

[論文]

Development of Education Policies for Migrant Children Towards Social Inclusion: The Cases of England and France

Seiko OYAMA *

Introduction

Education policies for migrant children have been developed in different ways in England and France since the 1960s. The assimilationist approach and institutional discrimination of migrant children were criticised in the 1950s and 1960s. This encouraged teachers and staff to be more aware and respectful of cultural diversity in English schools. On the other hand, within the French Republican framework, the recognition of diversity brings in tension with equality and universality (J-F Chanlat, 2017). Cultural aspects of migrant children have hardly been taken into account in French public schools.

In the 1960s, underachievement among migrant children was explained by factors such as socio-economic and cultural deprivation. The 1970s were marked by stronger links between education and economy, and concepts such as 'poverty' and 'unemployment' characterised the people who were excluded from economic growth. French political discourse in the 1980s contributed towards the formation of the socially 'excluded' people who were unemployed because of the lack of both adequate skills and diplomas from schools (H. Silver, 1994). International organisations such as UNESCO also focused on children who were excluded from education and asserted the need for 'Education for all'¹. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education, declared that schools have to accommodate all children regardless of disadvantaged and marginalised conditions, including disabled children as well as children from linguistic, ethnic, and cultural minorities (UNESCO, 1994). The internationalisation of the agenda in favour of inclusive education for all children and the introduction of market-oriented principles have grouped 'disadvantaged' children in socio-economic and cultural terms in English and French national education systems. Social inclusion of all children through education became one of the principal agendas for the New Labour

投稿日2018年9月26日 受理日2018年11月28日
*教養学部国際学科准教授

government in England in the late 1990s, and a number of resources were directed towards the population at large, including migrant children, to combat social exclusion (Alexiadou, 2016). The principle objective of such policies was the integration of people into the labour market. Therefore, they targeted higher achievement among disadvantaged groups within a market context through social and educational differentiation (Alexiadou, 2011).

This article focuses on the development of education policies for migrant children after 2010 when new educational frameworks were introduced for the inclusion of these children in England and France. After 1997, the Labour government encouraged the diversification of schools in England, and academisation was one of its approaches in doing so. Under the Coalition government after 2010, the academisation of primary and secondary schools was accelerated. This precipitated competition for resources among schools. The marketisation process hardly helped schools address social, economic, and cultural disadvantages (Alexiadou, 2011). The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG)ⁱⁱ was abolished in 2012, and therefore schools and local authorities could no longer count on a targeted budget to deal with ethnic minority children's difficulties at school.

In French public schools, there was also a remarkable reform in the integration process of new arrivals in the same period. There had been initiation and adaptation classes (*Classe d'Initiation*; CLIN and *Classe d'Adaptation*; CLAD) for new arrivals in the public education system since the 1970s. However, in 2012, these 'classes' turned into 'unities' (*unité pédagogique pour élèves allophones arrivants*, UPE2A)ⁱ where new arrivals were supposed to be 'included' in the mainstream classes as soon as possible. Circular No. 2012-141 of 2-10-2012 of the Ministry of Education underlines the passage from the 'integration' to 'inclusion' of the new arrival children within the French public education system.

'Inclusion' has been set as a common and major objective in recent education policies for migrant children in England and France. However, the term 'inclusion' has not been defined anywhere. This article analyses the development of new education policies for migrant children, focusing on the conceptual framework for social inclusion and education. In doing so, this article will refer to the framework discussed by the New Labour government and focus on the problem of economic and cultural inclusion (D. Muijs et al., 2008). This article argues that although inclusive policies for migrant children developed in different ways in both countries, they are both based on the functionalist perspectives of economic inclusion.

Economic and cultural aspects of social inclusion in education

Lindblad and Popkewitz (1999, p.5) argue that the 'way an educational system in a society is governed has an impact on social integration/exclusion inside as well as outside education'. Education policies have been increasingly considered as one of the important factors in the fight

against social exclusion at the local, national, and international levels. Lindblad and Popkewitz (1999, p.5) also suggest that the 'relationships between steering and social integration/exclusion are dependent on contextual circumstances inside as well as outside educational systems'. This idea is supported by critics. It casts doubts on the role of education in overcoming the exclusion of disadvantaged groups, because there is another argument that the production of inequality is built into a society.

