



CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Sonja Ugen, Thomas Lenz, Joanne Colling, Axel Grund, Ulrich Keller,
Pascale Esch, Susanne Backes, Elif Tuğçe Gezer, Danielle Hoffmann,
Elisa Mazzucato, Luc Weis & Antoine Fischbach

To cite as: Ugen, S., Lenz, T., Colling, J., Grund, A., Keller, U., Esch, P., Backes, S., Gezer, E. T., Hoffmann, D., Mazzucato, E., Weis, L., & Fischbach, A. (2023). Conclusion and Implications. In LUCET & SCRIPT (Eds.), *European Public School Report 2023: Preliminary Results on Student Population, Educational Trajectories, Mathematics Achievement, and Stakeholder Perceptions* (pp. 150 - 162). <https://doi.org/10.48746/EPS2023-5>



5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Luxembourg is a highly diverse country in terms of the socioeconomic, sociocultural, and linguistic composition of its population and this diversity is reflected in the national education system with an increasing share of students speaking a language other than Luxembourgish and/or German at home, both at primary and secondary school level (see *Figure I.13* and *I.14* for details). Although this diversity is an asset, students speaking a language other than Luxembourgish and/or German at home (e.g., French, Portuguese) and/or students with a low socioeconomic status (SES) have repeatedly been identified to struggle academically in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (e.g., Boehm et al., 2016; Hadjar et al., 2018; Hornung et al., 2021; OECD, 2018a; Sonnleitner et al., 2021).

In order to deal more adequately with the increasing language diversity of the student population and to counter the educational inequalities that are assumed to result (at least partially) out of a curriculum, in which high language expectations present an important challenge for a growing number of students, the Luxembourgish government has broadened the educational offer by introducing European public schools (EPS) that follow the European curriculum (Eurydice, 2022) and public schools following other international curricula (i.e., UK-Style education, see *Chapter I* for details). In contrast to schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, EPS offer their students the opportunity to select one main language of instruction (L1) among the available language sections (i.e., German, French, and English). In addition, students are choosing a first (L2) and a second additional language (L3), which are taught as foreign languages (see *Chapter I* for details). Due to this more flexible language offer, EPS might provide a learning environment that is more adapted to the diverse student population in Luxembourg, contributing in turn to the reduction of the identified inequalities.

By combining data from different sources (e.g., administrative student data, expert interviews, academic achievement scores) the present report provides preliminary descriptive results on the societal demand towards EPS, their attendance rate and student population (*Chapter I*), as well as on the perception of EPS by the school management (i.e., functioning, offer, challenges) and by parents of EPS students (i.e., satisfaction, uptake reasons; *Chapter II*). Based on longitudinal administrative student data, the educational trajectories (e.g., grade repetition rates) of EPS students were analysed (*Chapter III*). In addition, the recent integration of EPS into the Luxembourg School Monitoring Programme “*Épreuves Standardisées*” (ÉpStan) in autumn of the school year 2022/23 allowed for the analysis of full-cohort data among both primary and secondary school students in a first attempt to compare EPS students to their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum with regard to academic achievement in mathematics (*Chapter IV*).

In the following, the present report's key findings and potential explanations are discussed in light of important methodological limitations while deducing practical implications for the national education



system and providing an outlook on future research that is needed to obtain a more encompassing understanding of EPS in Luxembourg.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE PRESENT REPORT'S MAIN FINDINGS

The establishment of the first EPS (i.e., *École Internationale Differdange et Esch-sur-Alzette*) in 2016 marks an important change in Luxembourg's education system. By broadening the educational offer through the introduction of EPS, which provide a multicultural and multilingual education according to the European curriculum, students are given the opportunity to choose a main language of instruction among the available language section (i.e., German, French, and English; MENJE, 2020). In this context, *Chapter I* offers an overview of the development of EPS in Luxembourg, their main characteristics (e.g., organizational structure, instruction languages) as well as their students' demographics, by mainly relying on administrative student data. The following conclusions on the growth of EPS and on the composition of their student population can be drawn:

Since 2016, a total of six EPS have opened in different locations across Luxembourg (see *Figure I.22*) and the number of students attending EPS increased considerably at both primary (i.e., from 0.1% of the school population in the school year 2016/17 to 2.5% in 2021/22, see *Figure I.5*) and secondary school level (i.e., from 0.3% in 2016/17 to 5.2% in 2021/22, see *Figure I.6*). This indicates that there seems to be a **high demand** for EPS, which is in line with findings from *Chapter II* on the uptake of the EPS offer (for details see 2.3 on the societal demand towards EPS).

