Teachers', Parents' and Children's Perspectives of Teaching and Learning Greek in a Complementary School in Luxembourg

Claudine Kirsch

Abstract

Many scholars have been interested in studying patterns of language shift or language maintenance of migrants during their diaspora. One way of sustaining the development of a home language can be the attendance of a complementary school. This paper explores the differing perspectives on teaching and learning Greek in a complementary school in multilingual Luxembourg. The participants include the two teachers of this school, the mothers of three newly migrated families, and their children. The children are multilingual and attend the Greek complementary school once a week. The data, which stem from interviews with all participants, have been analysed thematically. The findings show that the children's understanding of the purpose of attending the school and their experiences within the school, varied with age and school friendships. The teachers were aware of the children's different levels of motivation, which they associated with language competence and opportunities for socialisation. Although they valued the children's multilingualism, they did not build on this their lessons which were underpinned by a monolingual policy. While the parents had high expectations regarding competence in Greek, and enrolled their children to develop this competence, they nevertheless did not seem to perceive Greek as an educational priority. The findings of this paper encourage teachers to reflect on their language policies and teaching approaches and encourage them to capitalise on their students' heterogeneity.

C. Kirsch (✉)
University of Luxembourg, Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg
E-Mail: claudine.kirsch@uni.lu

199

1   Introduction

Many scholars have investigated patterns of language shift or language mainte-
nance of migrants during their diaspora. Children from ethno-linguistic minori-
ties run the risk of losing their home language as a result of perceiving it as a
language with specific and limited use (Baker 2011). They may consider it less
prestigious and less useful in relation to higher education or career opportunities,
attributing only sentimental value to it. Complementary schools can contribute
both to the development of the children's home language and their ethnic and lin-
guistic identity. These non-mandatory schools have been established by specific
ethnic minorities to promote and maintain the community's language, religion
and/or culture (Lytra and Martin 2010, p. xi). They are characterised by several
features, such as monolingual ideologies, a curriculum designed to generate
knowledge and pride in the home culture; mixed-ability and mixed-age-group-
ing; a high degree of parental and community involvement, and financial support
through fees or donations (Hall et al. 2002). Parents may play a range of roles,
such as voluntary teachers, support staff, school administrators or fund-raisers
(Lytra 2011a, b). Like their children, they may perceive complementary schools
as socialising spaces (Li Wei and Wu 2010). While these schools can be perceived
as a "safe haven" (Lytra and Martin 2010), they are also sites of tension. Li Wei
(2014), for example, pointed out that teachers and students have different linguis-
tic, cultural and educational backgrounds and experiences. In addition, the mono-
lingual ideologies which tend to be found in complementary schools may clash
with the teachers' and students' multilingual experiences in their daily life. The
onset of new orientations in language pedagogy also calls for flexible language
use (Blackledge and Creese 2010; García and Seltzer 2016; Panagiotopoulou
2016).

The present case study examines teachers', mothers' and children's perspec-
tives of learning or teaching Greek in a complementary school in Luxembourg.
While most studies on complementary schools have been carried out with estab-
lished families, the present one investigates the views of three families who
recently migrated from Greece, one of the countries hit hardest by the financial
crisis (Labrianidis and Vogiatzis 2013). Using interviews, I will explore the par-
ents' reasons for enrolling their children at this school, the children's motivation
for attending it, and the participants' experiences. The children are competent
in Greek and learn the three official languages of the country, Luxembourgish,
German, and French, in their mainstream primary school. The findings pro-
vide insight into the differing perspectives on learning Greek held by the vari-
ous actors. My intention is not to contrast the statements—it seems obvious from

65 the outset that the actors will have different views based on their different expe-
66 riences—rather, I would like to give a voice to all participants and show their
67 understandings of what it means to learn Greek.

2 Ideologies, Language Practices, Views on Culture and Identity Construction

70 Complementary schools bring together teachers and students who share the same
71 linguistic roots—albeit with different cultural and linguistic experiences—in an
72 institution characterised by specific language ideologies. Lytra (2010, 2013),
73 Li Wei and Wu (2009) and Li Wei (2014) described some of the different ide-
74 ologies prevailing in these schools. For instance, institutions may be driven by
75 monolingual ideologies and, therefore, implement monolingual-oriented policies,
76 such as "one-language-only" (OLON) or "one-language-at the-time" (OLAT),
77 which strictly separate languages. Other schools may privilege a "standard" lan-
78 guage over regional varieties, considering the former as the "more valuable set
79 of resources" and thereby the "proper" (Blackledge and Creese 2010, p. 11) lan-
80 guage. Although strong monolingual and standard ideologies are at play, students
81 and teachers have nevertheless been reported to draw on other languages than
82 the target language in the classroom. Blackledge and Creese (2010), who stud-
83 ied Bengali, Chinese, Gujarati and Turkish community schools in the UK, found
84 that bilingualism (or multilingualism) was the norm and that interactions between
85 teachers and students involved flexible language use. Li Wei and Wu (2009) and
86 Li Wei (2011) found examples of translanguaging—the use of one's entire lan-
87 guage repertoire—in several Chinese complementary classes in the UK. The
88 dynamic language use of students and teachers was also reported by Faltzi (2011)
89 and Hancock (2012), who investigated learning Greek and Chinese, respectively,
90 in complementary classes in Scotland. Panagiotopoulou et al. (2016) reported
91 that the four teachers they studied in Greek complementary schools in Canada
92 dealt with the children's multilingualism in varied ways. While some developed
93 monolingual classroom practices, others created multilingual spaces. Translan-
94 guaging was neither a legitimised practice in the Turkish complementary schools
95 studied by Lytra (2010), nor at the Greek complementary school in Luxembourg
96 (Tsagkogeorga 2016). Tsagkogeorga (2016) reported in her MA dissertation that
97 the teachers requested that the students use Greek, and that teachers and students
98 only occasionally used French to ensure comprehension or make cross-linguis-
99 tic comparisons. Code-switching was not well-received as it clashed with the

teachers' ideology of correctness. In general, the literature shows that students translanguage for a range of reasons albeit, or possibly because of, the dominant monolingual ideologies. They may do so because they lack vocabulary in the community language or because it is a natural practice (García 2009). However, translanguaging is also a means of negotiating power relations and enacting identity. Li Wei (2011) reported that students used English to rebel against the school's monolingual policy, to contest the practices, and to undermine the teachers' authority. He argued that the students' "multilingual practices are a symbolic resource of contestation and struggle against institutional ideologies" (Li Wei, p. 381).