To fight the social exclusion inherent in the education system, the New Labour government in England introduced a 'holistic approach' to education, and 'Every Child Matters (2003)' was one of them (Alexiadou, 2011). The present study is based on the conceptual framework developed by D. Muijs et al. (2008) for the promotion of social inclusion at school under 'Every Child Matters'. This framework examines the links between social inclusion and education policy from economic and cultural perspectives. Economic inclusion is realised by enabling access to economic resources and promoting success in the economic field through schooling and by enabling people to benefit from labour market opportunities (Muijs et al., 2008). Cultural inclusion is concerned with representation and stereotyping, and the institutional rules and processes that may culturally exclude some groups from mainstream social life.

This article analyses the functionalist aspects considered in the new inclusive framework for migrant children by studying whether new educational policies take it for granted that 'social inclusion is an important part in the proper functioning of society that brings benefits both to society as a whole and to individuals within that society' (Muijs et al., 2008, p. 3). This article tries to compare the objectives set by the new inclusive provisions and the functionalist aspects reflected in the school systems by studying whether the provisions are based on economic inclusion or cultural inclusion.

Academisation and its impact on inclusive education for migrant children

The New Labour government encouraged maintained schools, which receive funding through local authorities, to become academies in order to enable greater autonomy for their management and curricula. Because the conversion to academies was only reserved for underperforming secondary schools, very few schools actually converted. A Conservative-Liberal Coalition government pushed for further academisation through the Academies Act 2010, by encouraging all secondary, primary, and special schools to convert to academies. At the same time, new academies such as free schools, university technical colleges (UTCs), and studio schools were also opened. Academies enjoy significant freedoms in shaping their curricula, employing teachers, and in framing admissions and management policies under the academy arrangements, which take the form of academy agreements and financial assistance made directly with the Secretary of State for Education. Academisation was carried out with the

objective of enabling greater autonomy of schools and independence from local authorities. The goal was to raise the schools' levels of achievement (West, 2013, 2015).

The diversification of school types is expected to bring about a differentiated pedagogy, in principle, for vulnerable and disadvantaged pupils including newly arrived migrant children. Two major types of academies were established based on school performance as inspected by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED): converter and sponsoredⁱⁱⁱ. However, this did not prevent the concentration of vulnerable and disadvantaged children in underachieving sponsored academies. Academies Annual Report of the year 2014-2015 shows that the proportion of special educational needs (SEN) children is much higher in sponsored academies (17.0% at the primary level and 17.3% at the secondary level) than in converter academies (13.5% at the primary level and 12.8% at the secondary level) (DfE, 2016). A larger number of ethnic minority children are registered in sponsored academies (38.3% at the primary level and 31.1% at the secondary level) than in converter academies (25.9% at the primary level and 23.4% at the secondary level). The proportion of ethnic minority children in sponsored academies is higher than in all state-funded schools (30.4% at the primary level and 26.6% at the secondary level) (DfE, 2016). Further, significantly higher numbers of pupils eligible for Free School Meals (FSM) are found in primary and secondary sponsored academies than the national average. At the primary level, 26.2% pupils in sponsored academies are eligible for FSM, when compared to the 15.6% in all state-funded schools. In secondary sponsored academies, 23.5% pupils are eligible for FSM, when compared to 13.9% in the state-funded secondary schools. The proportion of these children in converter academies is much lower at both primary (13.7%) and secondary (9.7%) levels. These statistics show that diversification of school choices available to parents and pupils increased competition among schools.

The current structure within schools operates with 'choice' and 'selection' principles, and thus, emphasises on differentiation (Alexiadou, 2011). The statistics show that academisation has augmented the concentration of vulnerable and disadvantaged children in underachieving schools, although the schools themselves might have intended to pursue the functionalist integration of varying groups. The government has published 'Equality Objectives' (DfE, 2014, p.2) based on the Equality Act of 2010 to recall inclusive practices by setting the vision of 'a highly-educated society in which opportunity is more equal for children and young people no matter what their background or family circumstances'. 'Equality Objectives' emphasise a functionalist integration of disadvantaged children by supporting them in realising their full potential, and raising their attainment and monitoring it to ensure increased opportunities and improved outcomes (DfE, 2014).

These actions are all based on performance management, standards-driven curriculum, and marketisation. Raising standards of educational achievement aims to ensure that all children gain knowledge that can inspire them to enter the world of work and close the achievement gap

between the rich and the poor by taking socio-economic deprivation into consideration. The Coalition government has prioritised the rhetoric of an education policy for social inclusion, and at the same time, has continued to 'promote measures that intensify the principles and practices of the market in education' (Alexiadou, 2011, p. 595).

