: A. Özsoy (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 299-309.

Berthouz-Proux, M. (1973). Quelques problèmes de bilinguismes comparés. *Etudes de Linguistique Appliquée* 9, 51-63.

Billiez, J. (1990). Le double apprentissage français-arabe au Cours Préparatoire. *LIDIL* 2, 17-50.

Broeder, P. & G. Extra (1998). *Language, ethnicity and education. Case studies of immigrant minority groups and immigrant minority languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

CNFP Réseau (2000). *Les langues vivantes à l'école; Recueil des textes officiels*. Lyon: Centre Régional de Documentation Pédagogique de l'Académie de Lyon (CNDP).

Dabène, L. *et al.* (1988). *L'insertion des jeunes issus de l'immigration algérienne; aspects sociolinguistiques, discursifs et sociopolitiques*. Rapport. CDL-LIDILEM Université Stendhal Grenoble 3.

Deprez, C. (1994). *Les enfants bilingues: langues et familles*. Fontenay/Saint Cloud: Didier.

Extra, G. & D. Gorter (Eds.) (2001). *The other languages of Europe. Demographic, sociolinguistic and educational perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gardin, B. (Ed.) (1976). L'apprentissage du français par les travailleurs immigrés. *Langue Française* 29.

Héran, F., A. Filhon & C. Deprez (2002). La dynamique des langues en France au fil du XXe siècle. *Populations & Sociétés* 376, 1-4.

Heredia-Deprez, C. (1976). Pour une étude des rapports aux langues maternelles dans la migration. *Langue Française* 29, 31-44.

INSEE (1994). *Les étrangers en France. Contours et caractères*. Paris, INSEE.

INSEE (1999). *Mars 1999 recensement de la population. Tableaux références et analyses, PPLE DP 69*. Paris:l'Harmattan.

Kipp, S., M. Clyne & A. Pauwels (1995). *Immigration and Australia's language resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Leconte, F. (1998). *La famille et les langues. Une étude sociolinguistique de la deuxième génération de l'immigration africaine dans l'agglomeration rouennaise*. Paris: l'Harmattan.

LIDIL, (1990). *Les langues et cultures des populations migrantes: un défi à l'école française* 2, Grenoble: PUG.

Marty, N. (2002). Les langues entrent au programme. *JDI (Journal des instituteurs et des institutrices)* 6, 61-75.

Masthoff, P. (1998). La France. In: P. Obdeijn & J.J. de Ruiter (Eds.), *Le Maroc au cœur de l'Europe. L'enseignement de la langue et culture d'origine (ELCO) aux élèves marocains dans cinq pays européens*. Tilburg, Tilburg University Press, Syntax Datura, 13-67.

Merabti, N. (1991). *Pratiques bilingues et réseaux personnels de communication*.Université Stendhal Grenoble 3 (Thèse de Doctorat).

Ministère de l'Education Nationale (2001a). *Dossier de presse, rentrée scolaire 2001, l'école (www.education.gouv.fr/discours/2001/rentree/ecole.htm)*.

Ministère de l'Education Nationale (2001b). Enseignements élémentaire et secondaire. *Bulletin Officiel n° 1* (Janvier 1999). Paris: Ministère de L'Education Nationale.

Ministère de l'Education Nationale (2001c). Les élèves du premier degré. *Repères et Statistiques*. Paris: Ministère de l'Education Nationale.

Obin, J.P. & A. Obin-Coulon (1999). *Immigration et intégration*. Paris: Hachette Education.

Poignant, B. (1998). *Langues et cultures régionales*. Rapport à Monsieur Lionel Jospin Premier Ministre, 1er juillet.

Relevement des Conclusions (2000). Relevé des conclusions de la réunion des groupes de travail mixtes franco-algérien, espagnol, marocain, portugais, tunisien et turc.

Tribalat, M. (1998). Populations originaires de Turquie en France. In: L. Gervereau, P. Milza & E. Temine (Eds.), *Toute la France. Histoire de l'immigration en France au XX siècle*. Paris: Somogy.

Véronique, D. (1998). Étudier la dynamique des bilinguismes issus de l'immigration. In: J. Billiez (Ed.), *De la didactique des langues à la didactique du plurilinguisme. Hommage à Louise Dabène*. Grenoble: CDL-LIDILEM, 179-186.