The ideologies that underpin a curriculum do not only affect language practices (and student behaviour), but also the view of culture that is portrayed to students. In the same way teachers decide to use the "standard language", they also choose specific aspects of culture that they wish to familiarise students with. Textbooks convey particular cultural values and ideologies, and act as a means of socialising learners. Curdt-Christiansen (2017), for example, explains that students do not only learn how to read Chinese through reading Chinese stories, but they also learn socially accepted norms and moral values such as diligence, obedience or dedication. Francis et al. (2009) and Li Wei (2014) hold that the values taught may be "imagined", idealised and highly traditional rather than real. The curriculum may be at odds with the students' complex lives. Lytra (2010) provides an example: the Turkish students in her study interacted in Turkish in everyday practices, from listening to traditional and modern Turkish music, watching Turkish programmes, and using Turkish in messages to relatives. Their everyday experiences were not reflected in the traditional curriculum. A clash of values and experiences can lead to behavioural problems and make students resist the "socialising" method of teaching (Li Wei 2014; Li Wei and Wu 2009). There are, however, also examples of schools where learners were encouraged to "combine their different life experiences in more fluid ethnicities" (Creese et al. 2006, p. 41). Lytra (2013) showed that the children in one Turkish school weaved together different language varieties, experiences, genres, and modes of communication, which, in turn, enabled them to make links between their everyday life and school. In sum, the body of literature on language, literacy and cultural practices indicates that schools offer students some spaces to negotiate multilingual and multicultural identities (Li Wei 2014). This idea runs counter the more commonly-held belief that complementary schools aim to enforce "singular and essentialised ethnic or heritage identities" (Creese et al. 2006, p. 41).

137 ## 3   Student Satisfaction and Motivation

138 Archer et al. (2009), Gaiser and Hughes (2015), and Zielinska et al. (2014)
139 interviewed primary and secondary students of Albanian, Chinese, Polish, Ara-
140 bic and Ukrainian origin, who attended complementary schools in England and
141 Iceland. The Arabic, Ukrainian, Albanian and Polish students enjoyed attending
142 the schools (Gaiser and Hughes 2015; Tereshchenko and Archer 2015; Zielinska
143 et al. 2014). The Ukrainian and Chinese students perceived school attendance
144 as an integral part of their life and their cultural identity (Gaiser and Hughes
145 2015). The Polish, Arabic and Ukrainian students appreciated the opportunity to
146 meet with peers of a similar language background and engage in social activities
147 (Gaiser and Hughes 2015; Zielinska et al. 2014). It was a means of connecting
148 with and sharing culture. The Chinese students reported on by Archer et al. (2009)
149 even described the school as an "idealised" learning space where they could learn
150 aside like-minded and non-disruptive peers. The Albanian students felt a sense of
151 belonging in their school, which aimed at reinforcing group solidarity and ethnic
152 identity (Tereshchenko and Archer 2015). The Polish children perceived the com-
153 plementary school as a refuge or a "safe haven" which contrasted with the dis-
154 criminatory practice of not being allowed to speak Polish which they experienced
155 in their mainstream schools in Iceland and England (Zielinska et al. 2014).

156 The students' motives to attend the school varied. The younger children
157 reported that their parents wanted them to visit the school because they believed
158 they would return to their country of origin (Zielinska et al. 2014). Some older
159 students emphasised the relevance of literacy in the community language because
160 it enabled communication with relatives (Gaiser and Hughes 2015; Zielinska
161 et al. 2014). Others were motivated to take exams, arguing that competence in
162 the community language increased educational and career opportunities (Gaiser
163 and Hughes 2015; Zielinska et al. 2014). When considering these findings, one
164 must bear in mind the diverse backgrounds of the students. For example, students
165 of the same linguistic background shared different migration patterns and experi-
166 enced different family language policies.

167 While students are generally portrayed as motivated and as having positive
168 experiences, some negative experiences have been reported as well. For instance,
169 the Chinese students revealed mixed feelings. On the one hand, they appreci-
170 ated the opportunity to learn about their heritage language and culture and to
171 do so in a "culture-rich approach"—that is, learn language through culture, his-
172 tory, and philosophy (Archer et al. 2009). On the other hand, they found the
173 workload demanding, perceived the learning of Chinese as difficult (Gaiser and

174   Hughes 2015), considered the teaching strategies old-fashioned, and complained
175   about the lack of resources (Archer et al. 2009). Tsagkogeorga (2016) reported
176   that some Greek students who had recently migrated from Greece, especially
177   teenagers, stopped attending the Greek complementary school in Luxembourg.
178   Some students were disappointed that the curriculum and material differed from
179   that of the schools in Greece. Others needed to spend more time on homework to
180   address the demands of the trilingual mainstream school. While Tsagkogeorga's
181   study focused on five secondary students from established transcultural families,
182   enrolled in the European School, the present study looks at primary school chil-
183   dren who recently migrated from Greece and were enrolled in the same Greek
184   complementary school.