Diverse approach for cultural inclusion at English schools

Differentiated educational support for ethnic minority children has been provided in English schools since 1960s. However, under the Coalition government, the Department for Education decided to end the EMAG funding. The Coalition government abolished the budget meant for specific support concerning cultural aspects of migrant children (the EMAG) in 2012. Local authorities had to reduce staff and services for specific support of ethnic minority children after an announcement of budget cuts from core funding by 2014/15^{iv}. With the end of the EMAG in 2012, schools and staff lost the dedicated financial resources that helped them support ethnic minority children. Schools had total autonomy to decide whether to allocate a certain portion of their budget for the differentiated support of ethnic minority children.

The Coalition government focused on socio-economic deprivation as one of the important risk factors for underachievement. It also introduced 'pupil premium' grants in 2011 with the aim of raising the attainment levels of FSM children. One of the 'Equality Objectives' of 2014 suggested that academy grammar schools could use pupil premium grants to make arrangements for admission. By the allocation of pupil premium grants, the government encouraged all schools to prioritise pupil premium admissions with the aim of avoiding socio-economic segregation in student selection (Alexiadou, 2016).

With the introduction of pupil premium grants, the government paid more attention to newly arrived English as additional language (EAL) children, especially from new member states of the European Union just after its enlargement. Schools can use pupil premium grants and offer specialised support for underachieving EAL children, although all EAL children are not eligible for FSM.

Inclusion provisions after 2010 progressively emphasised socio-economic perspectives as important risk factors for the underachievement of migrant children. In his article, Strand (2015) argued that low attainment was more inherent in socio-economic factors than in ethnicity or origin. Cultural aspects are considered for their inclusion at school. Citizenship education under the National Curriculum reflects and respects diverse national, regional, religious, and ethnic identities in the UK. Whether bilingual support can be offered or the use of the first language of EAL children at school can be encouraged depends entirely on EAL teachers and differentiated provisions available at school. Maintained schools have the choice to work together with the Local Authority by asking for EAL staff and services. Academies are dependent on their internal

resources or the resources of the Multi Academy Trust for EAL strategy.

Inclusion rather than integration in France

Education policies for migrant children have been extremely limited in France because the differentiation of children in the public education system, based on their origin, ethnicity, and other factors is not allowed under the Republican principle of equality. The special provisions for new arrival children created the CLIN at the primary level and the CLAD at the secondary level in the beginning of the 1970s. The principal objective of these classes was the acquisition of French language for the quick integration of children into ordinary classes and in the mainstream school environment. These classes had welcomed children whose first language was not French. Circular No. 2002-100 of 25-4-2002 insisted on the Republican principle of equality and allowed only foreign nationals to attend these classes.

Provisions addressing education such as CLIN and CLAD were the major policies targeting migrant children for about forty years in the French public education system. There had been a discussion about the disadvantages for new arrival children who were put in the same structure despite their different levels of French language acquisition^v. Special provisions governing new arrival children were transformed by Circular No. 2012-141 of 2-10-2012, and the CLIN and CLAD were replaced by the UPE2A. Under these provisions, the children are put in a grouped unity but not in a fixed class. The provisions aim to maintain the openness of this unity towards mainstream classes and ensure a rapid and smooth adaptation of the children to the rules and functioning of the school.

The UPE2A brought different aspects into the inclusive provisions for migrant children. The new provision insists on the transition of the pedagogical and schooling approach from 'integration' to 'inclusion'. Under the previous provisions such as CLIN and CLAD, French language teachers were responsible for the integration of new arrival children and these children had a relative distance from their mainstream classes before they attained a certain level of French language skills. The new provision is in conformity with the principle of inclusive schooling for all children, which was reaffirmed as the *droit commun* by Act No.2013-595 of 8 July 2013. Allophone children, whose first language is not French, are entitled to specific pedagogical support which helps include them into the public education system (MEN, 2016). In the reference report titled 'Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future' of an international conference held by UNESCO in Geneva in 2008, the 'inclusion' process was defined in a different manner when compared to the definition of 'integration'. The integration models developed by the French public education in the 1980s and 1990s urged all students to adapt to the 'existing norms, styles, routines and practices of the education system', and the fixed model was questioned for its relevance for all students, regardless of the diversities among them (UNESCO, 2008, p.9). On the

other hand, inclusive education implies the conception and the implementation of learning strategies to respond to learners' diversities (UNESCO, 2008). Inclusive education requires the reformation of the education system so that it can correspond to different expectations (Garel, 2010).