Chapter I further illustrates that EPS differ in their student composition (e.g., nationality, language primarily spoken at home, SES) when compared to schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum. While Portuguese students account for the highest share of non-Luxembourgish nationals in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum at primary (i.e., 16.4%, see *Figure I.11*) and secondary school level (i.e., 20.5%, see *Figure I.12*) in the school year 2021/22, the majority of non-Luxembourgish student in EPS at primary school level is French (i.e., 19.5%) or of other non-EU nationalities (i.e., 29.2%). At secondary school level, the majority of non-Luxembourgish students in EPS is of French (i.e., 14.4%), Portuguese (i.e., 14.6%), or other non-EU nationalities (i.e., 25.3%), whereas the biggest group of non-Luxembourgish students in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum is of Portuguese nationality (i.e., 20.5%). With regard to the language primarily spoken at home, EPS students primarily speak French at home and this both at primary (i.e., 34.2%, see *Figure I.13*) and secondary school level (i.e., 19.2%, see *Figure I.14*). In schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, Luxembourgish/German and Portuguese are the languages primarily spoken at home (i.e., 40.2% and 27.3%, respectively) at secondary school level. Comparing the SES of EPS students to the SES of students in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, data from the *ÉpStan* show that the mean SES is higher at primary (i.e., 59.8) and secondary school level (i.e., 51.9) in EPS than in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (i.e., 50.1 and 44.5, see *Figure I.15*), a finding that also holds true when individually



comparing each EPS to the average SES of schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum. Taken together this comparison of the student composition in EPS and in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum indicates that the **EPS student population differs from the student population in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum** (e.g., higher SES, French primarily spoken at home). In addition, low SES students and students speaking another language than Luxembourgish and/or German at home (i.e., Portuguese), students groups which have repeatedly been found to struggle academically in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (e.g., Boehm et al., 2016; Hornung et al., 2021; Sonnleitner et al., 2021), take up the offer of EPS less frequently than high SES students and students that are speaking French or English at home. This finding also aligns with results of *Chapter II* showing that Portuguese students are less likely to apply to EPS relative to their share of the general student population in Luxembourg than, for example, French students (for details see *Table II.3*).

Chapter II focuses on school management teams and parents as two important groups of actors that are directly affected by the implementation of EPS in Luxembourg, by combining different data sources and methods (e.g., semi-structured expert interviews, online parent questionnaire).

Looking at the perception of EPS by **school management teams** (i.e., characteristics, functioning), EPS are considered to provide a coherent school offer to their students that allows them smooth transitions (e.g., from primary to secondary education, common track in lower secondary school). One topic that was emphasized by all interviewees when reflecting on the EPS was the **multilingual education offering students the possibility to select one main language of instruction** and thereby allowing to adapt the school offer to the highly diverse linguistic profiles of students in Luxembourg. In this context, students struggling in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum due to their language profiles are discussed by the school management teams as a student group that EPS should target. Whereas EPS are generally seen as an important educational offer for an increasingly (language) diverse student population, the school management teams identify Luxembourgish language teaching (i.e., quantity, quality), the development of a vocational offer and an **improvement of system knowledge among all actors included in the education system** (e.g., parents, teachers of EPS and of schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, educational advisors and school psychologists) as aspects requiring further development. An improvement of the system knowledge might contribute to increase the uptake of the EPS offer in student groups that are currently less frequently attending EPS (e.g., low SES students, Portuguese speaking students).

