



Language Policy Division
Strasbourg, France



Jagiellonian University
Kraków, Poland

“Towards a Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education?”

**An international conference organised jointly by
the Council of Europe, Language Policy Division,
and the Jagiellonian University**

Kraków, Poland, April 27-29, 2006

© Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, Strasbourg, France: www.coe.int/lang;
www.coe.int/portfolio
Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland: www.uj.edu.pl

Collated by: Waldek Martyniuk

Formatted by: Tomasz Kulawik

Strasbourg–Kraków 2006

Conference Programme

27.04.06	Thursday
14.45 – 15.45	Registration of participants
15.45 – 16.00	Welcoming address and opening statement: Władysław Miodunka, Vice-Rector of the Jagiellonian University and Joe Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division, Council of Europe (Aula Collegium Maius)
16.00 – 16.25	Introduction: Mike Byram, Durham University: <i>Towards a common European framework of reference for language(s) of education? – a project in the context of the Council of Europe work on language education</i> (Aula Collegium Maius) – abstract on p. 17
16.30 – 17.30	Session I: Opening the scope (J. Bobrzyński Room) 1. Helmut Vollmer, Universität Osnabrück: <i>Language across the Curriculum (LAC)</i> – abstract on p. 19 2. Mike Fleming, Durham University: <i>The use and mis-use of competence frameworks and statements with particular attention to describing achievement in literature</i> – abstract on p. 21 2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion
17.30 – 17.45	Coffee
17.45 – 19.15	3. Władysław Miodunka, Jagiellonian University / Grażyna Przechodzka, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University of Lublin: <i>Mother Tongue vs. Foreign Language Performance – a Polish Case</i> – abstract on p. 23 4. John De Jong, Language Testing Services, Velp: <i>PISA – Assessing Reading Literacy in Language of Instruction</i> – abstract on p. 25 5. Waldek Martyniuk, Language Policy Division, Council of Europe: <i>Describing language competences – EU-key competences, PISA-reading literacy, and the CEFR</i> – abstract on p. 27 3 × 20 minute-presentations + 30 minute-discussion
19.20 – 20.00	A welcoming toast with the Rectors of the Jagiellonian University (Collegium Maius, Stuba Communis)
20.15	Dinner

28.04.06

Friday

9.00 – 11.00

Session II (J. Bobrzyński Room): *IMEN (International Mother Tongue Education Network) Symposium, Part I: What to (re-)search? Problematising perceptions of LS, LAC and LE for a common European Framework* – abstract on p. 29

1. **Piet-Hein van de Ven, Radboud University Nijmegen & HAN University Arnhem/Nijmegen:** *Comparative research on mother tongue education* – abstract on p. 31

2. **Sjaak Kroon, Tilburg University & Radboud University Nijmegen:** *Unity through Diversity in European Language Teaching* – abstract on p. 33

3. **Sigmund Ongstad, Oslo University College:** *The Concepts of 'Language' and 'Discipline' in Transgression. A paradigmatic, critical and comparative study of 'Norwegian'* – abstract on p. 35

4. **Jon Smidt, Sør-Trøndelag University College:** *The complexities of 'writing': Conceptions of writing and the teaching of writing in Norway and other countries* – abstract on p. 37

4 × 20 minute-presentations + 40 minute-discussion

11.00 – 11.30

Coffee

11.30 – 13.00

Session III (J. Bobrzyński Room): *Educating for plurilingualism*

1. **Eike Thürman, Landesinstitut für Schule / Qualitätsagentur, Soest:** *Baccalauréat européen plurilingue* – abstract on p. 45

2. **Suzanne Burley / Cathy Pomphrey, London Metropolitan University:** *Diversity and coherence: bridging the boundaries between English (L1) and Modern Languages in language teacher education* – abstract on p. 51

3. **Ljudmila Ivšek, National Institute of Education, Ljubljana:** *Slovene: Language of Education, Official and State Language* – abstract on p. 53

3 × 20 minute-presentations + 30 minute-discussion

parallel to

Session IV (Refektarz): *Which curriculum for whom?*

1. **Laila Aase, University of Bergen:** *Convergences between first language and second language? Theoretical and practical implications* – abstract on p. 55

2. **Grażyna Zarzycka, University of Łódź:** *The cultural, sociocultural and linguacultural layers of Polish as a native and as a foreign language as revealed in the process of education* – abstract on p. 57

3. Iwona Janowska / Ewa Lipińska / Anna Seretny, Jagiellonian University: *Linguistic education in Polish schools abroad, i.e. teaching a foreign or a second language vs. teaching a native tongue* – abstract on p. 59

3 × 20 minute-presentations + 30 minute-discussion

13.15 – 15.00

Lunch

15.15 – 16.15

Session V (J. Bobrzyński Room): *IMEN (International Mother Tongue Education Network) Symposium, Part II: Tension and translation* – abstract on p. 39

1. **Ellen Krogh, University of Southern Denmark:** *Fuzzy criteria in the mother tongue classroom* – abstract on p. 41

2. **Nikolaj Frydensbjerg Elf, University of Southern Denmark:** *Unfit for the Dyadic Split? Modes, Media and Semiocy* – abstract on p. 43

2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion

parallell to:

Session VI (Refektarz): *Migrant children in a MT classroom*

1. **Piet van Avermaet, University of Ghent:** *The curriculum/policy in language(s) of school education. The case of Flanders. With a special focus on migrants* – abstract on p. 61

2. **Marie Hádková, Charles University, Prague / Jaromíra Šindelářová, Usti n. Labem University:** *'Multicultural' classroom interaction – participation of migrant children* – abstract on p. 63

2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion

16.15 – 16.45

Coffee

16.45 – 18.15

Session VII (J. Bobrzyński Room): *Teaching literature*

1. **Tanja Janssen / Gert Rijlaarsdam, University of Amsterdam:** *Describing the Dutch literature curriculum: A theoretical and empirical approach to describe the perceived and actual curriculum* – abstract on p. 65

2. **Kari Sallamaa, University of Oulu / University of Helsinki:** *Constructing a European Canon and its didactic implications* – abstract on p. 67

3. **Giuseppe Longo, University of Venice / University of Verona:** *Teaching literature: how? Towards new paradigms in the didactics of literature* – abstract on p. 69

3 × 20 minute-presentations + 30 minute-discussion

19.00

Reception – Dinner

29.04.06

Saturday

9.00 – 11.00

Session VIIIa (J. Bobrzyński Room): *Reading literacy*

1. **Marli Tijssen, Centre for the Innovation of Vocational Training and Adult Education in the Netherlands (CINOP):** *Levels of Dutch in upper-secondary vocational education and the use of the CEF for the description of language proficiency of the language of school education* – abstract on p. 71

2. **Irene Pieper, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt/Main:** *Reading literature as a major sub-discipline in German primary and secondary education under challenge* – abstract on p. 73

2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion

Session VIIIb (J. Bobrzyński Room): *Reading literacy*

1. **Gerhard Rupp, Ruhr-Universität Bochum:** *Promoting reading literacy in mother tongue education* – abstract on p. 85

2. **J. L. Milton, University of Wales, Swansea:** *The Importance of Vocabulary Measures in a Language Framework: Lessons from the Common European Framework for Foreign Languages* – abstract on p. 77

2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion

parallell to

Session IXa (Refektarz): *MT as part of ELP?*

1. **Irina Khaleeva, Moscow State Linguistic University:** *Teaching national languages in Russia*

2. **Helge Bonset / Theun Meestringa, National Institute for Curriculum Development of the Netherlands (SLO):** *Some Steps Taken Towards a CEF for Languages of School Education* – abstract on p. 79

2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion

Session IXb (Refektarz): *MT as part of ELP?*

1. **Peter Broeder / Rita Sorce, Tilburg University:** *Managing diversity in multilingual Europe* – abstract on p. 81

2. **Georgii Khruslov, Pushkin Institute of Russian Language / Institute for Ethnic Issues in Education, Moscow:** *General Analysis of Current National Curricula in Language(s) of School Education in Russia* – abstract on p. 83

2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion

11.00 – 11.30

Coffee

- 11.30 – 12.30 **Session X** (J. Bobrzyński Room): *LE curriculum*
1. **Anne-Marie Broi, Office de la statistique et de l'informatique scolaires (OSIS), Neuchâtel / Brigit Eriksson, University of Applied Sciences, Zurich:** *HarmoS – language 1: “The development of a model of competences for the language 1 (language of education) and the development of minimal standards for grades 2, 6 and 9 in Switzerland”* – abstract on p. 85
 2. **Mina Drever, Training and Development Agency for Schools, UK:** *Interactional corrective feedback in first language (L1) and second/foreign language (L2) acquisition and learning: does it have the same effects?* – abstract on p. 87
- 2 × 20 minute-presentations + 30 minute-discussion
- 12.30 – 14.00 Lunch
- 14.15 – 15.15 **Session XI** (Aula Collegium Novum): *Polish as Mother Tongue*
1. **Agnieszka Kłakówna, Pedagogical University, Kraków:** *Wychowanie językowe jako podstawa kształcenia kulturowego (Learning through language to develop cultural competence)* – **in Polish, with interpretation to English** – abstract on p. 89
 2. **Jadwiga Kowalikowa Jagiellonian University / Urszula Żydek-Bednarczuk, University of Silesia, Katowice:** *Standaryzacja wymagań i osiągnięć jako konsekwencja rozwoju modelu nauczania języka polskiego jako ojczystego (Standardisation of requirements and achievements in Polish as MT)* – **in Polish, with interpretation to English** – abstract on p. 93
- 2 × 20 minute-presentations + 20 minute-discussion
- 15.15 – 16.15 **Closing Session** (Aula Collegium Novum): *Towards a common European framework of reference for language(s) of education?* – **summary and discussion, introduction by Mike Byram**
- 16.45 – 18.45 Sightseeing

Welcoming address

WŁADYSŁAW MIODUNKA

Vice-Rector, Jagiellonian University

Witam Państwa serdecznie w Polsce, w Krakowie, w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim – najstarszym polskim uniwersytecie.

Inaugurując konferencję „Europejski system opisu kształcenia w języku edukacji szkolnej” w auli *Collegium Maius*, zwanej początkowo *Lectorium Theologorum* nawiązujemy do początków Uniwersytetu, założonego 12 maja 1364 roku przez króla Kazimierza Wielkiego. W latach 1397–1400 uniwersytet, zwany wtedy Akademią Krakowską, został odnowiony z inicjatywy Królowej Jadwigi. 26 lipca 1400 roku w obecności króla Władysława Jagiełły oficjalnie otwarto *Collegium Maius*, a wykład inauguracyjny odbył się w *Lectorium Theologorum*.