185   ## 4   The Greek Complementary School
186   in Luxembourg

187   The first Greeks arrived in Luxembourg in 1955, but the rate of immigration
188   increased from 1968, when Greeks found employment opportunities in the Euro-
189   pean Institutions and the NATO. In 1981, after Greece became a member of
190   the former EEC, Luxembourg counted 100 Greeks among its residents. Greek
191   families continued to emigrate to Luxembourg, particularly following the cri-
192   sis in 2009, increasing the population to 3250 in 2018 (STATEC 2018). They
193   are among the 47,87% of the non-Luxembourgish citizens in 2018, with a total
194   population of 602,005 on 1st January 2018 (STATEC 2018). The Greeks hope to
195   find work on the wider job market and possibly to improve their children's educa-
196   tional opportunities (Kirsch and Gogonas 2018). Finding a new job may require
197   language skills in two or even three of the country's official languages, Luxem-
198   bourgish, French and German, sometimes in addition to English. Contrary to the
199   Greeks in the 1970s who enrolled their children at the Greek section of the Euro-
200   pean school, the new migrants tend to favour the state-funded trilingual educa-
201   tion system. Children are faced with the challenge of learning Luxembourgish,
202   German and French from primary school, and English from secondary school. In
203   addition, their parents may enrol them into the Greek complementary school to
204   further develop their competences in Greek.

205   The Greek school was established in 1978 and is currently run on the premises
206   of one of the European schools. According to Tsagkogeorga (2016), this location
207   could create a more pronounced sense of "openness" that goes beyond a narrow
208   focus on Greek language and identity. Having carried out an ethnographic study

Author Proof

209   in the school, she reported on the existence of some discrete elements represent-
210   ing "Greekness", such as a map, some collages and some texts displayed on the
211   walls.

212   The Greek school is run by the Ministry of Education, Research and Religion
213   in Greece and the Coordinating office for Greek-language education in Western
214   Europe, based in Brussels. The aims of the school are to develop receptive and
215   productive language skills and nurture the Greek identity through the teaching of
216   elements of culture, history, geography and mythology. The teachers draw on the
217   curriculum produced by the Greek Ministry and use the books and materials spe-
218   cifically designed for students learning Greek while living in diasporic contexts.
219   Tsagkogeorga (2016) found that the secondary teachers focused on the teaching of
220   Greek, thereby making some references to Ancient Greek to explain elements of
221   Modern Greek. They also taught Greek History to emphasise universal values such
222   as peace, freedom and dignity. In addition, they spoke about national days such as
223   the "Independence Day" or the "Day of the No", although they did not celebrate
224   these in the same way as in Greece, wishing to respect the transcultural character
225   of the families (Tsagkogeorga 2016). Despite the focus on language, the teachers
226   do not assess the students' competence at the end of the year. Students who wish
227   their levels of competence to be accredited, will need to take an exam organised
228   by the Greek Language Centre. The school prepares students for this test.

229   The school organises weekly three-hour-long classes at different levels target-
230   ing primary and secondary students aged six to 18. The teachers are seconded
231   from Greece, have formal teaching qualifications, and a long experience of teach-
232   ing Greek as a first and second language. In 2016/2017, 50 students were enrolled
233   in the school, 31 in the primary and 19 in the secondary school. While all children
234   came from families of Greek origins, about one third came from families where
235   both parents spoke Greek. Only 13% of the enrolled population came from fami-
236   lies who migrated within the last five years and, of these, three children attended
237   the Greek complementary primary school. All children were multilingual. They
238   attended either a multilingual mainstream school or a private one such as the
239   European school where they were enrolled in the Greek, Dutch, Spanish, French
240   or Portuguese section depending on their language background (Frygana 2016).
241   The newly arrived families tended to choose mainstream schools for their chil-
242   dren. The children's competences in Greek were highly diverse. Each year, the
243   teachers tried to ensure that the classes grouped together children of more or less
244   the same language skills and with an age difference no bigger than two years. The
245   organisation is difficult owing to the small size of the school, the diverse language
246   and cultural backgrounds of the children, and the fact that lessons can only take
247   place during the afternoons when children do not attend their regular school.

5   Methodology: Exploring Learning and Teaching Experiences

This small case study draws on qualitative data to investigate the perspectives on learning or teaching Greek of two teachers, three mothers and their children. The research questions read as follows:

- What are the parents' reasons for enrolling children in the Greek school and what are the children's motives?
- What are the parents' and the children's experiences of learning Greek at the complementary school?
- How do teachers develop the children's competence in Greek and their under-standing of Greek culture?

The participants included, on the one hand, the teachers of the complementary school and on the other, the families. Both teachers, Ms Barlos and Ms Andreou, had taught many years in mainstream schools, but their experiences of teaching in a complementary school differed. Although the teachers came to Luxembourg for different reasons, both were interested in discovering different ways of life. Both are multilingual. In line with the topic of the present book, I looked for newly migrated families who wished to take part in this study. I focused on children of primary school age because Tsagkogeorga (2016) had worked with secondary students previously in her MA dissertation. The choice was limited. As mentioned before, only 13% of all children enrolled at the Greek school had recently arrived in Luxembourg and, of these, three attended the primary school. All three families agreed to take part in the study. Their children were among the youngest in the school and of these, two had only attended the school from September 2017. The three participating families, called here Gavalas, Kourakis and Marinakis, arrived between 2013 and 2014 following a job offer. The families had two or three chil-dren, of which one was enrolled at the Greek school at the time of the study. All children attended the mainstream school and learned the country's three official languages. Table 1 below provides an overview of the families. All names are pseudonyms.