Focusing on **parents** as a second important group directly affected by the implementation of EPS, *Chapter II* identifies the **extended linguistic offer as the main reason** why parents select EPS for their child (82%), followed by the costless nature of EPS (65%), and the international certification (60%). For those parents having perceived difficulties related to language requirements at a previous school, the majority reports that those difficulties were at least mostly resolved by the change of schools. The result that only a small share of parents (10%) indicates to have received information on EPS by teachers at



their child's previous school seems to be in line with the perception of school management teams, **that the system knowledge among all the actors included in the education system needs to be considerably improved**. In general, the majority of parents perceive their child to be (moderately) happy (93.4%) and to do (very) well academically (77.8%) in EPS. Parents further report to be mostly satisfied with the EPS and this especially so with the linguistic offer (85%), whereas they would like to see an improvement of the communication between school and parents (15% were dissatisfied with this aspect).

By focusing on **tangible educational outcomes of students** at both primary and secondary school level (i.e., educational trajectories, academic achievement in mathematics), *Chapter III* and *Chapter IV* further broaden the knowledge generated on EPS in Luxembourg. With regard to students' **educational trajectories** (i.e., grade repetition rates), first findings from *Chapter III* using longitudinal administrative student data seem to indicate that the majority of EPS students (i.e., 82% in the school year 2020/21) that were registered in P5 (i.e., final year of primary education in EPS) transitioned towards secondary education within EPS instead of switching to another curriculum, a result which appears to align with the perception of **smooth transitions** between primary and secondary education offered by EPS (i.e., transition within one school) that was raised by school management teams (see *Chapter II* for details). With regard to the school population in S1 (i.e., first year of secondary education in EPS), *Chapter III* illustrates that the largest share of S1 students has transitioned into EPS from primary schools that followed the Luxembourgish curriculum, thereby completing one more year of primary education (C4.2) compared to their peers that have completed primary education in EPS. Looking at **grade repetition** in the school year 2021/22, delayed school trajectories seem to occur **less frequently** in EPS with the share of EPS students without delay being higher in both primary (i.e., 98% in P5, see *Figure III.2*) and secondary school (i.e., 89% in S5, see *Figure III.3*) when compared to primary (i.e., 78% in C4.1) and secondary school students (i.e., 48% in grade 11 for ESG students) in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum. In light of the **methodological limitations** described in more detail in *Chapter III* (i.e., no separate analysis by language sections, small number of students in EPS, and this especially so in later schools years at both primary and secondary school level), results from *Chapter III* offer a first tentative indication of EPS students showing greater continuity (i.e., lower rates of grade repetition) than students in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum.

Using encompassing full-cohort data from the ÉpStan collected in autumn of the school year 2022/23, *Chapter IV* focuses on understanding how EPS students compare to their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum in the subject of mathematics, a school subject for which a bigger overlap is presumed between the two school offers than for the language curricula (see *Chapter IV* for details). When looking at students' **academic achievement in mathematics** at primary school level, **EPS students perform on average better** than students in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, and especially so in later years (i.e., close to 40 ÉpStan points in C4.1/P5). In addition, results from



Chapter IV offer a first tentative indication that **low SES students or students speaking a language other than Luxembourgish and/or German at home (i.e., French, Portuguese, English) in EPS demonstrate better academic achievement scores** in mathematics than their peers with the same background characteristics in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (see *Figures IV.3* and *IV.6*, for example). At secondary school level, EPS students are on average performing better than their peers in the *Enseignement secondaire général - voie d'orientation* (ESG) and the *Enseignement secondaire général - voie de préparation* (ESG-VP), while having lower mean values in mathematics than students in the *Enseignement secondaire classique* (ESC). As with *Chapter III*, results of *Chapter IV* are **preliminary** and have to be interpreted with caution due to **important methodological limitations** (e.g., very small number of EPS students with specific background characteristics, comparison of an ability-based tracked school system to the comprehensive school system in EPS, comparability of the language versions of the mathematics achievement tests not yet statistically controlled, for details see *Chapter IV*).

Taken together, the findings of the present report indicate that there is a high demand for EPS to accommodate all students opting to follow the European curriculum. It should be noted that the current student composition in EPS differs from the student population in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum with low SES students and/or students speaking Portuguese at home taking up the offer of EPS less frequently than high SES students and/or students speaking another language at home (i.e., French, English). Both school management teams and parents report a rather positive perception of EPS, with the extended linguistic offer being the main reason why parents select EPS for their child. Regarding tangible educational outcomes, preliminary results offer a tentative indication of EPS students showing higher continuity (i.e., lower grade repetition rates) than their peers in school following the Luxembourgish curriculum. With regard to achievement in mathematics at primary school level, the present report indicates that students in EPS perform better than their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum. At secondary school level, EPS students perform better than their peers in ESG and in ESG-VP, while staying below the performance of ESC students (*Chapter IV*). In addition, low SES students and students speaking Portuguese at home display better achievement scores in EPS than their respective peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum.