Ponieważ nasza konferencja jest organizowana wspólnie przez Wydział Polityki Językowej Rady Europy i Uniwersytet Jagielloński, warto zwrócić uwagę na współpracę europejską, której przykładem są początki Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego: założycielem uniwersytetu był polski król Kazimierz z dynastii Piastów, inicjatorką jego odnowienia – królowa Jadwiga, urodzona w Budapeszcie reprezentantka europejskiej dynastii Andegawenów, a wykonawcą jej woli Władysław Jagiełło, wielki książę litewski i król Polski.

Dziś Uniwersytet Jagielloński jest drugim co do wielkości – po Uniwersytecie Warszawskim – uniwersytetem w Polsce, kształcącym 42 000 studentów i zatrudniającym 6520 pracowników, w tym 980 profesorów. Uniwersytet liczy 15 wydziałów, a najmłodszymi z nich są Wydział Zarządzania i Komunikacji Społecznej, Wydział Stosunków Międzynarodowych i Politycznych oraz Wydział Biotechnologii. Ponieważ Uniwersytet Jagielloński dynamicznie się rozwija, musi rozwijać się jego baza lokalowa: gotowe są trzy części kampusu po drugiej stronie Wisły, a niedaleko stąd w 2005 roku zostało otwarte *Auditorium Maximum*, mieszczące kilka dużych sal, w tym – największą na 1200 miejsc.

Nauczanie i studiowanie języków zawsze należało do ważnych zadań Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Nauce języków obcych służy Jagiellońskie Centrum Językowe, aktualnie zmieniane i modernizowane. Języki można studiować na dwóch wydziałach: Wydziale Filologicznym oraz Wydziale Polonistyki, gdzie nauczaniem języka polskiego jako obcego zaj-

muje się Centrum Języka i Kultury Polskiej w Świecie, kształcące na kilku programach około tysiąca studentów rocznie. Centrum ma duże zasługi we wprowadzaniu w Polsce standardów europejskich. Od roku 2000 Centrum reprezentuje Polskę w *Association of Language Testers in Europe* (ALTE). Pracownicy Centrum, a zwłaszcza dr Waldemar Martyniuk, dbali o zachowanie standardów ALTE w systemie certyfikacji języka polskiego jako obcego. Także tu powstała polska wersja językowa „*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*” („Europejski system opisu kształcenia językowego: uczenie się, nauczanie, ocenianie”). Opracował ją dr Waldemar Martyniuk, a została ona opublikowana w 2003 roku w Warszawie.

Szanowni Państwo, to wielki zaszczyt dla nas, że ta konferencja odbywa się w Krakowie, w Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim. Jest to także moja osobista satysfakcja, że konferencja na temat standardów europejskich w językach edukacji odbywa się tu, gdyż osobiście jestem przekonany, że ta tematyka jest ogromnie ważna dla nauczanych dzieci i młodzieży. Jako dziecko wiejskie ze wschodniej Polski chodziłem do prowincjonalnych szkół. Języka polskiego i innych języków uczyli mnie znakomici nauczyciele, a rozwinięte umiejętności językowe pomogły mi potem w studiach w Polsce i za granicą. Pamiętam jednak, że wielu kolegów nie miało tak dobrych nauczycieli i w rezultacie do dziś mają oni kłopoty z publicznym wypowiadaniem się, czy formułowaniem listów oficjalnych. Dlatego wierzę, że w skutecznym kształceniu umiejętności językowych bardzo mogą pomóc europejskie standardy.

Wygłaszając 26 lipca 1400 roku swój wykład inauguracyjny, ówczesny rektor Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Stanisław ze Skarbimierza, powiedział, że „w małym domu tego kolegium mądrość całego świata jest zamknięta”. Wierzę, że dziś, 606 lat później, mogę powiedzieć, że w auli *Collegium Maius* mądrość językowa całej Europy została zgromadzona. Dzięki temu ta konferencja ma szansę stać się ważnym krokiem w stronę europejskiego systemu opisu kształcenia w języku edukacji szkolnej. Organizatorom i wszystkim uczestnikom serdecznie tego życzę.

WŁADYSŁAW MIODUNKA

Vice-Rector, Jagiellonian University

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my great honor to welcome you to Poland, to Kraków and finally to the Jagiellonian University – the oldest Polish university.

We inaugurate the conference “Towards a Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education?” in a very special place. *Collegium Maius*, previously called *Lectorium Theologorum*, draws our attention back to the beginnings of the University, which was first established as the Studium Generale on May 12, 1364 by Casimir the Great, King of Poland. Later it was restored on the initiative of Queen Jadwiga d’Anjou who bequeathed her jewelry for that purpose. The University was officially re-established after its benefactress’s death on July 26, 1400 by King Władysław Jagiełło and the opening ceremony was held exactly in *Lectorium Theologorum*.

This conference is organized jointly by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe and the Jagiellonian University and it is by no means an exaggeration to say that the history of the University is an excellent example of European cooperation. The University was established by Casimir the Great, Polish King; restored by Jadwiga, Polish Queen from the European dynasty d'Anjou, whose will was executed by her husband Władysław Jagiełło, Grand Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland.

At present the Jagiellonian University is – after the University of Warsaw - the second largest university in Poland, with 42.000 students and 6.520 employees among whom 980 hold the title of professor. The University is divided into 15 faculties – the most recently created ones are: Faculty of Management and Social Communication, Faculty of International and Political Studies and Faculty of Biotechnology. As the Jagiellonian University is constantly developing it is important to improve the academic and research environment by enlarging the area of University premises. So far four new buildings have been built, three of them in the outskirts and the newest one – Auditorium Maximum – in the city center. The latter, opened in 2005, houses several theater rooms, the largest of which can hold up to 1.200 people.

Teaching and studying languages has always been an important issue at the Jagiellonian University. Nowadays language education at the University is carried out by the Jagiellonian Center for Foreign Languages which is currently being modernized and reorganized. There are two faculties dedicated to language teaching: Faculty of Philology (Faculty of Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures) and Faculty of Polish Studies. Recently at the Faculty of Polish Studies a special academic unit – the Center for Polish Language and Culture in the World – was created in order to teach Polish as a foreign language. The Center runs several different programs and educates around 1.000 foreign and Polish students per year. Since 2000 the Center has been representing Poland in the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE). The academic Staff of the Center, especially Dr Waldemar Martyniuk, has taken an active part in implementing the ALTE standards into the process of certification of Polish as foreign language. It was also at the Center, where the Polish version of “The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages” was translated. This work of Dr Waldemar Martyniuk was afterwards published in Warsaw in 2003.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege for the Jagiellonian University to host this conference. I personally feel very satisfied with the fact that the conference concerning European standards in language education takes place in Kraków. I am inclined to believe that its subject matter is of great importance in children and youth education. I grew up in the countryside of Eastern Poland and therefore I attended small-town schools. Nevertheless I had most excellent teachers of both Polish and foreign languages. The language skills they helped me to develop were essential in my further studies both in Poland and abroad. Unfortunately, I remember that not all of my friends had such an auspicious start and as a result nowadays they find it hard to make public statements or to write official letters. All of the above makes me believe that the European standards can be very helpful in the efficient language education.

During his inaugural speech – on July 26, 1400 – Stanisław of Skarbimierz, at that time rector of the Jagiellonian University said, “The little house of this *collegium* contains the wisdom of the whole world”. I think that today, 606 year later, it is justified to say that this very Hall of the *Collegium Maius* contains the linguistic wisdom of the entire Europe. I am strongly convinced that owing to the latter this conference has a chance of becoming an important step towards a Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education. This is precisely what I would like to wish to both the organisers and the participants.

Opening statement

JOE SHEILS

Language Policy Division, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, France

The Council of Europe promotes international cooperation in language education policy and practice among its 46 member states. The projects carried out by the Language Policy Division in Strasbourg aim to share expertise and experience in the development of policies for plurilingualism among citizens as a basis for active, democratic citizenship and social cohesion.

The Division's projects include the elaboration of instruments for policy analysis and planning, and more recently initiatives designed to promote a holistic approach to language education embracing all languages in a coherent approach. It assists states in reviewing and planning policies for all sectors and all languages, develops common European benchmarks for curriculum and examinations, and other tools designed to enhance the quality of language education.

While work has until recently concentrated mainly on foreign/second language learning and teaching, and the education of minorities, the languages of school education are now becoming a major focus both in their own right and as part of the Council's goal to promote a global, coherent approach to language policy in education.

This academic conference is the first major event that the Council of Europe has organised on these languages, and it will be followed by an intergovernmental conference in Strasbourg in October to which the representatives of Ministries of Education will be invited. It is intended to develop work in this area initially within the current medium term project (2006 – 2009), and in particular to explore the feasibility of elaborating a Common European Framework of Reference. In the spirit of the Council of Europe's principles, such an instrument would be descriptive and not prescriptive. It would offer a common basis for reflecting on and planning syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, textbooks, examinations etc. across Europe. The conference will help to clarify basic concepts and issues that will need to be considered in the development of this new project.

Abstracts

Introduction

MIKE BYRAM

Durham University, United Kingdom (Adviser to the Language Policy Division, Council of Europe)

Towards a common European framework of reference for language(s) of education? – a project in the context of the Council of Europe work on language education

The Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg has launched a project to examine the feasibility of producing a common European framework of reference for languages of school education.

This work builds upon the success of the *Common European Framework of Reference* for modern/foreign languages which is widely used in curriculum development, textbook writing, promoting new approaches to teaching and learning, examinations and so on. The main principle of the *CEFR* is to promote plurilingualism and this has recently led to the production of a *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe* in which it is shown *inter alia* how the principle of plurilingualism includes the teaching and learning of the language(s) of education systems, which are often designated as ‘mother tongues’ or ‘national languages’. The new project focuses on these languages.

The project is in its initial stage. Three expert meetings have been held already, defining the scope of the project and suggesting the working methods. One of the outputs of the expert work so far has been to organise this international conference to examine the views on the topic as presented by the broader academic audience in Europe. It is anticipated that the conference will produce useful reflections on the relationship between terms, concepts, understandings and practices of the educational and academic fields in question. For example, it is important to discuss the differences between concepts such as Mother Tongue Education, Standard Language Education, Key Language, Language of Instruction, First Language Education, Home Language, National Language, State Language Education, etc. Our aim is not to try to objectify definitions, but to try to understand the nature of the different national, cultural and academic perceptions of such terms when working internationally.

Another issue which the conference will address is that of specialisation in language education. It is not easy to find professionals who are work on the whole spectrum of languages in education, including foreign languages, second languages, minority and regional languages, state and national languages, languages and their regional or social varieties. All of

which need to be taken into account in the education of young people in compulsory schooling . There is a trend to specialisation, with the result that there is a lack of contact between for example those dealing with foreign/second language education and those specialising in mother/first/official/national language – as well as between those specialising in teaching literature and those interested in teaching language itself.