The methods of this small case study are semi-structured interviews and con-versations recorded between January and April 2017. I carried out two one-hour-long interviews with the teachers, one in English, one in French, depending on their preference. My questions addressed the school organisation, the curriculum and teaching material, the linguistic and cultural background of the children, the

Tab. 1 Overview of the participating families

	Family 1 Gavalas	Family 2 Kourakis	Family 3 Marinakis
Date of arrival	2014	2013	2013
Number of children	3	2	3
Name and age of the child attending the Greek school	Anna (8)	Petros (7)	Sofia (10)

teachers' professional experience and teaching approaches, and, finally, their perceptions of the children's experiences and the parents' expectations. I asked Tsagkogeorga, who had investigated the experiences of secondary students at the same school (2016), to carry out three semi-structured interviews with the parents. Firstly, she knew some of the families which facilitated the interview process and, second, she could interview the parents in Greek. She focused on the parents' reasons for sending the children to the Greek school, the children's language competences, and the parents' and the children's experiences at the school. These interviews took place at the parents' home and lasted on average 30 min. She also interviewed the three children in Greek. To facilitate this process, she asked them to bring along an object which they associated with the school and talk about it (Hughes and Baker 1990). These conversations in Greek lasted 15 min and covered topics such as motivation and experiences. One limitation of the study is the short one-off interviews with the children. The quality of these data may have improved had Ms Tsagkogeorga been able to get to know the children better and do a follow-up interview.

All interviews were recorded, transcribed and, when in Greek, translated into English. The teachers had an opportunity to read through the transcripts (and a draft chapter) and make corrections. The data were analysed through thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006; Clarke and Braun 2013). Firstly, I identified emerging themes such as competence, friendships, uncertainty, and language ideologies. Next, drawing on triangulation (Flick 2011), I brought together the perspectives of the mothers, the children and the teachers. My main aim was to give a voice to the parents and the children because their perspectives often remain unheard (Conteh et al. 2005). The comparison also brought to light some similarities and differences.

The research project abided to the ethics guidelines of the University of Luxembourg. Anonymity and confidentiality are of utmost importance, particularly because there is only one Greek school in Luxembourg and there are only few Greek parents whose children attend the lower level of this complementary school. I was not able to use all my data because some would have made it possible to identify the participants.

6 Findings

The following four sections on competence, motives, experiences and language policy show the differing perspectives of the participants.

6.1 The Children's Language Competence

The three children stated that they were able to speak Greek as well as Luxembourgish, some German and some French. Petros (Family 2) even indicated knowing some features of Chinese and English. Anna (Family 1) and Sofia (Family 3) were literate in Greek to different degrees. The mothers confirmed that the children had "a good level" of Greek which they attributed mainly to their family language policy of Greek only. Ms Marinakis (Family 3) expressed this most clearly as follows:

"Here at home it is a rule, it is a law that we speak only Greek. Of course, when she [the daughter] is alone she can speak German or Luxembourgish".

None of the mothers mentioned that the children had begun to acquire Greek while living in Greece and only Ms Gavalas hinted at some issues in her children's development of Greek. She reported that Anna's younger siblings had forgotten some words, referring to an incident when the children did not know the Greek word for "whale", although they had heard it many times at home. She went on to say, "I see that we need to practise all the time". At times, her younger children spoke whole chunks in Luxembourgish and Ms Gavalas, who did not understand this language, either had to draw on the context to get the gist of the conversation, or ask Anna for translations. Anna, too, replaced Greek words she did not know with Luxembourgish ones. Although the other two mothers did not mention language-related issues, they all stated that their children would further develop their Greek through permanent contact with the language, which for them meant speaking to relatives at home and on holidays abroad. Furthermore, they mentioned input from reading and TV. The mothers of Family 1 and 3 nuanced their statement, declaring that their children showed little interest in reading books in Greek, preferring other languages. None of the mothers pushed their children to write in Greek, but Ms Marinakis (Family 3) was pleased that her daughter had a pen pal in Greece whom she regularly communicated with.

6.2 Motives and Expectations

The three families mentioned the same reasons for sending their children to the Greek school. They wished to develop the children's language skills and perceived a strong link between Greek, identity and family life. In their words:

> We very much want the children to learn Greek in addition to all the other things they learn here because it is our language. It is the language that we speak at home. We think it is important for the identity of the child. (Interview with Ms Gavalas)
>   Because, we are both Greeks, we speak Greek and we want him to learn Greek. (Interview with Ms Kourakis)

They had high expectations and mentioned "mastery" of Greek, which included literacy and knowledge of grammar and spelling. Mastery of Greek would come in useful if the children went back to Greece to study or work but none of the parents mentioned this. Ms Kourakis had the highest expectations, despite understanding them to be unrealistic. She declared, laughing:

> My expectations are high indeed, to learn Greek. I expect him to learn whatever he would learn at a Greek school, which cannot be done within so few hours, but, in any case, to learn to read and write and learn about the culture.

Ms Kourakis was the only person who mentioned culture explicitly, as seen in the above quote. By contrast, one of the teachers believed that the families sent the children to school to create a more profound link with culture and, in this way, to nurture their identity:

> I think it is mostly the culture, the Greek identity, to know about one's origins. I think this is the main reason. Not exactly to learn the language perfectly but to have a connection with Greece in general. (Interview with Ms Andreou)

Despite the parents' strong claims, there was also evidence in the data that the Greek school was not a priority. The mothers expressed a general feeling of uncertainty as to whether and how long the children would continue to attend the Greek school. They all mentioned the bursting schedules of their children—mainstream school, sports, music school, Greek school, clubs—and their own organisational issues. Ms Gavalas indicated that the enrolment in the following year would depend on the children's other leisure activities. Ms Marinakis was unsure how long Sofia would continue, but preferred her to attend the Greek school rather than doing anything else. Like Ms Gavalas, her involvement with the

school seemed to consist of driving the child to school and, in her words, "trying" to help with homework.

When asked about their motives to attend school, the children were hesitant. Sofia stated that she liked "spending her time" at the school because she learned something. Anna said, "because my mother wants", and Petros began the sentence, "I go because …", without finishing it. When asked whether attending the school would improve their skills in Greek, Anna replied, "I don't know", and Petros explained, "I know Greek and I don't need to learn". The statements of the younger children show some uncertainty. The fact that none of the children mentioned any personal goals or specific motives in their brief interview does not, however, necessarily indicate a lack of motivation on their part. The children may not have thought about motives or may have found it difficult to verbalise these.