5.2 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Since 2016, a total of six EPS have been established across Luxembourg, with one of their main aims being to broaden the educational offer (i.e., various language sections) to deal more adequately with the increasing language diversity of the country's student population. In light of the high demand towards EPS and with the extended linguistic offer being the main reason why parents select EPS for their child, it seems that the newly introduced school offer is well received and might contribute to reduce educational inequalities, considering that EPS students seem to display smooth educational trajectories (i.e., lower grade repetition rates) and better achievement in mathematics than their peers



in general at primary school level and than their peers in ESG and ESG-VP at secondary school level (see *Chapter IV*).

Although the present report's descriptive data analyses do not allow for the drawing of a final conclusion regarding which aspect of EPS (e.g., linguistic fit, structural differences, student population characteristics) most decisively contributes to explaining the observed differences in educational outcomes in favor of EPS students (i.e., smooth trajectories, better achievement in mathematics); the finding that low SES students and students speaking a language other than Luxembourgish and/or German at home (e.g., French, Portuguese) perform better in mathematics than their respective peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum is a first promising finding that could be in line with the assumption that the **better linguistic fit** in EPS contributes to reducing educational inequalities. As discussed in more detail in *Chapter IV* (see 4.6), the observation that achievement differences in mathematics in favor of EPS students seem more pronounced in C4.1/P5 than in lower primary school grades can potentially be explained by the fact that mathematics instruction becomes increasingly complex and thus more language-bound in higher school grades. The suspected better linguistic fit in EPS might therefore come more strongly into play in later primary school grades.

Another potential explanation could be due to **structural differences** that exist between EPS and schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum. In comparison to the vast majority of schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, EPS provide **primary and secondary education within one institution**. As discussed in *Chapter II*, school management teams in EPS perceive this coherent offer to students as an important characteristic of EPS that allows well-prepared and smooth transitions. In addition, the six EPS established across Luxembourg are Accredited European Schools (AES). As described in more detail in *Chapter I*, all AES are linked to the European School system by the means of a so-called Accreditation Agreement. In order to get and maintain the AES status, EPS in Luxembourg have to meet different requirements for accreditation in the domains of curriculum implementation (Article 3), linguistic conditions (e.g., offered language sections, Article 4), pedagogical content (e.g., preparation for taking the European Baccalaureate examination, Article 5), and teacher qualification (e.g., pedagogical and language qualifications, Article 6, for details see Schola Europaea, 2019). With accreditation being granted for a maximum of three years (Schola Europaea, 2019), EPS in Luxembourg are subject to regular external evaluations, an aspect which has also been raised by school management teams as an important EPS characteristic (see *Chapter II* for details). In contrast to schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, EPS thus undergo an **institutionalized quality assurance**, which might in turn relate to the observed differences in educational outcomes (i.e., smooth educational trajectories, better academic achievement in mathematics) between EPS students and those in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum. Another structural difference between EPS and schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum is that EPS have greater **flexibility in their teacher recruitment**, which results in more freedom in hiring teacher profiles that fit the school's



respective needs (see *Chapter II* for more details). By recruiting teachers internationally, school management teams perceive the diversity of their EPS teacher backgrounds (e.g., culture, languages) to be very positive and to foster different perspectives and experiences within their school's educational community. Besides their main language of instruction (L1, see *Chapter I* for details), EPS students are required to learn a first (L2) and second additional language (L3) generally taught as foreign languages by teachers that are native speakers or must have a command of the language to be taught at the highest level (C2 following the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*; Schola Europaea, 2018). In the scope of the previously described institutionalized quality assurance, EPS teachers are furthermore undergoing a **statutory evaluation** every fourth year, which is conducted in line with the three defined categories of the AES Teaching Standards (e.g., Teaching and learning, Wider professional responsibilities, Professional conduct and qualities; Schola Europaea, 2015, 2023). As described for the institutionalized quality assurance, the greater flexibility in teacher recruitment and the statutory evaluation could be further structural differences between EPS and schools that follow the Luxembourgish curriculum, which might relate to the observed educational differences between EPS students and their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum.