Our goal is to look for convergences between these areas, since they all relate to the same area of reflection: language use and language users. In developing a new framework, we hope to counter further fragmentation and stimulate critical discussion and analysis, examining to which degree and in which ways more coherence in curricula is achievable both in practical, academic, and political terms.

In this introductory session we will trace the development of the *CEFR* and related documents and instruments and then outline what we hope will be the directions taken in the production of a new framework for the language(s) of education. This will include an explanation of the purpose and functions of such a document, the ways in which it might relate to the existing *CEFR*, the implications for convergences among the different types of language teaching and learning, and the vision of the language learner and user which might lie behind it.

The three main inter-related content areas of the conference are:

1. Theoretical Approaches and Analytical Descriptions
 - a. General analysis of current national curricula/policies in Language(s) of School Education / Mother Tongue Education
 - b. Analysis of the role of major sub-disciplines such as writing, reading, literature, culture, etc in the national curricula/policies of Language(s) of School Education / Mother Tongue Education
 - c. Innovative and controversial approaches – especially those of interest from an international/European perspective
2. Proficiency descriptors and assessment issues
 - a. Descriptors defining proficiency in Language of School Education / Mother Tongue Education
 - b. Levels of proficiency in Language of School Education / Mother Tongue Education
3. Mother Tongue Education vs. Foreign Language Education – comparative studies
 - a. convergences
 - b. divergences

References

www.coe.int/lang; www.coe.int/portfolio;

Guide for the development of Language Education Policies in Europe: from linguistic diversity to plurilingual education, 2003 (Project 1 rev.) / Beacco Jean-Claude & Byram Michael

Session I: *Opening the scope*

HELMUT JOHANNES VOLLMER

Universität Osnabrück, Germany

Language Across the Curriculum (LAC)

Language across the curriculum (LAC) relates to linking different forms and aspects of language education within the school curriculum, particularly emphasising the role of language in all subject-matter learning. The potential of this approach will be described and analysed more closely, based on preliminary findings within my own research project “Fachlernen und (Fremd-) Sprachlichkeit” (2004-2006). As a result, I will argue that LAC should become an integral part of a framework of reference for languages of school education in Europe.

In my paper, I will first name the five issues connected with the topic, namely: 1) relating mother tongue education to foreign or second language learning, 2) relating the learning of the first foreign language to that of other foreign languages, 3) relating foreign language education to heritage language education, 4) developing subject-specific language competencies in each subject and across all subjects in school, 5) using a foreign/second language (in the case of many migrant children a *third* language) for subject-matter learning within “bilingual education” or CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning).

I will demonstrate the necessity of developing a comprehensive model of language education, using the concept “Gesamtsprachliche Bildung” as it has been developed in Germany recently, incorporating different language experiences and activities inside and outside school, and compare it to the notion of *literacy*. In particular, I will distinguish between 4 levels of analysis: the *level of research* (what do we know about the potential linkages?), the *level of learning* (what are learners expected to acquire and to “do”?), the *level of teaching* (what are the challenges for the teacher to support cognitive development and advanced language discourse learning), and the *level of evaluation and assessment* (how can we evaluate progress on the part of the learner in language awareness and in using language skills from different sources?).

My *focus* will then be on *academic discourse competence* in L1 and in L2. I will explain and apply two notions from Cummins, namely BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) versus CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency). CALP, as the language of

school and of science, demands more than the performance of certain speech acts for securing understanding: it requires precision, explicitness, rationality, shift from everyday language to academic language use, including the use of appropriate metaphors and domain-specific terminology. This in turn requires *receptive and productive competencies* for manipulating macro discourse functions (like describing, hypothesising, explaining, evaluating) in structured forms of writing and speaking, organised according to content, purpose, audience, and text type (genre). CALP also implies *mediation competence*: the ability to “translate” or rephrase concepts, models, observations or insights for different audiences, e.g. for peers, for a lay audience, for experts from outside school, from the academic field or the discipline itself.

Based on my own data (taken from task performance of monolingual and bilingual geography students in Grade 10) I will illustrate the specific role that *academic discourse competence* plays in extending the communicative basis which has been laid through mother tongue education (or second language education for immigrant children): it initiates students into different discourse communities and their conventions, it prepares them for becoming members of relevant social/professional groups and for participating in authentic discourse. This may be the basis for expanding identities towards a multiplicity of personal, professional, political or civic roles.

As to bilingual education, CLIL teaches us about the intimate relationship between cognition and language, in L1 as much as in L2: thus all mental activities are linguistically mediated: naming and combining concepts, negotiating of meaning and of social roles, task comprehension and problem solving alike. Specific demands are posed by “discontinuous” texts, by text-image relationships, and social semiotics.

After a short summary, I would like us to discuss some implications and perspectives for the view of LAC following from the insights above: As much as LAC will have to become a necessary component of any framework of reference for languages of school education in Europe, we are just beginning to explore it.

References

- Coetzee-Lachmann, Debbie (in progress). *Assessing bilingual learners' use of language in subject-specific contexts: Aspects of geographical literacy* Osnabrück: Universität (unpubl. PhD. thesis).
- Vollmer, H. J. (2005). Fachliche Kommunikationsfähigkeit als integrativer Teil von Fachkompetenz. (Paper, presented at the *Kieler Kompetenz-Workshop „Biology in Context“*, Universität Kiel, June 16-17, 2005).
- Vollmer, H. J. (2006). „Fachlernen und (Fremd-)Sprachlichkeit: Aufgabenbasierte Kognition, Kommunikation, Kooperation“. In: Hahn, A. & Klippel, F. (Hrsg.), *Sprachen schaffen Chancen. Dokumentation des 21. Kongresses für Fremdsprachendidaktik*. München: Oldenbourg. (to appear).

MIKE FLEMING

Durham University, United Kingdom

The use and mis-use of competence frameworks and statements with particular attention to describing achievement in literature

A key question facing the Council of Europe project on Language(s) of Education is whether competences are a valuable means of framing learning outcomes in language or whether their limitations outweigh their advantages. The conceptual enquiry in this paper will examine the theoretical basis for using competence statements to provide common frameworks in a variety of fields. It will examine in particular the feasibility of describing progress and attainment in literary understanding in terms of competences. Despite considerable opposition to the idea of using competence statements to capture the complexity of human learning, their use has been gaining ground and is now widespread in a variety of spheres, including vocational education (*passim*), teacher training, higher education, interculturalism, and the Council of Europe's own work on language policies. Advocates of using competence statements for assessment purposes and syllabus design see their value largely in bringing objectivity, clarity and transparency to the specification of learning outcomes. Critics however take the view that competence frameworks are too limiting and narrow. In the context of literary achievement, where boundaries and definitions are flexible, and where there is more emphasis on subjectivity, uncertainty and fluidity, competence statements may bring an element of rigidity which is anathema to literary and artistic sensibilities. This paper will examine some of the more general arguments against the use of competence statements before addressing the particular case of literature. It will be argued that although many of the criticisms directed at the competence movement are fundamentally ill-founded, those criticisms have value because they indicate potential problems in their use.

The origins of the competence movement in vocational training accounts for the nature of some of the hostility it provoked, particularly when transferred to other contexts. By initially placing emphasis on technical skills and not higher level achievement (including understanding, attitudes, personal qualities) competence statements were thought to be narrow, reductive and functionalist. By limiting assessment to what is observable, it was felt that competence statements were uncompromisingly behaviourist. Furthermore it was thought

that a list of pre-determined skills did not allow for creative or unexpected outcomes. The word 'competence' itself suggested to some people satisfaction with ordinariness as opposed to excellence.

It will argued that many of the criticisms of the competence movement are theoretically flawed. Such criticisms, however, can provide insight into the limitations and usefulness of competence statements and how they can be best used in practice. The view that because they are based on behaviour, competence statements do not take account of understanding will be examined in the light of perspectives drawn from philosophy of mind, in particular the concept of dualism. The way the term 'competence' itself is understood and used will be examined.

In the light of the broader theoretical discussion the paper will go on to examine the application of competence statements to literary understanding. It will describe the types of literary theoretical assumptions which need to be acknowledged and examined explicitly in the development of a competence framework and will discuss some examples of the use of competence statements applied to literature.

WŁADYSŁAW MIODUNKA

Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland

GRAŻYNA PRZECHODZKA

Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin, Poland

Mother Tongue versus Foreign Language Performance – a Polish Case

The aim of this paper is to make a comparison between language performance of two different groups of Polish language users: Polish last year high school students who end their language education and foreigners learning Polish as a second language who took the CEF/ALTE C2 Level Examination in Polish as a Foreign Language in 2005.

As the Polish language certification system is based on the common European standards established by ALTE and on the “Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education”, language performance of both Polish and foreign students will be examined by means of the same test which will enable the researchers to assess their language performance in the following skill areas: reading and listening comprehension, writing and accuracy (grammatical competence).

The purpose of our research is to demonstrate that the “Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment” might be applied to the process of teaching Polish as a mother tongue as successfully as were the European standards applied while establishing the Polish language certification system.

As a general rule the syllabus used for teaching Polish language in Polish schools does not focus on the development of language skills. The research that was carried out is the first attempt to establish the level of language performance in Polish language of the Polish students in the following areas: writing, reading and listening comprehension.

The research was conducted on the last year high school students from eight Polish cities: Katowice, Wrocław, Kraków, Lublin, Łódź, Poznań, Sanok and Warszawa. While selecting the cities suitable for the purpose of the research the following factors were taken under consideration:

- a) the exams were to be conducted in those cities where examiners of Polish as a Foreign Language work;
- b) students participating in the research had to be representative for the South, North, East and West of Poland;
- c) both small (Sanok) and large cities (i.e. Kraków, Warszawa) had to be included.

One of the tests used in the “Polish as a Foreign Language 2005” examination session was employed in order to examine language performance of Polish high school students . The research group consisted of 150 Polish last year high school students. The results of the examinations will be compared with those achieved by 65 foreign students who took the CEF/ALTE C2 Level Examination in Polish as a Foreign Language in 2005.

Examination results will enable the researchers to observe in which skills, each representative group, has achieved the highest as well as the lowest score. The focus of the research will be to compare Polish and foreign students’ language performance in Polish language not only by means of the quantity (the points gained) but also by the quality of their performance.