6.3 Children's and Parents' Experiences at the Greek School

When asked about their experiences with the school, two mothers mentioned that the teachers were nice, friendly and accommodating, and all praised the Christmas celebration. Each year at Christmas and at the end of the school year, the school organises an event where children, parents and teachers socialise. Furthermore, two mothers spoke about the curriculum and the pedagogy, voicing some criticism. Ms Kourakis' desire for more rigour, more work, and literacy shines through in the statements, "they do light things" and "they don't read and write", as well as in her explanation that her son was playing games, painting letters and watching movies at school. In her words:

> It is a very time-consuming process to get to the school. And the time he spends there doing things, learning things, they have to learn something, all this time has to be used. Because, I don't care so much that he goes there for playing games, which is of course important, but on the other hand the educational process has to be done normally. (Interview with Ms Kourakis)

It is important to note that Petros was in the beginner class and had only attended the school for six months at the time of the interview. According to the teacher he and his peers engaged in reading and writing activities, albeit in a playful way. Ms Marinakis felt that the school catered mainly to children of established families who were less competent than children of newly arrived children. This was one reason, she believed, that her eldest children had left the

complementary school. She hoped that the school would address the needs of all children even better in the future, particularly in light of the increasing number of newly migrated students. It is unclear if this mother was aware of the diversity of the school population, the constraints of organising classes, and the teachers' efforts to address the children's needs. Differentiation to meet Anna's needs, as shown later, is a case in point.

While the parents could not provide any detailed information about their children's learning experience, they assumed that the children liked attending the school. Sofia explained in the following statements why she did so:

> I like it because we learn a lot of things there. So, I can remember them easily. For example, the year before last we learned about Alexander the Great and Bucephalus and I still remember that lesson. I like going there because it's interesting, I have a good time. (Interview with Sofia)

Sofia liked reading—she had brought a book to the interview—and had set herself a target; reading 15 books to get the "bookworm price". At the Greek school, she had particularly liked reading the chapters, "And the trees have a soul" and "A peaceful family". She saw a purpose in what she did at the Greek school and believed that she could make connections between the curriculum of both the Greek and the mainstream school. She referred specifically to World War II. The opportunities to socialise with other children, for instance at the Christmas party, were another positive aspect she mentioned. Although motivated, Sofia reported that she was sometimes worried about not being able to follow the teacher who she felt spoke fast. She was also concerned about her writing skills. While this experience reveals some anxiety on Sofia's part, it would be incorrect to associate this feeling exclusively with the Greek school. Neither Sofia nor her parents were asked about Sofia's experience of language-learning at the mainstream school and, therefore, it is unclear how Sofia felt about language-learning in general.

Anna had a more unusual experience. She began her study of Greek in the beginner class with Petros, although she already knew some Greek letters. The teacher differentiated her lessons to enable Anna to move to the advanced class. She did so during the academic year, three months before our interview. This explains why Anna had not made any friends in her new class yet and seemed unsettled. Both Anna and Petros associated the school with work, as illustrated by the object they had chosen to speak about in the interview: a pencil case. When asked to speak about their experiences at school, Anna referred to reading and writing without providing any details. She revealed that she would like

to do some mathematics and some painting as she had done in the beginners' class. Petros mentioned doing some painting. When asked whether he learned the alphabet or did any reading—activities he engaged in at school—he denied this. These examples show that the younger children found it more difficult than Sofia to recount particular activities or explain their experiences in detail.

Both teachers were aware that not all children enjoyed their experience to the same degree and that some children lacked motivation. Ms Barlos described the challenge of making children interested in Greek and sustaining this interest. Both teachers tried to address the issue by teaching Greek through interesting activities and making children love Greek civilisation. They both engaged children in various oral and literacy activities such as reading, discussing texts, writing, focusing on grammar and spelling, and more rarely, songs, drama and role-play. Literacy played a bigger role in more advanced classes. Ms Barlos endeavoured to find reading and writing activities for the children that were meaningful, interesting and motivating. She mentioned, for example, writing about an animal, stating an opinion, making a description, doing a presentation, or writing an entry into a personal journal. She also referred to teaching elements of culture, history, geography and civilisation. Sofia's account of the lessons hints at more general aspects of civilisation rather than at specific aspects of Greek. Had Ms Andreou had more time, she would have worked more on Greek civilisation. Her current focus was the language. She explained: "For me, it is first the language, because in order to find a culture, to discover things, they have to know a good level of the Greek language".

The teachers mentioned two other factors which impacted student motivation: competence and friendships. Ms Barlos was aware that children came from different backgrounds with some or little contact with Greek. She considered the school as a place where all children could meet and understand that they have common roots. She perceived her role to be a socio-cultural and linguistic mediator. The interviews with the children indicate, however, that Anna and Petros had not made friends yet and seemed not to have realised that the peers had "common roots" and were multilingual as well. Anna and Petros stated that the other children spoke Greek only, which was not the case. Did they mean, perhaps, that all children spoke Greek only at school? By contrast, Sofia was aware of the language background of her peers who she sometimes overheard speaking German or French during the break. One wonders to what extent the younger children's perceptions of the language backgrounds of their peers were related to the monolingual-oriented language policies of the school.

6.4   A Monolingual Perspective

Although both teachers spoke positively about multilingualism, believed that it facilitated language learning, and were amazed by the children's competences, languages other than Greek had almost no place in the classroom. Both teachers emphasised that they focused on Greek and stopped children who spoke other languages in class.

> In class we just speak Greek, but they are allowed to use another language if they don't have a way of explaining what they want. Only in this case. I don't like it when they start talking all the time because we don't have so much time and they are there to learn Greek. So, when they start speaking French, we run out of time. (Interview with Ms Andreou)

Ms Barlos held that teachers had to persevere with Greek and make the effort to explain something in various ways, and that the children would eventually understand. She insisted that the teachers had no negative attitudes towards other languages. Both legitimised the language policy by referring to the limited time available to teach Greek, the children's acceptance of the policy, and their diverse competences in this language. They felt that the Greek children who were born in Luxembourg were not as competent as the newly arrived ones who were "very good", "confident", could "listen with more ease" and were "more accurate and more motivated". The latter children could be models for the former.