Besides the presumed better linguistic fit and the structural differences that exist between EPS and schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, the present report underlines at various occasions that the **student population in EPS differs from the student population in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum**, and this has thus to be contemplated as another potential explanation for the observed differences in educational outcomes in favor of EPS students (i.e., smooth educational trajectories, better achievement in mathematics). As discussed in more detail in *Chapter IV* (see 4.6), the composition of the schools' student population, which is likely to be reflected at the classroom level (e.g., low share of low SES students or of Portuguese speaking students in EPS classrooms), has repeatedly been identified to be related to individual student achievement (Caldas & Bankston, 1997; Opdenakker & Damme, 2001; Sykes & Kuyper, 2013). In a study that investigates the effects of classroom composition on achievement, Hornstra et al. (2015) discuss, for example, that teachers might lower their instructional level in classes with a high share of low SES students and that low SES students might generally be more sensitive to contextual effects of their classroom (e.g., class size, didactical approaches, instruction quality) than their high SES peers, which might result in achievement differences.

The observation that low SES students and Portuguese speaking students take up the EPS offer considerably less frequently than their high SES peers and French or English speaking students could potentially result out of **three main hurdles** that will be discussed in more detail in the following.

(1) Application of selection criteria in light of a high demand towards EPS: As illustrated in *Chapter II* by the means of pre-registration data for the school year 2022/23, a total of 3.031 students had filed a demand for admission in one (or multiple) of the six EPS in Luxembourg, but only 1.529 new students



had been accepted. Considering that the demand towards EPS is surpassing the number of available places, EPS have to decide which students to accept within their institutions based on certain selection criteria. In this context, the school management teams (see *Chapter II* for details) have discussed residence-related (i.e., students living closer to the EPS), family-related (i.e., having siblings already attending EPS), and student-related selection criteria (i.e., language proficiency, academic profiles) that are taken into consideration when deciding which students to accept in EPS. With the student-related selection criteria being the one most frequently mentioned by school management teams, it stands to reasons whether a selection based on the profiles of prospective students (e.g., language proficiency, realistic possibility to successfully pursue an academic track) could constitute a structural hurdle for specific student groups (e.g., low SES students, or students speaking a language other than Luxembourgish and/or German at home), which results in a less frequent acceptance in EPS. Although the application of selection criteria could potentially explain why student groups with specific background characteristics are less frequently attending EPS, the finding that students of Portuguese nationality do not only attend but also apply less frequently to EPS relative to their share in Luxembourg's general student population seems to indicate that other hurdles contribute to the observation that the student population in EPS differs to the student population in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum.

(2) System knowledge regarding the characteristics of Luxembourg's education system: In order to be able to take an informed decision regarding their child's education, parents must be aware of the different school offers in Luxembourg and of their differences and similarities. With regard to schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, it seems important to know that German is the language of literacy acquisition, that French is introduced as a second language and that there is a language switch in content subjects and in mathematics at secondary school level. The language offer in EPS is more flexible, with students being able to choose their main language of instruction (L1) among the available language sections (i.e., German, French, and English), two additional languages (L2 and L3) being taught as foreign languages and no language switch at secondary school level in the subject of mathematics. Another important difference between the two school offers, among others, is that secondary school students are allocated to three main school tracks based on their academic abilities in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum, whereas students in EPS are attending one common track during early secondary education. Based on findings that low SES students and/or students speaking a language other than Luxembourgish and/or German at home are particularly at risk to struggle academically in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (e.g., Boehm et al., 2016; Hadjar et al., 2018; Hornung et al., 2021; OECD, 2018a; Sonnleitner et al., 2021), it would be especially important that parents of those students are aware of potential issues (e.g., high language expectations), which might hamper their child's educational pathway (e.g., grade repetition, lower academic achievement). Considering that EPS have only recently been established and that only a



small share of parents (10%, see *Chapter II* for more details) indicate to have received information on EPS by teachers at their child's previous school, an additional hurdle might be that parents might not yet be aware of the EPS offer or that they might not consider the EPS offer to be directed at them due to how EPS might be perceived in the general population (e.g., expat schools).