JOHN H.A.L. DE JONG

Language Testing Services, Velp, The Netherlands

PISA – Assessing Reading Literacy in Language of Instruction

Since the year 2000 the OECD has set up a programme for assessing key skills for 15-year-olds every three years. Key skills are assessed in Reading literacy, Math's and Science. For each participating country reading literacy is assessed in the language of instruction, this may be the mother tongue for the majority of the target population, but in many countries the language of instruction may also be a second language for a substantial number of students. The assessment aims to evaluate whether the educational systems in participating countries have succeeded in bringing students to the level necessary for success in their future lives, be it in continuing further education or in joining the workforce. In 2000 Reading literacy was the major domain in PISA: most of the total available testing time was devoted to this domain. In 2009 Reading literacy will again be the major domain.

Reading literacy in PISA 200 is defined as: “*Understanding, using, and reflecting on written texts, in order to achieve one’s goals, to develop one’s knowledge and potential, and to participate in society*”.

In my contribution I will present the framework for reading literacy that was developed for PISA 2000, the vision on reading literacy that evolved in evaluating students’ work, the scale for describing differences in levels of reading literacy, some major findings about relations between level of reading literacy and other relevant variables, and views on new developments that have been proposed for inclusion in the assessment plan for PISA 2009.

Reference

Kirsch, I., De Jong, J.H.A.L., Lafontaine, D., McQueen, J., Mendelovits, J., and C. Monseur. (2002) *Reading for Change: Performance and Engagement Across Countries – Results from PISA 2000*. Paris: OECD.

WALDEK MARTYNIUK

Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, Strasbourg, France

Describing language proficiency: EU-key competences, PISA-reading literacy, and the CEFR

Describing language competences has been in the last years subject of several projects, among them three major European developments: the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) surveys, the European Commission “Education and Training 2010” work programme, and the Council of Europe Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Within each of these projects descriptions of language proficiency have been produced:

- PISA – reading literacy (in “mother tongue”), in addition to literacy in mathematics and science;
- EU – key competences for lifelong learning (communication in the mother tongue and communication in a foreign language, in addition to mathematical literacy and basic competences in science and technology, digital competence, learning-to-learn, interpersonal and civic competences, entrepreneurship, and cultural expression);
- CEFR – foreign languages (learning, teaching and assessment)

In my paper I intend to present results of a comparative study analysing the approaches and the descriptive parameters used within the three frameworks.

In conclusions I am going to examine the possibility to use the findings of these projects for drafting a framework of proficiency levels for the language(s) of education project.

Session II: IMEN (International Mother Tongue Education Network) Symposium, Part I

SJAAK KROON, SIGMUND ONGSTAD, JON SMIDT AND PIET-HEIN VAN DE VEN

What to (re-)research? Problematising perceptions of LS, LAC and LE for a common European Framework

The symposium addresses the general challenge of how to perceive and describe basic concepts of the curricular and educational school subject that in France is called French, in Norway Norwegian etc. (What preliminary COE-discussions outlined as LE/LAC/LS). In this (re-)research conceptions of 'Language' turn out to be not a neutral object for investigation, but the very notion that may obstruct a broader understanding of the paradigmatic changes of these subjects over the last decades. Our view is among others informed by comparative, cooperative studies of what earlier has been termed Mother Tongue Education as Standard Language Education (MTE as STLE) not the least through the research group International Mother Tongue Education Network (IMEN) in Europe over the last 20-25 years. <http://www.lu.hio.no/imen>

A tendency is that the national(istic) dimension in curricula in some, but not all countries has weakened. Crucial concepts and fields of knowledge such as media, text, communication, ICT has entered the discipline and changed, not only its mere content, but even its 'nature' as discipline. Although 'language' is both important and dominant, it has got competition from perceptions such as 'text', 'communication' and 'culture'.

Hence traditional sub-disciplines such as writing, has been challenged too: text, communication, context, literature, life, self, culture, context for instance. are considered as crucial elements of the ecology of institutionalised writing. Another main challenge is internationalisation. The political focus in many countries has shifted from MTE/STLE more over towards the turbulent 'triangle' *between* a) MTE for immigrants, b) MTE/STLE and c) national STLE as a second language.

These tendencies will raise major research questions and are too extensive for a two hours slot. Each presenter focuses on different *fields* nevertheless sharing the view that LE/LAC/LS or MTE/STLE is under rapid change and deserves a proper inspection. We will do so, with one eye on CoE's goals and IMEN's research traditions on the other. Scopes of interests made explicit in CoE's paper *Report and projection of further work*, are: *concepts, curriculum analyses, competence* and *minority groups*. Each presenter will position his individual paper.

Thus in *Comparative research on mother tongue education*, Piet Hein van de Ven describes how IMEN historically has approached some of these problems, and how and why there are developed methodologies for international comparisons in the field. He gives an overview over main findings and recognitions from 20 years of international comparative, qualitative (re-)research for a platform of shared basic notions and experiences.

Further Sjaak Kroon in *Unity through Diversity in European Language Teaching*, describes recent shifts in Europe, including effects of the Bologna process and possible consequences of the COE framework for foreign language teaching. He describes developments calling for a shift from homogeneity to *diversity* in European language teaching. Leaning on IMEN research, Kroon further describes possible future research designs for relevant research projects. For discussion he addresses the challenge of dealing with cultural and linguistics diversity in the every day classroom practice of teachers and students.

Jon Smidt addresses *The complexities of 'writing'*. He departs from findings in IMEN projects, analysing school documents (the rhetoric of the subject) combined with close analyses of classrooms and teacher interviews. Empirical data even stem from a new qualitative study of writing instruction in Norwegian elementary schools. His overall scope though is conceptualizations of writing in an international, comparative perspective.

Sigmund Ongstad's contribution, *The Concepts of 'Language' and 'Discipline' in Transgression* deals with paradigmatic changes in perceptions of 'language' and of disciplinarity and their intimate but changing interrelatedness. The notion of 'Norwegian' is critically seen as a tacit dominating conceptualization of both 'language' and 'discipline' which struggles to be valid. His questions for discussion are: Given that the description for the Norwegian situation is valid, are similar curricular developments visible in other countries and what are the conceptual consequence for establishing a common European framework for LE/LAC/LS?

PIET-HEIN VAN DE VEN

Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Comparative research on mother tongue education (MTE)

From 1981 the International Mother tongue Education Network carried out some international-comparative research on school subjects like Dutch in the Netherlands and Flanders, French in France and Belgium, German in Germany, English in England, etc.

It is not clear which joint international concept can be used for these subjects.

- MTE, L1? But the school subject often is not the mother's tongue, the first language.
- Standard Language? But MTE's history reaches far beyond the period of standardisation.
- National language? But some nations share their language (German in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland), some languages share their nations (French in France and Belgium), some nations have more national languages (The Netherlands).

IMEN used the traditional term "mother tongue education" (MTE).

Comparative research by IMEN had been motivated by lack of such research. The main stream studies in comparative education compared educational institutions and structures, and/or educational results; there was hardly a focus on school subjects' content.

The main objective of IMEN was to stimulate a European discussion on and comparison of MTE. Comparative research projects were carried out (mainly 1981-1995) focusing on a comparative analysis of MTE.

Some results:

- Very few scholars in this field seemed interested in international comparison: MTE-research appeared deeply rooted in the different traditions of national education systems and language communities.
- By lack of any research tradition IMEN developed a methodology for international comparison. The interest in comparative analyses of the content level of MTE and the reconstruction of differences in meaning construction in different cultures of MTE implied a certain preference for qualitative research methodology.

- A fundamental distinction should be made between the level of *rhetoric* (the formal and ideological curriculum) and the level of *practice* (classroom activities). There is a considerable gap between these two levels.
- On the level of rhetoric there is a paradigmatic discussion on the school subject during the whole 20th century. In the seventies in several countries a communicative approach competed successfully with a traditional one (literature, grammar). In MTE's practices this paradigmatic debate appeared to be less visible.
- In the meaning creating context of a paradigm, terms like 'communication' or 'literature' get different meanings. In the 1970s a communicative approach included conceptualisation, and aimed at emancipation. In the 1990s a more utilitarian paradigm defined 'communication' mainly as training vocational skills.
- MTE's contents are expressed in the same terms, but differ in meaning and practices. Grammar education in the Netherlands is not the same as grammar education in Germany; teaching writing processes in the Netherlands is not fully similar to teaching these processes in Norway. Literature as cultural heritage appeared in the Netherlands education in national literature, in an Hungarian case study it focussed much more on a European heritage.
- International comparative research demands carefully treatment of main concepts; e.g. the concept of 'functional' MTE was used in the Netherlands to contribute to vocational training, in Sweden for authentic learning in MTE, in Hungary for transmission of cultural heritage and in the UK (London School) for emancipatory MTE.
- International comparison demands translation. This caused problems. Didactics (English) e.g. is not similar to didaktiek (Dutch), Didaktik (German, Scandinavian), la didactique (French). There are concepts that appear to be hardly translatable, like 'Bildung'.
- The *field structure* of the school subject appeared to differ too. Constituents like literature, writing, oral communication, grammar, new media, reading, are differently mutually connected (or not). There are differences in the patterns of dominance between these constituents, literature being dominant in Germany, language abilities in the Netherlands. Not all countries have the same constituents, although literature, grammar, reading and writing appear to be the 'hard core' of the subject.

In sum: MTE appeared to be 'a social construction'. There are different concepts of language, grammar, literature, etc. What do we discuss discussing MTE, L1, literature, grammar, writing, etc.?

SJAAK KROON

Tilburg University & Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Unity through Diversity in European Language Teaching

As a consequence of, among other things, the Bologna agreement, in recent years a growing concern for unifying European education can be observed. This first of all applies to organizational and administrative unification, especially in higher education, leading to unified bachelor-master structures, credit systems, and certification agreements. This all is meant to lead to higher degrees of comparability and, as a consequence, better possibilities for mutual participation, exchange, and cooperation.

As far as the content of education is concerned, this unification tendency can be observed in international comparative research activities such as the PISA, PIRLS, TIMSS and IALS studies on educational achievement, and in the agreed upon Common European Framework of Reference for Languages as a basis for the elaboration of curriculum guidelines, syllabuses, examinations, textbooks etc.

Understandable as these unification activities might be in view of the massive and inescapable internationalization and globalization processes the world in general and the field of education in particular are facing today, they should not all too easily be taken as the only possible road to a unified European concept of (national) language teaching, i.e. the teaching of English as a standard language in England, German in Germany, Dutch in the Netherlands, Italian in Italy, etc.

Research findings from two recent investigations - in the Netherlands and Norway, and in the Netherlands, Germany, Flanders and England respectively - that were carried out in the context of the Research Programme of the International Mother Tongue Education Network (IMEN) show that a common characteristic of all participating countries is that they, at a national level, are facing the challenge of dealing with diversity in education. Since ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity can be considered fundamental and permanent characteristics of societies and schools in a world that is literally shaped by internationalization processes, also at an international European level, the principle of accepting and dealing with diversity seems to be the more appropriate way forward. Implementing this principle at the level of

educational policy as well as the level of teacher training and everyday classroom practice calls for a philosophy in which diversity is not longer exclusively considered as a problem or a burden, but rather as a right and a resource.