Teachers and staff as well as members of the community at large developed and shared the principles by taking into account cultural ethics, personalised support, and collective work with different partners. The openness of UPE2A towards the mainstream class and the whole school has brought about a major institutional change in the special provisions for new migrant children. The enrolment of new arrival migrant children in a mainstream class was mandatory even under Circular No. 2002-100 of 25-4-2002. However, new arrivals were trained for over 12 hours in the CLIN or CLAD, and spent most of their time in these withdrawn classes until they acquired the expected level of skill in French. Under the UPE2A, the duration of intensive French training was reduced to a minimum of nine hours a week for primary children. Further, allophone children have to take at least two different disciplines besides French. Allophone children are integrated into mainstream classes according to their French language skills. Therefore, schedules are formulated individually. Schooling records must be shared for each student, especially for those who have changed schools.

Collaborative work is required not only for teachers of French as a second language (FSL), but also for mainstream teachers. This has been institutionalised at schools. At the secondary level, FSL teachers can organise collaborative teaching with teachers of other disciplines. For example, in a secondary school, an FSL teacher holds the classes with other teachers to teach different subjects such as plastic art, modern foreign languages, gymnastics, and chemistry in French. In a few other schools, the FSL teacher is among several teachers responsible for UPE2A. Teachers of other subjects, such as mathematics, take charge of UPE2A a few hours every week. FSL teachers are also required to work in mainstream classes because the pedagogy has to be differentiated to meet the specific needs of allophone children.

The representation of the first language of the children at school was one of the drastic changes in the new provision. As one of the member states of the European Union, the benefit of plurilingualism was widely recognised and foreign language education became mandatory at the primary level. Allophone children are encouraged to use their first language in conducting research and in taking notes in class because the first language has been recognised as an advantage for the acquisition of French (DGESCO, 2016b). Inclusive education requires schools and teachers to be more aware of specific needs of allophone children in the classroom. Therefore, the classes must be prepared appropriately for all children to be able to follow the activities with certain cultural and linguistic support.

There has been a new tentative form of linguistic consideration for allophones students in mock-examinations of French language for general and technology Baccalaureate degrees in

certain secondary schools. For example, the Academy of Versailles allows allophone candidates to take oral examinations using texts in their first language or bilingual editions (CASNAV, 2017). The examiner will be also informed of the linguistic situation of allophone students according to the CEFR levels. Accordingly, phrases need to be reformulated to ensure comprehension (CASNAV, 2017). Differentiated treatment for allophone students preparing for Baccalaureate respects the principle of inclusion, mentioned in Circular No. 2012-141 of 2-10-2012, 'to assure the best conditions of the integration for allophone students arrived in France is the obligation for the Republic and his or her school'.

The new provision has valued cultural diversity of allophone children in classrooms and schools. Circular No. 2002-100 of 25-4-2002 respected the maintenance of the first language of the children while also encouraging the maintenance of its acquisition as a modern foreign language (*Langue Vivante I or II*), or making special provisions for mother tongue teaching at or outside school. On the other hand, the new provisions for inclusive education encourage the preservation of the first language of the children for the benefit of their inclusion in mainstream classes. Cultural codes different from those at school and the dominant culture are acknowledged and shared by all teachers and staff at a school for the inclusion of allophone children.

Cultural inclusion inherent to economic inclusion

Our study has shown that the new provision for allophone children after 2012 in the French public education system emphasises cultural aspects for the successful inclusion of these children. The differentiation approach has encouraged schools to develop diversified methods to respond to specific needs and local conditions at the academy level. Schools cannot avoid taking economic perspectives into consideration in the development of new provisions for inclusion.

A rapid increase in the number of newly arrived allophone students urged academies and schools to take on a 'whole school and academy' approach by not leaving most of the work to the teachers in charge of special provisions. The number of newly arrived allophone children registered in public primary and secondary schools was 38,100 in 2010/11, 52,500 in 2014/15, and 60,700 in 2016/17^{vi}. Nonetheless, schools have succeeded in receiving high proportions of those children in inclusive provisions^{vii}. 91% of newly arrived allophone children in 2016/17 were received in such provisions.