(3) Potential organizational hurdles that hamper the uptake of the EPS offer: A further hurdle that might contribute to preventing parents from taking up the EPS offer is of a more organizational nature. Whereas the vast majority of primary school students in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum is automatically allocated to the closest school within their municipality, EPS students frequently display higher travel distances than their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (see *Table I.6* in *Chapter I*). Parents of disadvantaged students (e.g., low SES) could potentially face more difficulties in organizing their child's uptake of the EPS offer than those of advantaged students (e.g., reaching the geographical location of the EPS).

To **increase both the socioeconomic and sociocultural diversity** of the student population in EPS, all parents should be proactively and broadly informed about the characteristics, similarities and differences of the two school offers in order to be able to take informed decisions regarding their child's education. In this context, it would be important to foster an encompassing system knowledge among all actors included in the education system (e.g., teachers, parents, educational advisors, school psychologists). In light of the finding that only a small share of parents (10%, see *Chapter II* for more details) indicate having received information on EPS by teachers at their child's previous school, one approach that could be taken would be to inform teachers that EPS are complementary to schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum and that this offer could be especially beneficial to students that struggle in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum and might therefore be shared with parents (e.g., in the scope of the *bilans intermédiaires*).

Besides raising the target population's awareness towards EPS and fostering the system knowledge of all the actors of the education system, school management teams stated that the integration of positive aspects from EPS into schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum could potentially be an important approach to further develop the education offer in Luxembourg (see *Chapter II* for details). In this context, a French literacy acquisition pilot project that was recently established in four primary schools aims at **extending the linguistic offer in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum** by giving C2.1 students the possibility of learning to read and write in French (MENJE, 2022).

Should future studies be able to demonstrate the success of this pilot project and should the French literacy acquisition offer in turn be implemented at the local level, the **three previously described hurdles could potentially be overcome** (e.g., no selection criteria, teachers might be more aware of



offers directly integrated into schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum than of the EPS offer that is complementary, schools located more closely to students' residence).

Against this backdrop and especially when taking into consideration that the demand is high and goes beyond the currently available places at EPS (see *Chapter I* and *II* for details), extending the linguistic offer in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum might contribute to counter existing educational inequalities at a broader level (e.g., by giving more students the possibility to benefit from learning to read and write in their native or a related language). In addition to an extension of the linguistic offer, schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum could potentially also benefit from adopting other characteristics that might be related to the finding that students in EPS have better educational outcomes than their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (e.g., primary and secondary education within one institution, institutionalized quality assurance, flexibility in teacher recruitment).

5.3 OUTLOOK

As described in more detail in the respective chapters, due to important methodological limitations, the present report only allows for the following tentative conclusion: EPS students show better educational outcomes than their peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (e.g., smooth educational trajectories, better academic achievement in mathematics, and this especially in primary school). By continuously integrating both the EPS and the classes participating in the French literacy acquisition pilot project into its well-established school monitoring tool, the ÉpStan will in the future allow for a more in-depth analysis of potential educational outcome differences between alternative school offers (i.e., EPS, French literacy acquisition pilot project) and schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum (e.g., investigation of longitudinal data sets, propensity score matching of students in EPS with comparable peers in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum).

By operationalising the presumed better linguistic fit in EPS and in the pilot project (e.g., via student and parent questionnaires), future research studies will allow to explore which characteristics of the alternative school offers contribute in explaining observed differences in educational outcomes. In addition, including academic achievement measures in languages (e.g., German, French), as far as psychometrically possible (e.g., comparability of test versions and language curricula), in a future ÉpStan data collection would allow for the analysis of whether academic achievement differences in favor of EPS students also exist in other subjects. A better understanding of whether an extension of the linguistic offer both in EPS and in schools following the Luxembourgish curriculum helps to encounter the existing educational inequalities would provide the involved stakeholders with solid and reliable data for evidence-based policy making in the field of education. In turn, such results could be used for the creation of school offers, in which all students can make use of their full academic potential irrespective of their individual background characteristics (e.g., SES, language background).