In this contribution some outcomes of international-comparative IMEN research in multiethnic, multicultural and multilingual classrooms will be discussed in view of their potential for striving at unity through diversity in European language teaching. This discussion will be put in the perspective of the recent changes in dealing with diversity at the (national) policy level that can be observed in a number of European countries. There are two types of examples to be mentioned here. Examples of the first type are the announcement by the Dutch Minister of Integration of a code of conduct referring among other things to the necessity of speaking Dutch in the public sphere, and the ban on speaking Turkish in the playground by a Berlin school board. Examples of the second type are the growing concern of Western European Governments, as for example in the Netherlands and England, to (re)define the country's canon, i.e., to explicitly state what constitutes the Englishness of England and the Dutchness of the Netherlands.

Where the end of the 20th century showed a climate of pluralism in which immigrants were expected to integrate in mainstream society and at the same time maintain their own identity and language, we now witness a growing assimilation pressure. Working towards a Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education cannot escape the task and the opportunity of dealing with cultural and linguistics diversity and exploring ways to make diversity work in the every day classroom practice of teachers and students.

SIGMUND ONGSTAD

Oslo University College, Norway

The Concepts of 'Language' and 'Discipline' in Transgression. A paradigmatic, critical and comparative study of 'Norwegian'

The contribution focuses changes in perceptions of language (de Beaugrande, 1998) and of disciplinarity (Goodson, 1996) and the intimate interrelatedness of the two. It is claimed that language studies are confronted with fundamental, and hence '*paradigmatic*' shifts in conceptual understanding. '*Critical*' implies an ambition to reveal deeper epistemological connections between the ideology of logo-centrism and essentialist thinking about school subjects and academic disciplines as knowledge constructions. 'Norwegian' is seen as a 'mothering' conceptualization of both 'language' and 'discipline'. *Comparative* lines are drawn to international tendencies (Ongstad, 2003).

The notion 'the extended text concept' seems now generally accepted. It seems less accepted though that 'extension' could not be seen as just another disciplinary *addition* to phonetics, morphology, semantics, syntax and pragmatics or possibility to bridge the language-literature gap. Thinking in terms of just accumulating knowledge elements or new fields may obstruct a needed investigation of *how* pragmatics and context theory should be perceived and related to established linguistic fields (Halliday, 1978).

The paper therefore argues that paradigmatic differences between on the one hand a Saussurean/Chomskyian perception of language and on the other hand a Hallidayian/ Habermasian view on communication, can shed light on a disciplinary, dilemmatic split in LE/LAC/LS (or MTE/STLE): should didactics be added or should it contribute to a redefinition of the discipline Norwegian, as it tends to in colleges? A closer inspection of didactic and curricular literature reveals two different, implicit positions:

1. Language is implicitly and mainly seen as an *instrument* for *doing* something. The dyad semantics/syntax that constitutes language is a functional tool that can be used (*How to things with words?*). Pragmatics is accepted, but placed *outside* language. Children should learn what language is and then how to *use* it. This simple adding to a Saussurean worldview still dominates.

2. Language does not exist as such, but only as a focused *aspect* of a larger cultural, communicational whole. A split between text and context is refuted. All writing and reading are hence *simultaneously* structuring, referring and acting of texts/utterances. These processes are intimately and systemically related to specific discursive contexts or genres. No aspects can not be understood as separate. Children should learn to *communicate*.

Turning to curricula a somewhat similar split can be registered between perceptions of *content* and *methods*, not only in domains of LE/LAC/LS, but in general. It is a tempting hypothesis that these two major patterns are related. A Saussurean, essentialist, Popperian view of knowledge may give preference to closure of the sign. Accordingly there also exists *a* language and *a* discipline, described (respectively) as grammar and curriculum. Both can normatively be put in use/function/action. Behind the scene there is a nation's homogeneity, which core is seen as mainly reproduced by *the* language and *the* discipline (cf. *The Englishness of English*). Given this position, integrated pragmatics, theories of dynamic contexts and multimodality are seen as blurring rather than clarifying.

Norwegian as a dynamic field of accumulated knowledge experiences plain adding and subtle amalgamation. These two tendencies nurture two different kinds and perceptions of disciplinarity. The notion of Norwegian is misleadingly 'unifying' the (school) subject and the discipline (in teacher education) and veils that Norwegian is no longer Norwegian (cf. Peter Elbow's - *What's English?*). Disciplinarity has moved from being more 'proper' to more 'applied', from 'Norwegian' towards 'dynamic contexts' in the schools and accordingly from '*norsk*' towards '*norskdidaktikk*' in teacher educations.

Thus the close relationship between nation, language and school subject is dissolved (cf. *The Rise and Fall of English*). Competences anno 2005 would rather be found in: familiarity with semiotics variety, in skills within the multicultural, in ability to navigate contextually, and to handle dilemmas and paradoxes. To discuss: If this shift of paradigm is not just a Norwegian phenomenon, how may such changes inform international studies and the conceptualization process of 'languages of education'?

JON SMIDT

Sør-Trøndelag University College, Norway

The complexities of “writing”: Conceptions of writing and the teaching of writing in Norway and other countries

In a European setting, and indeed in most of the world today, writing is considered a basic skill, important in most walks of life and used in nearly all school subjects. Thus, in the new Norwegian national curriculum for ages 6 to 19, all school subjects are responsible for developing writing skills. But writing in the natural sciences is regularly a very different thing from writing narratives or argumentative texts in subjects like “Norwegian”. Internationally, it is today accepted that literacy is best understood as “literacies”, connected to different social and cultural functions and spheres (Barton, Berge, Fairclough).

This paper offers a view of what “writing” means in Norwegian schools in a period of challenges and rapid change in the social practices of writing in society. It also argues that it is important for international discussions about writing, writing competence, and the teaching of writing to understand what is actually implied by these terms in different countries, and it suggests that international comparative studies may be helpful to build such an understanding.

Starting with an example from a comparative study, conducted within the IMEN network, of school writing in Norway and the Netherlands (the NONE project), the paper initially points to the fact that terms like “writing” or “the teaching of writing” may not be understood or constructed in the same way in different countries. Building on IMEN methodology, the NONE project demonstrated how the conception of crucial elements in a subject, in this case “writing”, can be clarified by analysis of official school documents (the “rhetoric” of the subject), by close analysis of data from classrooms, and by analysis of interviews with teachers.

Fresh examples are taken from a newly started qualitative study of writing across the curriculum in Norwegian elementary and secondary schools. Comparing texts written by two fourth graders (9 year olds) in different genres and subjects, the paper demonstrates the need to understand the social and cultural norms and contexts of writing in various subjects in different countries in order to understand what such writing may mean in children’s development of literacies.

Session V: IMEN (International Mother Tongue Education Network) Symposium, Part II

ELLEN KROGH, NIKOLAJ FRYDENBJERG ELF

Tension and translation

The symposium addresses content area 1: Theoretical Approaches and Analytical Descriptions with more specific reference to 1c: *Innovative and controversial approaches – especially those of interest from an international/European perspective.*

The overall question of the symposium is: how do we develop research approaches and educational policies catering for the tension between general frameworks and cultural complexity, and how do we open for possible ways of productive ‘translation’ between these poles, in research as well as in policies and practice.

The general version of this tension is the one between the generalizing and standardizing approach inherent in international educational frameworks and aims on one hand and the cultural complexity and diversity of national and regional curricula and educational practice on the other hand. But the tension is also repeated at the national level between policies of qualifying for international competition and policies of cultivating national, regional and individual characteristics. And again at the practical level in the tension between curriculum goals and classroom practice.

Generalizing and standardizing demands both differentiation and reduction of complexity, holding threats of fragmentation and simplification. In research these threats might emerge in specialization and in a reduction of perspectives to purely linguistic approaches. On the other hand research approaches originating in the cultural and practical complexity of concrete mother tongue/standard language subjects may offer analytical positions and tools which lead to less reductive and fragmented problematic for comparative studies and questions of generalization. The levels of policy and practice hold a similar challenge: how to make individuality, cultural diversity, open curricula and rich practice visible as the most powerful ways of qualifying for curricular goals as well as for competition?

In the symposium three cases, covering three different versions of the tension, are brought to bear on the overall question.

ELLEN KROGH

University of Southern Denmark

Fuzzy criteria in the mother tongue classroom

The presentation will discuss a case of classroom practice with portfolio assessment in Danish at the upper secondary school level. It addresses *language as subject* (LS) and the interaction between LS and *language across the curriculum*. The case is an example of innovative *teaching practice* in which *evaluation* has been developed as a comprehensive concept, both in the sense that it integrates learning subject knowledge and language with learning to learn and in the sense that it generates evidence of many aspects of language use and language learning.

The case highlights the complexity of working with explicit assessment criteria. Evaluation criteria for specific tasks and assignments were developed through class discussions. During the process of working with the criteria in response sessions these were continuously revised and refined. The teacher organized and contributed to the discussions but didn't overrule the class. She accepted "fuzzy" criteria in the opening stages and regularly established processes of metareflection leading to revisions.

The case is part of a larger qualitative study of a development project in Danish (Krogh 2006). One important finding in the study was that assessment was transformed into evaluation understood as a more comprehensive concept "ascribing value to the learning experience, first in the identification and understanding of the criteria and standards used, second by judging what is considered meritorious and third by synthesising the implications for future action." (Klenowski 2002). The process of developing 'evaluation' in Danish turned out to have an integrative effect, tying together otherwise often separated aspects of the subject, literature and language as well as oral and written activities. The didactic principle involved is that of organized dynamic interaction between ritualized action and metaproceses of reflection and communication.

The study raises conflicting perspectives as it addresses tensions between formative and summative assessment, didactic and curricular aims, and between differing views on the overall task of Danish as a subject.

Black & William's (1998) review of research on classroom assessment documented that, when carried out effectively, informal classroom assessment with constructive feedback to the students will raise levels of attainment. As indicated in the words 'effectively' and 'constructive', classroom assessment is not just a set of new educational techniques. In fact improving learning through assessment depends on a set of 'deceptively simple', key factors among which are the active involvement of students in their own learning and the need for students to be able to assess themselves and understand how to improve.

In the present case the apparent simplicity of applying a new evaluative practice was revealed as deceptive. The deception applies to the broader context of the subject didactic culture which was changed through the didactic intervention of portfolio assessment. The changes pertained not only to the classroom culture, but also to subject knowledge and communicative aims. The development of declarative knowledge of language use was foregrounded and brought to bear on literature studies, on oral and written assignments *and* on new genres of reflection and evaluation. The latter constitute a new domain of language use reflecting and supporting subject knowledge and learning practices, but also constituting a general competence with potentials for language across the curriculum. The domain may be covered by the term *didactization* (Ongstad 2004).