Some problems remain, as seen in the statistics. Newly arrived allophone students on the waiting list have increased from 1,800 in June 2015 to 2,800 in June 2017. Approximately 12% to 20% of the newly arrived children were obliged to wait about two weeks to three months to enter secondary schools because there was not enough room in the UPE2A for new arrivals. In 2016/17, 9,300 schools received at least one allophone student each, and 30% of these schools had only one allophone student in total (MEN, 2018). The statistics show that 40% of the 60,700 newly

arrived allophone students were supported by the inclusive provisions in schools that received more than 20 students.

Comparing the statistics between 2014/15 and 2016/17, the proportion of allophone students in UPE2A has decreased from 76% to 67%. It dropped from 78% to 62% in primary schools, 80% to 76% in junior high schools, and 65% to 55% in high schools (MEN, 2015, 2018). The decrease can be explained by the new inclusive approach in which allophone students are urged to participate in a smooth and rapid adaptation into mainstream classes. On the other hand, the proportion of the children included in ordinary classes and were provided linguistic support increased, especially at the primary level. Thus, the new inclusive approach has been institutionalised in primary schools through collaborative work with regular class teachers. We cannot disregard the functionalist perspectives of economic inclusion in these provisions if we look at cases where schools have long waiting lists and a concentration of newly arrived allophone students. In the academy of Bordeaux, the number of cases of UPE2A implanted in schools has decreased and there was only one unity at the primary level in March 2017. In schools where there is no UPE2A on site, the FSL teacher travels from different schools, or the allophone students are made to attend a different school. This 'mobile' UPE2A has allowed greater flexibility in receiving a larger number of allophone students across France (Ibrahima et al., 2016). Offering access to education to newly arrived allophone children, who have been waiting to attend school in France, is beneficial for social cohesion.

Conclusion

Our study has shown that the new inclusive provisions for migrant children after 2010 in England and France reflected the functionalist perspectives of economic inclusion for the benefit of both individuals and the entire society. Although the marketisation of school management has introduced diversity, differentiation, and competition in the system, inclusion in this context 'is satisfied with providing "equal opportunities" to compete, with recognition that unequal contenders have little chance of equal outcomes' (Alexiadou, 2016, p.18). Therefore, the impact of differentiated pedagogy must be studied in terms of the attainments of migrant children.

Marketisation of school management might have a smaller influence on the public education system in France. Schools and teachers in France seem less competent in enabling the higher attainment of 'disadvantaged children' than those in England. However, the impacts of the new provisions, in consideration with the cultural aspects on the inclusion of allophone students in the education system, must be examined with some indicators.

Although the types of new inclusive provisions for migrant children differ in both countries, schools in England and France have urged the formulation of diverse and differentiated pedagogical approaches to encourage the inclusion of these children. By transferring autonomy

into the hands of the schools and teachers, there is a greater need for leadership and higher skill levels in developing differentiated pedagogies. Network building among teachers and schools to exchange and share skills related to inclusive education for migrant children is worth discussing. In addition, differentiation and marketisation will cause a great gap between the schools in which inclusion is successful and the schools in which it is not. Therefore, the impact of equality objectives in the education policies on governing this gap between successful and unsuccessful schools should be studied.

Note

- i 'Education for All' was a commitment in which 164 governments pledged their support for at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000. Governments, development agencies, and civil society were involved and committed to achieving the goals by 2015.
- ii EMAG was introduced in 1999 and associated with a reallocation of national-level policy responsibility from the Home Office to the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE). The grant targeted the enhancement of different levels of educational progress and achievements of ethnic minority children.
- iii Converters are outstanding or good schools which have voluntarily become academies. Sponsored academies are typically underperforming schools which have been compelled to convert.
- iv HM Treasury (2010) Spending Review 2010, October.
- v The adoption of a common structure named 'unité pédagogique pour élèves allophones arrivant (UPEAA)' has been mentioned in the Annual Report of Inspections Générales in 2009 (MEN, 2009).
- vi The following statistics are listed in the references of MEN, Note d'information 2006, 2012, 2015, 2018.
- vii The inclusive provisions are UPE2A, UPE2A-NSA (UPE2A for the children who had no schooling experience), ordinary classes with linguistic support, and others.