REFERENCES

- Boehm, B., Ugen, S., Fischbach, A., Keller, U., & Lorphelin, D. (2016). Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse in Luxemburg. In Ministry of Education, Children and Youth, SCRIPT & University of Luxembourg, LUCET (Eds.), *PISA 2015: Nationaler Bericht Luxemburg* (pp. 4–12). <https://men.public.lu/dam-assets/catalogue-publications/statistiques-etudes/secondaire/pisa-2015-de.pdf>
- Caldas, S. J., & Bankston, C. (1997). Effect of school population socioeconomic status on individual academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(5), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1997.10544583>
- Eurydice (Ed.). (2022). *Luxembourg overview*. <https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-education-systems/luxembourg/overview>
- Hadjar, A., Fischbach, A., & Backes, S. (2018). Bildungsungleichheiten im luxemburgischen Sekundarschulsystem aus zeitlicher Perspektive In LUCET & SCRIPT (Eds.), *Nationaler Bildungsbericht Luxemburg 2018* (pp. 58–82). Luxembourg: LUCET & MENJE.
- Hornstra, L., Van Der Veen, I., Peetsma, T., & Volman, M. (2015). Does classroom composition make a difference: Effects on developments in motivation, sense of classroom belonging, and achievement in upper primary school. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(2), 125–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2014.887024>
- Hornung, C., Wollschläger, R., Keller, U., Esch, P., Müller, C., & Fischbach, A. (2021). Neue längsschnittliche Befunde aus dem nationalen Bildungsmonitoring ÉpStan in der 1. und 3. Klasse: Negativer Trend in der Kompetenzentwicklung und kein Erfolg bei Klassenwiederholungen. In LUCET & SCRIPT (Eds.), *Nationaler Bildungsbericht Luxemburg 2021* (pp. 44–55). Luxembourg: LUCET & MENJE.
- MENJE (Ed.). (2020). *The Luxembourg Education System*. <https://men.public.lu/dam-assets/catalogue-publications/divers/informations-generales/the-luxembourg-education-system-en.pdf>
- MENJE (Ed.). (2022). *EDI - Infomagazin für Elterner*. <https://men.public.lu/dam-assets/catalogue-publications/edi-infomagazin-fir-elteren/2022/web-edi-10.pdf>
- OECD (Ed.). (2018). *Luxembourg—Country Note - PISA 2018 Results. Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)*. https://www.oecd.org/pisa/publications/PISA2018_CNT_LUX.pdf
- Opendakker, M.-C., & Damme, J. (2001). Relationship between school composition and characteristics of school process and their effect on mathematics achievement. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(4), 407–432. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920120071434>
- Schola Europaea (Ed.). (2015). *Quality teaching in the European Schools - Booklet*. <https://gudee.eu/DOC2016/2015-09-D-3-en-2-Booklet.pdf>
- Schola Europaea (Ed.). (2018). *Control of the level of linguistic competence as part of the procedure for recruitment of non-native speaker teaching and educational support staff*. <https://www.eursec.eu/BasicTexts/2018-01-D-65-en-3.pdf>
- Schola Europaea (Ed.). (2019). *Regulations on Accredited European Schools*. <https://www.eursec.eu/Documents/2019-12-D-12-en-1.pdf>



Schola Europaea (Ed.). (2023). *Evaluation of seconded and locally recruited teachers in the European schools*. <https://www.eursc.eu/BasicTexts/2023-01-D-32-en-3.pdf>

Sonnleitner, P., Krämer, C., Gamo, S., Reichert, M., Keller, U., & Fischbach, A. (2021). Neue längsschnittliche Befunde aus dem nationalen Bildungsmonitoring ÉpStan in der 3. und 9. Klasse: Schlechtere Ergebnisse und wirkungslose Klassenwiederholungen. In LUCET & SCRIPT (Eds.), *Nationaler Bildungsbericht Luxemburg 2021* (pp. 109–115). Luxembourg: LUCET & MENJE.

Sykes, B., & Kuyper, H. (2013). School segregation and the secondary-school achievements of youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(10), 1699–1716. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.833707>