This feature is interesting in connection with the LE project, bearing on the tension between cultural complexity and general frameworks, between "providing a means of reflecting on and finding the common language for reflection AND being prescriptive / inspirational / aspirational" (Seminar report Nov. 2005). What I want to discuss in the session is whether a further development of this domain of language use may have the potential of bridging or 'translating' between these poles.

References

- Klenowski, V. (2002): *Developing Portfolios for Learning and Assessment*. London: Routledge.
- Krogh, E. (2006, forthcoming): *En ekstra chance. Portfolioevaluering i dansk*. København: Undervisningsministeriet.
- Ongstad, S. (2004): *Språk, kommunikasjon og didaktikk. Norsk som flerfaglig og fagdidaktisk ressurs*. Oslo: Fagbokforlaget.

NIKOLAJ FRYDENBJERG ELF

University of Southern Denmark

Unfit for the Dyadic Split? Framing Modes, Media, and Semiocy

Since the 19th century there has been a more or less unquestioned generalizing tradition of identifying mother tongue education, or ‘language as subject’ (LS), with the general framework of literature and language; a ‘dyadic split’ (using the phrasing of IMEN) which has served the function, among other things, of nation building. In a contemporary global, semi-otic culture, however, it seems that this theoretical framework – which we might term the dominating *Theory 1* (T1) of LS – is becoming increasingly invalid, creating a tension that calls for translation and intervention.

Pursuing a more valid and transparent alternative, this presentation orients itself towards a semiotically informed curriculum framework (Kress & van Leeuwen 2001) proposing that the language/literature dichotomy can be rethought on all levels – classroom practice, teacher education, academic research, and political documents – through the relatively simple theoretical distinction *modes* and *media*. This approach – which would allow for the continuation of a strong, and indeed necessary, emphasis on the teaching and learning of language, but at the same time acknowledges the interlacing of language as a semiotic resource with other semiotic resources in a variety of co-signifying media – we might call the vernacular *Theory 2* (T2) of LS.

The driving question of the presentation, then, is whether T2 could be made operative – is ‘fit’ or ‘unfit’ – for didactical design. An *analytical* answer will be offered through a brief analysis of data from an intervention research project (part of a PhD project, due August 2006) which brought a seemingly canonised ‘literary’ and nation building ‘writer’ like ‘Danish’ Hans Christian Andersen into concrete, local classroom practice in new ways. More specifically, Andersen’s fairytales were made available for teachers as a rich, multimodal semiotic learning resource including 19th century computer-remediated newspaper reviews, picture books, oral readings, animations etc., hence introducing several constellations of modes and media for active student meaning-making. This design generated, I will argue, interesting new subject related knowledge production and critical reflection among students and teachers

which offers insights – *didactization*, in Ongstad’s words – in the potentials and constraints of rethinking LS. For example, it raises the question whether literature should be considered (seminar report Nov. 2005) “the most complex and enriching use of language”.

Using multimodal/multimedia resources in a semiotic intervention might seem “controversial” from the point of view of traditional schooling; but it is *not* controversial from the point of view of the young everyday media user outside school *or* from the point of view of media and mother tongue education researchers such as Buckingham (2003), Morgan (1998), and James Paul Gee. In their view, contemporary media culture should indeed be valorised in positive ways and could be included within formal teaching. This would, eventually, lead to fundamental changes in terms of the *what* and *how* – the ‘nature’, to use Dewey’s word – of subject matter, providing that ‘bottom up’ intervention is reflected by ‘top down’ changes in curriculum framework and assessment procedures on the macro level.

Constructively, thus, I open up for a discussion of the need of a rethinking of LS that reflects the ideas of T2. With T2, a new curriculum goal is being outlined, not only for LS, but also, in general, for language(s) of (school) education (LE). We might call this goal *semiocy* (using a neologism developed in a recent report about Danish as a Future school subject), or semiotic competence. Semiocy is the next step after ‘literacy’ (in the line of Barton, and others); it allows space for both semiotic *reflection* and *aspiration*, acknowledging the functional-utilitarian *and* the personal-formative need for citizens to be able to critically consume *and* contribute to a full range of semiotic domains and practices in a complex modern culture – addressed *en miniature* with different weight and emphasis in different school subjects, such as LS.

References

- Buckingham, David (2003): *Media Education. Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*, Polity.
- Morgan, Robert (1998): “Provocations for a Media Education in Small Letters” in Buckingham, David (ed.): *Teaching Popular Culture. Beyond Radical Pedagogy*, UCL Press.
- Kress, Günther & Theo van Leeuwen (2001): *Multimodal Discourse. The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*, London: Arnold.

Session III: Educating for plurilingualism

EIKE THÜRMAN

Landesinstitut für Schule/Qualitätsagentur, Soest, Germany

Baccalauréat européen plurilingue – Europäisches Mehrsprachenabitur – European plurilingual baccalaureate

Avec l'internationalisation grandissante de l'offre de formation, croît également l'intérêt d'un diplôme de fin d'études secondaires internationalement reconnu qui autoriserait l'accès aux études supérieures dans le monde entier sans examen des compétences linguistiques. En Europe, les programmes éducatifs adéquats qui préparent à un cursus international ne manquent pas et sont mis en œuvre dans de nombreux établissements publics. Toutefois ceux-ci ne sont pas transparents et ne sont pas construits de façon homogène ; aussi ne sont-ils pas compréhensibles et reconnus dans le monde entier. Ces critères sont actuellement remplis plutôt par des diplômes de fin d'études et des certifications d'organismes extrascolaires comme par exemple le TOEFL, les certifications CAMBRIDGE ESOL ou le *International Baccalaureate Diploma* (IB) de l'organisation de Genève, *International Baccalaureate Organization*.

Le fort intérêt du public pour ce cursus illustre cependant le fait qu'il faille renforcer la **reconnaissance internationale des diplômes des écoles publiques**. Il s'agit d'une problématique européenne qui a été mise en lumière lors des Journées de travail européennes sur l'enseignement des langues vivantes en octobre 2004 à Scheveningen et sur les offres d'enseignement bilingue en mars 2005 à Luxembourg. Par exemple, pour la plupart des certifications de fin d'études secondaires européennes, la qualité particulière de la formation bilingue n'est pas clairement mise en évidence pour ceux à qui elle est destinée dans les universités et dans le monde du travail.

C'est pourquoi il est proposé d'aider à la reconnaissance internationale de l'Abitur et de ses variantes nationales en Europe par la mise en place d'un **label de qualité européen**. Un nom doit être trouvé de manière consensuelle ; ci-après, la dénomination « *Baccalauréat européen plurilingue – Europäisches Mehrsprachenabitur – European plurilingual baccalaureate* » a été retenue.¹

¹ Malheureusement, la dénomination EB –European Baccalaureate est déjà donnée au baccalauréat des 10 écoles européennes pour les enfants des fonctionnaires européens.

Le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue* associe les avantages des cursus internationaux, comme le Baccalauréat International (IB) ou le Baccalauréat international allemand (*Deutsche Internationale Abiturprüfung*) et la volonté de préparer les élèves, grâce au soutien au plurilinguisme et à l'acquisition de compétences spécialisées selon une perspective européenne et internationale, à participer à la vie sociale et culturelle dans une Europe caractérisée par la diversité linguistique et culturelle, à contribuer à la construction européenne et à la représenter sur la scène internationale.

Le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue* est un label d'excellence complémentaire aux certifications nationales de fins d'études secondaires. Il repose sur la Convention européenne n°15 sur l'équivalence des diplômes du baccalauréat du 11 décembre 1953.² Grâce à cette convention, la reconnaissance européenne des baccalauréats nationaux est déjà acquise. L'accès aux études supérieures dans un autre pays est toutefois expressément subordonné à la maîtrise de connaissances linguistiques suffisantes.

Les connaissances linguistiques suffisantes pour l'admission dans un cursus universitaire ne sont pas clairement définies ; en Europe, deux facteurs prévalent cependant :

1. Compétences linguistiques de niveau B2, niveau « utilisateur indépendant » du cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues³ ;

2. Expérience de l'utilisation de la langue étrangère dans le cadre d'une discipline non linguistique (DNL). Un consensus existe en Europe sur le fait que, dans les établissements d'enseignement général et professionnel, l'utilisation des connaissances linguistiques doit être renforcée par des enseignements bilingues - CLIL (*content based language learning*) ou EMILE (enseignement de la matière dans la langue étrangère)- afin de consolider les compétences universitaires et professionnelles internationales des élèves ayant terminé leur scolarité.⁴

Le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue* lie ces facteurs à la recommandation de la commission européenne et du Conseil de l'Europe selon laquelle chaque citoyen européen doit disposer de **deux langues étrangères en plus de sa langue maternelle** et pouvoir participer activement à la vie publique au niveau régional, national et européen.⁵

Les **exigences minimales pour le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue*** s'énoncent comme suit:

- Compétences dans au moins deux langues étrangères au niveau B2 du cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues et preuve de l'utilisation d'une de ces langues dans

² Pour le moment, 36 Etats sont parties à cette convention ; parmi eux, certains ne sont pas membres du Conseil de l'Europe : par exemple, la Nouvelle-Zélande.

³ Ceci est également un résultat de la conférence européenne professionnelle « Improving Language Education » organisée sous la présidence néerlandaise de l'Union européenne du 14 au 16 octobre 2004 à Scheveningen.

⁴ Le lien entre l'enseignement bilingue et les compétences universitaires et professionnelles était au centre des journées de travail européennes : « l'évaluation de l'enseignement en Europe – le plurilinguisme ouvre de nouvelles perspectives », organisées sous la présidence luxembourgeoise de l'Union européenne du 9 au 11 mars 2005 à Luxembourg.

⁵ Onderwijs en burgerschap, Raad von Onderwijs, Nederlands Voorzitterschap, okt. 2004, EDUC 188.

une discipline non linguistique entrant dans le cursus de formation durant au moins les deux années qui précèdent le baccalauréat.

Les compétences linguistiques seront évaluées dans le cadre des programmes nationaux et des examens de fin d'études. Pour la langue étrangère utilisée dans une DNL une évaluation spécifique des compétences est inutile.

Ce dispositif n'exclut pas la possibilité de développer ses compétences linguistiques et de les attester au plan international par la préparation de certifications linguistiques externes dans le cadre de cours de langues étrangères (par exemple par le Cambridge ESOL pour l'anglais, le DSD pour l'allemand, le DELF pour le français, le DELE pour l'espagnol, le CELI pour l'italien, etc.).