References

- Nafsika ALEXIADOU (2011), "Social inclusion and leadership in education: An evolution of roles and values in the English education system over the last 60 years", *Education Inquiry*, volume 2, no.4, December 2011, p. 581-600.
- Nafsika ALEXIADOU, M. DOVEMARK, I. ERIXON-ARREMAN, et al. (2016), "Managing inclusion in competitive school systems: The cases of Sweden and England", *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 11 (1), p. 11-33.
- CASNAV (2017), "Accompagner un élève allophone issu d'UPE2A; vers les Epreuves anticipées de Français du baccalauréat général et technologique.", Académie de Versailles.
- Jean-François CHANLAT (2017), "Management, Diversity, Equal Opportunity, and Social Cohesion in France: The Republic Resistant to Differences", *Management and Diversity*, volume 3, p. 63-89.
- Department for Education (2014), *Equality Objectives*, September.
- Department for Education (2016), *Academies Annual Report, Academic year: 2014 to 2015*, November.
- DGESCO (2016a), *Repères sur l'inclusion des élèves allophones nouvellement arrivés*.
- DGESCO (2016b), *Repères sur l'inclusion des élèves allophone nouvellement arrivés en classe ordinaire, Développer des pratiques de différenciation pédagogique*.
- Jean-Pierre GAREL (2010), "De l'intégration scolaire à l'éducation inclusive: d'une normalisation à

- l'autre". *Journal des anthropologues*, 122-123, p. 143-165.
- Delphine GUEDAT-BITTIGHOFFER (2015), "La scolarisation des élèves allophones au collège: étude comparative des modalités d'organisation de quatre dispositifs d'accueil et des effets potentiels sur l'apprentissage du français", *Les Sciences de l'éducation-Pour l'Ere nouvelle*, vol.48, p. 83-107.
- Diallo IBRAHIMA, K. B. ABDALLAH, M. EMBARKI (2016), "Education provisions in support of allophone students in France: policies, achievements and challenges", *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning, suppl. Special issue: Pedagogies and diverse classrooms*, vol.11, issue 3, p. 248-258.
- Sverker LINDBLAD and Thomas S. POPKWITZ eds.(1999), *Education Governance and Social Integration and Exclusion: National cases of educational systems and recent reforms*, UPPSALA REPORTS ON EDUCATION 34.
- MEN (2006), "La scolarisation des élèves nouveaux arrivants non francophones au cours de l'année scolaire 2004-2005", *note d'information*, 06.08, mars.
- MEN (2009), "Rapport annuel des Inspections générales 2009", La documentation Française.
- MEN (2012), "Les élèves nouveaux arrivants non francophones en 2010-2011", *note d'information*, 12.01, mars.
- MEN (2015), "Année scolaire 2014-2015: 52 000 élèves allophones scolarisés dont 15 300 l'étaient déjà l'année précédente", *note d'information*, no.35 - Octobre.
- MEN (2018), "60 700 élèves allophones en 2016-2017: 90 % bénéficient d'un soutien linguistique", *note d'information*, no.18.15 - Juin.
- Daniel MUIJS, Mel AINSCOW, Carlo RAFFO, et al.,(2008), *Every Child Matters, leading schools to promote social inclusion: a study of practice*, National College for School Leadership.
- Hilary SILVER (1994), "Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms", *International Labour Review*, vol. 133, p. 531-578.
- Steve STRAND (2015), *Ethnicity, Deprivation and Educational Achievement at Age 16 in England: Trends over Time*, Department for Education.
- UNESCO (1994), *Salamanca Statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Paris.
- UNESCO (2008), *Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future*, International Conference on Education, Forty-eighth session, ED/BIE/ONFINTEED 48/3.
- Anne WEST (2013), "The Development of the Academies Programme: 'Privatising' School-Based Education in England 1986-2013", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61:2, p. 137-159.
- Anne WEST (2015), "Education policy and governance in England under the Coalition Government (2010-15): Academies, the pupil premium, and free early education", *London Review of Education*, volume 13, Number 2, September, p. 21-36.

要旨

移民の子どもに対する教育政策の展開と社会的包摂
——仏英比較——

小山 晶子

イギリスとフランスにおける移民の子どもに対する教育政策は、2010年以降に大幅な変化が生じている。イギリスでは、初等・中等学校のアカデミー化をはじめとする学校種の多様化を促す政策の影響を受け、学校現場にいる移民の子どもに対する教育的支援も多岐に渡っている。フランスでは、新規に到着した外国籍生徒の通常学級への迅速な適応を促すために、子どもの第一言語や文化的な背景に配慮する対策が導入されつつある。本論文は、イギリスとフランスにおいて新たな移民の子どもの社会的包摂が目的とされる際に、どのような経済的および文化的側面により配慮した政策が講じられているのかについて比較考察する。