There were some occasions, however, when the teachers used French or English, or allowed children to use other languages than Greek: firstly, to ensure comprehension and, secondly, to make cross-linguistic comparisons. Ms Andreou, for example, translated everything from Greek into English for one child who understood very little Greek. In sum, the monolingual-oriented language policy, the curriculum and the declared practices helped children develop their skills in Greek; though they did not provide them with rich opportunities to draw on their multilingual repertoire, which they drew on in their daily lives.

7   Discussion and Conclusion

In what follows, I discuss the perspectives of the parents, the children and the teachers. The Greek parents held positive beliefs about multilingualism and related Greek to identity. These findings are in line with other studies (Chatzidaki 2019 in this volume; Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi 2013; Gogonas and Kirsch 2016; Kirsch

and Gogonas 2018; Tsagkogeorga 2016). Furthermore, like parents in other studies, they invested in their children's learning of Greek by speaking Greek at home and sending them to a complementary school (Chatzidaki and Maligkoudi 2013; Kirsch and Gogonas 2018). While all mothers mentioned the development of Greek as a main reason for enrolling their children in the complementary school, only one mother referred to Greek culture. This contrasts with the survey carried out in the same school by Frygana (2016), where most parents mentioned two reasons: the development of the Greek language and the understanding of Greek culture. Frygana (2016) also found that newly migrated Greek parents in Luxembourg had higher expectations, but that their attitudes towards Greek and the official languages of Luxembourg tended to shift after three years of living in the country—when both parents and children gave more importance to the official languages to facilitate integration. While the mothers in the present study stated their high expectations regarding language competence explicitly, they nevertheless did not seem to perceive Greek as an educational priority. They made the study of Greek dependant on organisational matters, were minimally involved in the children's education and seemed to perceive their role as driving the children to school and overseeing homework. In this respect, the parents differed from Greek migrants in the USA, Australia and some parts of Europe, who made the development of Greek a priority (Smolicz et al. 2001; Tamis 2009) and who were actively involved in the school (Lytra 2011a, b). Contrary to these above-mentioned studies, the newly migrated children in Luxembourg attended multilingual schools and had to learn several languages, including Luxembourgish, German and French, more or less simultaneously. The pressure to help their children succeed in a multilingual system—possibly linked to their initial motivation to migrate to Luxembourg (Kirsch and Gogonas 2018)—made these parents prioritise the school languages. Furthermore, dominant language ideologies may influence the parents' endeavour to foster the development of a home language. Ms Barlos mentioned that some mainstream teachers had advised (other) parents to remove the children from the Greek school because they believed that learning Greek could impede the learning of other languages. Such monolingual language ideologies, based on an erroneous belief, can be highly influential. For language education to work well, it needs to be a collaborative endeavour between parents, the mainstream school and the complementary school (Curdt-Christiansen and Liu 2017).

Looking at the three children's motivation and experiences, it became clear that the younger children found it difficult to articulate their thoughts. Like children in other studies, the younger ones saw their parents as responsible for their enrolment (Zielinska et al. 2014). None of the children referred to identity development or job opportunities like the students in other studies (Archer et al. 2009;

557 Gaiser and Hughes 2015; Zielinska et al. 2014). However, the latter were older,
558 and the lack of understanding of any benefits related to learning Greek is likely
559 to be age-related. Furthermore, none of the three children expressed a feeling of a
560 shared identity with peers. Scholars had pointed out that friendships and a sense
561 of belonging were important motivational factors (Archer et al. 2009; Gaiser and
562 Hughes 2015; Tereshchenko and Archer 2015; Zielinska et al. 2014). Although
563 one of the teachers mentioned her role as a language and socio-cultural mediator,
564 only Sofia mentioned having made friends. The younger children had not realised
565 that their peers were also multilingual. One must bear in mind that the classes
566 were small, that the children came from different parts of Luxembourg or even
567 from Belgium, and that they only met once a week. Under these conditions, it is
568 difficult to make friends.

569 At the level of the school, tensions between the official language policy and
570 the teachers' attitudes towards multilingualism come to light. Like the multilin-
571 gual teachers who worked in a Greek complementary school in Canada (Pana-
572 giotopoulou and Rosen 2019 in this volume; Panagiotopoulou et al. 2016), the
573 two teachers valued the children's multilingualism. Nevertheless, they adopted
574 monolingual-oriented practices focusing mainly on Greek at school. Panagio-
575 topoulou et al. (2016) explained that each of the four teachers they reported on
576 handled the students' multilingualism in a different way, ranging from request-
577 ing monolingual performances to creating a multilingual learning environment.
578 These teachers could be placed on a continuum of monoglossic-heteroglossic.
579 Elsewhere, the same range of practices has been reported. While some comple-
580 mentary teachers tended to favour monoglossic practices like the teachers in the
581 present study (Lytra 2010), others used languages consistently in a dynamic way
582 (Blackledge and Creese 2010; Faltzi 2011; Li Wei 2011). There is a consensus
583 today—in theory at least—that monolingual-oriented practices are in line with
584 neither new developments of language pedagogies nor with the children's
585 experi-ences of language use outside school (Panagiotopoulou 2016). Many
586 scholars call for greater flexibility in language use and for content and language
587 inte-grated learning such as CLIL. Without knowing it, Anna referred to CLIL
588 when she mentioned her desire to learn Greek through mathematics. The
589 likelihood that children develop some integrative and instrumental motivation to
590 learn Greek (Csizér and Dörnyei 2005) and engage deeper in their learning
591 process through mobilising their entire language repertoire increases if they find
592 learning valuable and useful. Children would also understand language and
593 culture "as something that is used in the present or that can be projected in the
594 future' rather than some-thing one holds on to vaguely as one's
remembrances" (García 2005, p. 601).