- Compétence à dimension européenne et internationale, justifiée par une offre de cours correspondante dans le cadre des programmes nationaux, ainsi que par une attestation écrite de la participation à un projet européen ou international (COMENIUS, échange scolaire, stage en entreprise, recherche dans la ville partenaire, Printemps de l'Europe, etc.).

Les variantes suivantes sont envisageables pour apporter la **preuve de la qualification linguistique**. Les variantes 1 et 2 présentent les exigences minimales et la variante 3 inclut des performances supplémentaires⁶ :

Variante 1: démonstration des compétences linguistiques requises dans une langue étrangère + attestation de parcours réussi dans une DNL incluse dans le cursus général de formation dans une autre langue étrangère.

Variante 2: attestation de réussite dans deux DNL incluses dans le cursus général dans deux langues étrangères différentes.

Variante 3: démonstration des compétences linguistiques requises dans deux langues étrangères + attestation de parcours réussi dans une DNL suivie dans une langue étrangère et incluse dans le cursus général de formation ou dans plusieurs DNL suivie dans une ou plusieurs langues étrangères.

Afin d'assurer la transparence quant à la possibilité d'atteindre ces exigences et afin d'avoir un développement commun de la qualité, l'équivalence internationale des épreuves du baccalauréat et de leurs résultats est prévue. Il existe également une demande de tous les Länder de la République fédérale d'Allemagne sur ce point.

Avantages du baccalauréat européen plurilingue :

- Le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue* représente un label de qualité qui peut convaincre et être reconnu à l'échelle internationale en raison de la pertinence de ses exigences universitaires ; il contribue à la mobilité universitaire et professionnelle.

- Le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue* assure aussi bien le plurilinguisme que les compétences en langues étrangères et met ainsi en œuvre les objectifs du plan d'action de l'Union

⁶ Les **variantes 1 et 3** sont d'ores et déjà admises en Rhénanie-du-Nord-Westphalie dans le cadre de l'APO-GOST (*Ausbildungs- und Prüfungsordnung für die Gymnasiale Oberstufe* = « règlement sur la formation reçue durant les 3 années précédant l'Abitur et sur l'examen de fin d'études secondaires »). Sur tout le territoire fédéral, un grand intérêt existe pour encourager, en particulier, la **variante 1**.

européenne 2004-2006 « Encouragement de l'apprentissage des langues et de la diversité linguistique ».

- Pour les élèves, il représente une motivation forte à l'apprentissage.
- Contrairement à l'IB, il n'entraîne pas de modification des programmes et des examens nationaux.
- Sa délivrance relève de la responsabilité nationale sur la base d'un accord européen ;
- Les rapprochements de programmes bi- ou tri-nationaux lourds et les contrôles mutuels coûteux comme ceux qu'exigent l'AbiBac ou l'OIB français sont supprimés..
- Le renforcement de l'enseignement ainsi que la formation initiale, continue et permanente des enseignants dans les domaines du plurilinguisme, de la compétence linguistique, du bilinguisme et de l'engagement sont encouragés
- La coopération entre les établissements scolaires à l'échelle européenne, ainsi que la mobilité et l'intégration des enseignants et assistants de langue sont encouragées.
- Une mise en œuvre est possible sans coûts supplémentaires.
- Les accords binationaux déjà existants restent en place et peuvent être intégrés. Par exemple, les élèves peuvent également obtenir, en plus de la double qualification franco-allemande de l'AbiBac, le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue*, si, jusqu'au baccalauréat, ils apprennent et connaissent une autre langue que le français au niveau B2 ou s'ils suivent une DNL dans cette autre langue jusqu'au baccalauréat.

Un effet positif supplémentaire du *baccalauréat européen plurilingue* est le fait que les écoles publiques deviennent, grâce à l'extension des cours de langue aux DNL du programme, attractives au plan international et que l'intégration des enfants des employés travaillant dans des entreprises étrangères est facilitée en liaison avec le soutien de la langue du pays, une reconnaissance internationale de leur baccalauréat leur étant garantie. Cela est particulièrement important dans les régions qui ont des relations politiques et économiques internationales et où l'intérêt pour le Baccalauréat international (IB) croît actuellement de façon sensible.

Etapes de réalisation du label-qualité « Baccalauréat européen plurilingue » :

Des représentants de la KMK et des ministères de l'éducation français et néerlandais participent à la conception du *baccalauréat européen plurilingue*. Le pilotage est assuré par le Land de Rhénanie-du-Nord-Westphalie

Afin d'élaborer une proposition en vue de la conclusion d'une Convention européenne sur le *baccalauréat européen plurilingue*, un projet d'une durée prévisionnelle de trois ans (2005-2007) est lancé. Un séminaire en vue de la validation du projet réunissant les Länder de la République Fédérale d'Allemagne a lieu au deuxième semestre 2005. Parallèlement, le processus de validation au niveau européen est engagé.

Le calendrier suivant est proposé:

2005	24/25 octobre	Symposium Elaboration de la proposition Présentation à la commission scolaire de la KMK (1 et 2 décembre 2005)	
2006	1 ^{er} semestre	Présentation de la proposition aux instances européennes	Présidence autrichienne de l'UE
	2 ^e semestre	Développement Propositions d'axes d'organisation et de mise en œuvre	Présidence finlandaise de l'UE
2007	1 ^{er} semestre	Adoption de la Convention	Présidence allemande de l'UE

SUZANNE BURLEY AND CATHY POMPHREY

London Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

Diversity and coherence: bridging the boundaries between English (L1) and Modern Languages in language teacher education

Since 1998 as language educators the presenters have demonstrated consistent commitment to a broad, holistic view of language education. Their collaborative teaching and research has focused on the relationship between language use and development as a language teacher for trainee teachers of English (L1) and Modern Languages. Over the last few years the presenters have been asking questions about the possibility of developing a coherent framework for thinking about language and pedagogy within the subjects of English and Modern Languages. This collaboration has resulted in the publication of a range of work aimed at developing a new type of language teacher and challenging subject boundaries in relation to English and Modern Languages.

The proposed paper develops from previous research data collected from the presenters' teaching in an initial teacher education context. More recent analysis of this qualitative data has led to a consideration of the role of diversity within coherence. The paper places pedagogy at the center of the process of developing a coherent framework for thinking about language use and language users and explores the notion of coherence as a possible or desirable outcome in language education. Brumfit (2001)

The first part of the paper will examine the pedagogical approach used by the presenters in a language teacher education programme delivered to postgraduate trainee teachers of English (L1) and Modern Languages. It will discuss how this approach, which is underpinned by social constructivist theory (as applied to language teacher development by Roberts (1998), is informed by three key features: diversity, dialogue and reflection.

Diversity

The pedagogical approach aims to develop a learning community of trainee teachers which makes explicit use of the range of their language knowledge and their linguistic and cultural identity. This emphasis on diversity also makes explicit reference to the way in which language is constructed by the two different subject areas.

- Dialogue

It is through dialogue that individual linguistic, cultural and subject diversity is activated as a focus for learning. Trainee teachers engage with a variety of tasks used to stimulate the dialogue, for example comparing how different languages structure questions, which results in raising awareness of implicit understandings, particularly of the L1.

- Reflection

Reflection is a crucial part of the pedagogical process with which the trainee teachers engage as learners. A key reflective task is the language autobiography written after collaborative discussion and exploring links between language uses and identity. This enables the trainee teachers to articulate links between their own knowledge and experience and wider issues related to language education. The process of reflection facilitates the transition of the trainee teachers from language user and learner to language teacher. This transition enables trainee teachers to experiment in their own practice as language teachers with the pedagogical processes they have engaged with as learners.

The second part of the paper will demonstrate this convergence of diversity, dialogue and reflection as part of the trainee teachers' own pedagogical practice. It will present data from a teaching session delivered as part of the language education programme. In this session trainee teachers collaborate across the subjects of English (L1) and Modern Languages to develop teaching plans and approaches to working with poetry in different languages for use with Secondary school students. The data will chart trainee teachers' responses to the activity and reveal their developing pedagogical conceptualisations.

The paper will conclude by examining the notion of 'coherence' in relation to language education. It will highlight the importance of a pedagogical approach which builds on diversity and difference to achieve shared understandings about language education. It will propose that these shared understandings are enriched by an explicit focus on diversity and difference. This will be the main focus for further discussion.

References

- Brumfit, C.J. (2001): *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Burley, S. & Pomphrey, C. (2004): *Language Teacher Education: Developing English teachers as language teachers*. Sheffield: NATE.
- Roberts, J. (1998): *Language Teacher Education*. London: Arnold.

LJUDMILA IVŠEK

National Institute of Education, Slovenia

Slovene – language of education, official and state language

Slovenian people like to associate their identity with Slovene. The question is ontological – why and how to live within the language. On the face of it, the answer is rather simple – we have to preserve the language and raise national awareness and the language will be OK. Still, one has to raise a pedagogical question about how this can be best done.

Second important question is in connection with the functional scope of the language which does not merely mean the principled qualification of the language to play different roles. Responsibility for functional understanding and qualification of Slovene depends on language planning. Undoubtedly a large share of responsibility is on the shoulders of formal education. In addition to mastering the use of language and knowledge about the language, one necessary component also is language awareness, and last but not least, the knowledge about the language rights of each individual.

Slovenian language is a learning principle, language of education and a subject of study in the process of upbringing and education. The school system on the territory where Hungarian community lives is bi-lingual, and where Italian community lives, Slovene holds a position of a special subject.

In the whole educational system the reform in Slovene took place between 1994 and 1998 when school curriculum for primary, secondary vocational, professional education and gymnasium was introduced and implemented. There is also language diversity outlined in the school curriculum, which through achieving the goals enables flexible language competence in pupils.

At school pupils spontaneously develop communication competence in Slovene (e.g. by teacher setting an example) and systematically (e.g. at Slovene). The following factors are present in developing pupils' communication competence:

- teachers of Slovene (Slovene is the subject of study);
- teachers of all other subjects (Slovene is the language of education, in other words the language of pedagogical conversation);

- authors of study materials (materials and textbooks are in Slovene) and
- all school staff (Slovene is the official language).

Slovenian independence and integration processes in the united Europe have given Slovene a totally different status. Slovenian people have had to come to terms with the fact that Slovene is not only intended for native speakers but also for other people who wish or have to live among us, or be in contact with us.

The development of language has to adapt to the new technological challenges, to the demands of society and civilization, and finally to communication needs.

When Slovenia gained its independence, Slovene also became a state language with the role of national integration and promotion. Slovenia signed (1997), ratified (2000) and implemented (2001) European Paper on Regional Languages and Languages of Minorities.