I would like to conclude this chapter by touching on the implications of the findings. The Greek Ministry of Education is currently debating how to organise Greek-language education abroad to be more up-to-date and better address the needs of the children of the Greek Diaspora. The issue of traditional (monolingual) curricula that are not in line with the complex (and often multilingual) lives of the multilingual students has been identified elsewhere (Francis et al. 2009; Li Wei 2014; Lytra 2010). Arvaniti (2013) stated that the new policies on "Greekness" moved (or should move) away from previous ethnocentric views to more modernised perspectives, which promote "reciprocity, intercultural interconnection, dialogue and transnational synergies" (p. 175). Curdt-Christiansen and Liu (2017) held that the teachers' task consists of facilitating the development of the children's whole language repertoire, thereby recognising the diverse settings in which they use language. Because language is always related to power and because language users are situated differently socially, culturally and economically, García and Flores (2012) called for multilingual pedagogies based on social justice and social participation. Used in complementary and mainstream schools, multilingual pedagogies aim to develop students' multilingual and multicultural identities (Blackledge and Creese 2010; Creese et al. 2006; García and Seltzer 2016; Kirsch 2017; Panagiotopoulou 2016).

Good communication and clear explanations could be a way forward in the present case study. For instance, teachers could explain the curriculum and their pedagogy to parents to ensure that all actors understand the objectives and practices and are aware of the differentiation strategies deployed. To facilitate socialisation, enhance motivation and engagement, and make language-learning more meaningful and purposeful, the teachers could try to capitalise on the children's resources, open up spaces for translanguaging and become a "bilingual site" (Creese et al. 2006)—or in this case, a multilingual site. Given the diversity of the school's population, this is not easy.

My final words address the limitations and contributions of this case study. The study is based on interviews and includes young children who may need to develop a deeper rapport with the interviewer to share more insightful experiences. Detailed observations of the teaching practices and a larger study that includes more children would shed more light on the meanings that children, especially those of newly migrated families, associate with learning Greek in a complementary school. Nevertheless, this study is important because it is the first one that regroups the perspectives of several actors on learning Greek in Luxembourg and that includes newly migrated families. As such, it contributes to the literature on Greek families in Luxembourg (Gogonas and Kirsch 2016; Gogonas 2019 in this volume; Kirsch and Gogonas 2018; Tsagkogeorga 2016) and gives

tribute to the teachers, the parents and the children who engage in developing language skills and an understanding of Greek culture. Although a case study like this one is never representative, the present study encourages reflection on children's motives to attend complementary school, dominant language policies, and teaching approaches and, as such, it may open up new perspectives.

References

Archer, L., Becky, F., & Mau, A. (2009). "Boring and stressful" or "ideal" learning spaces? Pupils' constructions of teaching and learning in Chinese supplementary schools. *Research Papers in Education, 24 (04),* (477–497).

Arvaniti, E. (2013). Ellinoglossi diapolitismiki ekpaidefsi sti diaspora: ena synchrono plaisio ekpaideftikou schediasmou [Greek-language Intercultural Education in Diaspora: A modern context of educational and politic design]. *Journal Epistimes Agogis*, *1–2*, (175–199) [in Greek].

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3 (02)*, (77–101).

Chatzidaki, A., (2019). Greek schools in Germany as a "safe haven"; Teachers' perspectives on new migration and community language schools. In A. Chatzidaki, C. Kirsch, A. Panagiotopoulou & L. Rosen (Eds.), *New Migration of Families from Greece to Europe and Canada—Experiences and Interpretations of Family Members within the Context of Different Migration Societies and Educational Systems*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Chatzidaki, A., & Maligkoudi, C. (2013). Family Language Policies among Albanian Immigrants in Greece. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16 (06)*, (675–689).

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013) Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing strategies for effective learning. *The Psychologist, 26 (02),* (120–123).

Conteh, J., Gregory, E., Kearney, C., & Mor, A. (2005). *On Writing Educational Ethnographies: The Art of Collusion Paperback*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham books.

Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, Heritage and Learner Identities in Complementary Schools. *Language and Education, 20 (01),* (23–43).

Csizér, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learners' Motivational Profiles and Their Motivated Learning Behavior. *Language learning, 55 (04)*, (613–659).

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2017). Language socialization through textbooks. In P. Duff, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education (Vol. 8), Language socialization.* Springer: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02327-4_15-1.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Liu, J. (2017*). Educating Multilingual Learners: The Voice of Heritage Language Teachers. Social Justice through Multilingual Education in Complementary Schools? Recent Studies on Teachers' Perspectives from Europe and Canada.* Paper presented at the ECER 2017 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Faltzi, R. (2011). The Patterning of Language Alternation in a Greek Supplementary School. Selected Papers from the 19th ISTAL. https://www.enl.auth.gr/symposium19/. Accessed: February 2, 2019.

Flick, U. (2011). *Triangulation: Eine Einführung* [Triangulation: An introduction] (3rd ed.). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Francis, B., Archer, L., & Mau, A. (2009). Language as capital, or language as identity? Chinese complementary school pupils' perspectives on the purposes and benefits of complementary schools. *British Educational Research Journal, 35 (04)*, (519–538).

Frygana, M. (2016). *L'école de la language Grecque au Luxembourg* [The school of the Greek language in Luxembourg]. Paper presented at the conference Linguistic and educational challenges for established and recent Greek families 2016 in Luxembourg, Luxembourg.

Gaiser, L., & Hughes, P. (2015). *Language provision in Manchester's supplementary schools*. http://mlm.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Language-provisions-in-Manchester-supplementary-schools.pdf. Accessed: February 2, 2019.

García, O. (2005). Positioning Heritage Languages in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal, 89 (04)*, (601–605).

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective.* Malden: Wiley/ Blackwell.

García, O., & Flores, N. (2012). Multilingual pedagogies. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (S. 232–246). New York: Routledge.

García, O., & Seltzer, K. (2016). The Translanguaging current in language education. In B. Kindenberg (Eds.), *Flerspråkighet som resurs* [Multilingualism as a resource] (S. 19–30). Stockholm: Liber.

Gogonas, N. (2019). Recently migrated Greek families in superdiverse Luxembourg: motives for migration and global competence. In A. Chatzidaki, C. Kirsch, A. Panagiotopoulou & L. Rosen (Eds.), *New Migration of Families from Greece to Europe and Canada—Experiences and Interpretations of Family Members within the Context of Different Migration Societies and Educational Systems.* Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Gogonas, N., & Kirsch, C. (2016). "In this country my children are learning two of the most important languages in Europe": Ideologies of language as a commodity among Greek migrant families in Luxembourg. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21 (04)*, (426–438).

Hall, K. A., Özerk, K., Zulfiqar, M., & Tan, J. E C. (2002) "This is Our School": provision, purpose and pedagogy of supplementary schooling in Leeds and Oslo. *British Educational Research Journal, 28 (03)*, (399–418).

Hancock, A. (2012) Unpacking mundane practices: children's experiences of learning literacy at a Chinese complementary school in Scotland. *Language and Education, 26 (01)*, (1–17).

Hughes, J. N., & Baker, D. B. (1990). *The Guilford school practitioner series. The clinical child interview.* New York: Guilford Press.

Kirsch, C. (2017) Young children capitalising on their entire language repertoire for Language Learning at School. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 31 (01)*, (39–55).

Kirsch, C., & Gogonas, N. (2018) Transnational experiences, language competences and worldviews: contrasting language policies in two recently migrated Greek families in Luxembourg. *Multilingua, 37 (02)*, (153–175).

Labrianidis, L., & Vogiatzis, N. (2013). Highly skilled migration: What differentiates the "brains" who are drained from those who return in the case of Greece? *Population, Space and Place, 19 (05)*, (472–486).

Li Wei (2011). Multilinguality, Multimodality and Multicompetence: Code- and Mode-switching by Minority Ethnic Children in Complementary Schools. *Modern Language Journal, 95 (03)*, (370–384).

Li Wei (2014). Negotiating funds of knowledge and symbolic competence in the complementary school classrooms. *Language and Education, 28 (02)*, (161–180).

Li Wei, & Wu, C.-J. (2009). Polite Chinese children revisited: Creativity and the use of codeswitching in the Chinese complementary school classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12 (02)*, (193–212).

Li Wei, & Wu, C.-J. (2010). Literacy and socialisation teaching in Chinese complementary schools. In V. Lytra & P. Martin (Eds.), *Sites of multilingualism. Complementary schools in Britain today* (S. 33–44). Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.

Lytra, V. (2011a). Discursive constructions of language and identity: parents' competing perspectives in London Turkish complementary schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33 (01)*, (85–100).

Lytra, V. (2011b). Negotiating language, culture and pupil agency in complementary school classrooms. *Linguistics and Education, 22 (01)*, (23–36).

Lytra, V. (2013). From kebapçı to professional: the commodification of language and social mobility in Turkish complementary schools in the UK. In A. Duchêne, M. G. Moyerand & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Language, Migration and Social Inequalities: A Critical Sociolinguistic Perspective on Institutions and Work* (S. 147–167). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lytra, V., & Martin, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Sites of multilingualism. Complementary schools in Britain today*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.

Panagiotopoulou, A. (2016). Mehrsprachigkeit in der Kindheit: Perspektiven für die frühpädagogische Praxis [Multilingualism in Childhood: Perspectives for the Early Childhood Education]. WiFF-Expertise. Deutsches Jugendinstitut, Band 46. https://www.weiterbildungsinitiative.de/uploads/media/Exp_Panagiotopoulou_web.pdf. Accessed: February 2, 2019.

Panagiotopoulou, A., & Rosen, L. (2019). Recently arrived migrants as teachers in Greek complementary schools in Montreal: Views on Multilingualism. In A. Chatzidaki, C. Kirsch, A. Panagiotopoulou & L. Rosen (Eds.), *New Migration of Families from Greece to Europe and Canada—Experiences and Interpretations of Family Members within the Context of Different Migration Societies and Educational Systems.* Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Panagiotopoulou, A., Rosen, L., & García, O. (2016). Language Teachers' Ideologies in a Complementary Greek School in Montreal: Heteroglossia and Teaching. In P. P. Trifonas, & T. Aravossitas (Eds.), *Handbook of Research and Practice in Heritage Language Education* (S. 285–300). Springer International Publishing A.G.

Smolicz, J., M. Secombe, & Hudson, D. (2001). Family Collectivism and Minority Languages as Core Values of Culture among Ethnic Groups in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 22 (02)*, (152–172).

STATEC (2018). Population par sexe et par nationalité au 1er janvier (x 1000) 1981, 1991, 2001–2018 [Population by sex and nationality on 1 January (x 1000) 1981, 1991, 2001–2018] http://www.statistiques.public.lu/stat/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=12853&IF_Language = fra&MainTheme = 2&FldrName = 1. Accessed: February 2, 2019.

Tamis, A. M. (2009). The Greek Language in the Diaspora/La langue Grecque en Diaspora. *Études Helléniques, 17 (01)*, (1–19).

Tereshchenko, A., & Archer, L. (2015). Identity projects in complementary and mainstream schools: the views of Albanian and Bulgarian students in England. *Research Papers in Education, 30 (03)*, (347–365).

Tsagkogeorga, D. (2016). *Multilingual repertoires and identity negotiation: a study on pupils in the Greek complementary school of Luxembourg* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Luxembourg, Belval.

Zielińska M., Kowzan, P., & Ragnarsdóttir, H. (2014). Polish complementary schools in Iceland and England. *Intercultural Education, 25 (05)*, (405–417).