Article 11 of the Slovenian Constitution states that Slovene is an official language in Slovenia, and where Italian and Hungarian communities live, Italian and Hungarian are also official languages. From the historical point of view, Slovenia has always been a multi-lingual territory with language diversity and the White Paper from 1995 sets language indiscrimination in education as the main principle in education. In the first years of Slovenian independence the country had to face a great number of challenges in upbringing and education. The quality of the progress is transparent as far as languages are concerned. The changes which enact multilingual education were introduced gradually.

The language policy in education includes stronger collaboration between individual levels of education, between different language learning, between the political authorities responsible for this department. Much more effort has been put into evaluation of the language classes with an aim to find out about the national needs within the European and worldwide framework.

Language competence of an individual is a key competence for acquiring knowledge, for maintaining and building it up, for efficient inclusion in society and for fulfilling the needs in the work environment and private life.

Raising awareness about the importance of mastering a language or languages in the process of formal and informal education is important for each individual in the process of lifelong learning, which is slowly establishing its position in the knowledge society which we are part of.

Session IV: Which curriculum for whom?

LAILA AASE

University of Bergen, Norway

Convergences between first language and second language?

Theoretical and practical implications

The paper invites to a discussion on linguistic and cultural competence enhanced in language classrooms through a perspective on two school subjects in Norway: Norwegian as first language (NO1) and Norwegian as second language (NO2). Whereas the general aims of schooling in the same for all learners, we are forced to face the fact that competences in the national language vary more than we can accept within the learner group, and especially between minority groups and indigenous learners. We may identify this as a curriculum problem, a problem due to teacher competence or a problem due to insufficient understanding of what language competence implies. The issues are multiple: Could one curriculum and only one subject of Norwegian language and literature enhance our aims? Should minority learners be integrated in NO1 classes, or have separate classes? How can we deal with the great diversity within the minority group? How can we benefit from the linguistic competence in a multilingual class? Should bilingualism be an aim for minority learners? How can we enhance linguistic and cultural literacy in NO2 classrooms sufficient for mastering other school subjects, navigating and participating in society?

In Norway we have had a recent discussion on curricula, the concluding with a decision of keeping up two different, but similar curricula for NO1 and NO2. Still there are many research issues to be followed up. We need a more precise description of similarities and differences of L1 and L2 competence and we need to understand more of how language competence and identity building interact. Minority learners' need to develop a bilingual identity as well as a bilingual linguistic competence is one of the differences between teaching and learning L1 and L2. The implications for practices are multiple, especially the fact that bilingualism must be considered a resource and not a problem. And this requires work forms and teaching strategies that include and value the various linguistic competences in the minority group. This leads to the question of teacher competence. The change in ethnic diversity in the Norwegian society has not lead to fundamental revision of content and methods in teacher training.

One major issue concerning convergences between NO1 and NO2 is the diversity of competence within the minority learner group: between first generation and second generation immigrants, between newcomers and learners who have been in the country a long time. In addition comes great cultural and socio-cultural differences and attitudes to education within this learner group.

We must admit that second language acquisition often is taught within strictly utilitarian frames, the aim being to master the language in a narrow sense of communication. Text competence implies a competence of producing and understanding texts in a cultural frame, which again means mastering language in a variety of discourse communities and genres. Many of these are implicit in cultural competences for indigenous learners, but have to be taught explicitly for many minority learners. We may need new research on practices on these issues.

In Norway there is an ongoing work trying to define certain levels of proficiency in the subject NO2 based on The Common European Framework of Reference for Foreign Languages. The paper will discuss some of the results in this work in a perspective of convergences between NO1 and NO2.

References

- Eurydice 2004: *Integrating Immigrant Children into Schools in Europe*, www.Eurydice.org
Eurydice 2005; *Key Data on teaching Language at School in Europe. 2005 Edition*, www.eurydice.org

GRAŻYNA ZARZYCKA

University of Łódź, Poland

The cultural, sociocultural and the linguacultural layers of Polish as a native and foreign language as revealed in the process of education

The article will be a comparative study aimed at finding the similarities and the differences between teaching some aspects of Polish as a native and foreign language. A very important issue is, in the author's opinion, the problem of non-linguistic content of educational texts which have been offered to students during both types of language classes (i.e. the problem of context). By the term 'non-linguistic content of educational texts' I understand the cultural, sociocultural and linguacultural layers of both educational variants of Polish language; in this article I will not deal with the problem of grammar or forms of speech unless they are connected with some elements of culture or reality. In order to reveal these layers the study of teaching materials, curricula and theoretical works will be done.

The main goal of this study is to search the ways of approaching the Polish as foreign and native language education – which are considered to be two separate educational domains – in a field of content and teaching methods. This analysis will be aimed at collecting answers on following questions:

1. What are the differences between the Polish as MT and FL classes as far as cultural and sociocultural knowledge, developing practical and intercultural abilities and competences are concerned?
2. What elements of teaching methods should be transferred from Polish as a native language class to a Polish as foreign language class and *vice versa*?

As the author of this article is a Pole who teaches Polish as FL (L2) and a researcher interested in the theories of acquisition and developing communicative, sociocultural and intercultural competencies, the theoretical basis of this study will be important literature devoted to teaching foreign languages with regard to communicative, intercultural and dialogical methods (see the literature).

The author's interest is research on linguaculture, defined by researchers as discourse immersed in a culture, and in conclusion she will try to show that the linguacultural approach,

as well as the dialogical and intercultural approaches, which have been promoted for example in Claire Kramersch's works, can bring Polish – taught as a native and as a foreign language – together.

References

Council of Europe, 2001, *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*.

Kramersch Claire, 1993, *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kultura w nauczaniu języka polskiego jako obcego, 2004; Władysław Miodunka (ed.); Kraków: Universitas.

Linguistic education in Polish schools abroad, i.e. teaching a foreign or a second language vs. teaching a native tongue

The text attempts to discuss some aspects of a problem of teaching Polish in Polish schools abroad (i.e. establishments located outside of Poland and teaching children and teenagers of Polish origin), and points out its specific character providing that the goals of teaching Polish as a native tongue (*language as subject*) vs. teaching Polish as a second/foreign tongue **are and should be** convergent. On the one hand, the student should develop a communicative competence allowing for getting involved in language actions exceeding the familiar, private sphere; on the other hand, the student has to use the language as a medium for getting acquainted with Polish history, literature, and culture (*language across curriculum*) – thus, strengthen or build one's identity. Student's development in terms of the language and identity has to take place simultaneously, as both processes condition each other.

Both in Poland and in the Polish communities abroad, literary-historical education and language education have been treated so far as separate goals. One of these goals - usually the former one, has been ranked higher and treated as a priority. Theory and practice of teaching Polish as a foreign/second language and methods of teaching of Polish as a native tongue constitute two totally different areas, and function as two different didactic realities, although the scholars of both domains refer to the same notions, such as *the language, language training, teaching, or the student*. The common terms, however, are used in a slightly different meaning, and moreover, the scholars differently formulate the very goals of teaching, due to different expected results of the training, different audience of the didactic process, and different methods and techniques of teaching applied.

Polish schools abroad quite clearly stand between the two described didactic realities, and constitute a natural link between them. Polish which is being taught to children is not always the first language of the students, although it may be their native tongue. In most instances it is their second language, sometimes a foreign language. Thus, as has been pointed out before, in his type of schools Polish has to be taught partly as a native (first) tongue, but also as a foreign tongue.

The article presents a proposal of actions cooperatively worked out by the *Centrum Języka i Kultury Polskiej w Świecie* and the *Szkoła Polska im Jana III Sobieskiego* in Chicago, thanks to which it was possible to initiate the process of combining the two separate didactic realities into one. The project includes:

- program guidelines for teaching in Polish schools abroad, comprising both training of communicative competences and the elements of historical-literary education important for the Polish Diaspora;
- proposal of different organization of teaching in Polish schools abroad;
- project of training teachers.

The study discusses an experimental program of teaching Polish in the high school pre-finals grade. The innovative proposal which came into being as a result of cooperation of the Chicago school teacher and the *Centrum Języka i Kultury Polskiej w Świecie* staff, not so much combines the elements of language training with historical-literary education, but rather develops students' language skills based on properly selected literary texts, in a way recognized and used in foreign language teaching. In the future, similar programs will be worked out for other junior high and high school grades. The study presents also proposals of changes in the system of teaching allowing for full realization of the project.

First results are promising, however the condition for wider popularization of the adopted solutions is closer cooperation between foreign language teachers and Polish instructors, as well as collaboration among teachers in Poland and abroad.

References

- Europejski system kształcenia językowego, uczenie się, nauczanie, ocenianie*, tłum. W. Martyniuk, CODN Warszawa 2003.
- Komorowska H. (2005), *Programy nauczania w kształceniu ogólnym i w kształceniu językowym*, Fraszka Edukacyjna, Warszawa.
- Lipińska E. (2003), *Język ojczysty, język obcy, język drugi*, WUJ, Kraków.

Session VI: Migrant children in a Mother Tongue classroom

PIET VAN AVERMAET
Ghent University, Belgium

The curriculum/policy in language(s) of school education. The case of Flanders. With a special focus on migrants

In this paper the curriculum/policy in language(s) of school education of Flanders with a special focus on migrants will be discussed.

Flanders opts for a policy where every individual child or student needs to be able to meet/acquire the same final objectives of language(s) of education¹ with respect to knowledge, skills and attitudes. Differences can occur in the contextualisation of the competencies (i.e. the kind of programme one follows). E.g. a stronger focus can be on vocational language in a vocational learning context, while a stronger focus can be on academic language in an academic learning context. This is not a difference in level but only in context. Flanders also opts for a policy where migrant and non migrant children have classes in an integrated way, where heterogeneity is seen as a source and opportunity for language learning.

However, from an organisational perspective, at a certain point and for some time a two way approach is needed. In Flanders a distinction has been made between newly arrived migrants (so-called newcomers) and second or third generation immigrant children.

Newly arrived migrants (children), so-called newcomers can benefit from a separate curriculum and teaching programme. They enter the country with no or hardly any knowledge of the target language. They cannot immediately participate in the regular school programme. An ‘adapted’ curriculum with specific “developmental goals” have been developed for these children, to give them maximum opportunities to participate at school. This special programme is restricted to a minimum of time. We think these children need to have the opportunity to integrate in the regular curriculum and school programme as soon as possible.

In that ‘separate’ curriculum for newcomers we opt for developmental goals instead of final objectives. As classrooms with newcomers are diverse and heterogeneous in many ways, the pace of the language acquisition process will vary enormously. When entering in the regular classroom, a good profile description of the developmental goals reached for every child is necessary to provide maximum support.

¹ Language competencies have been described for primary, secondary and higher education.

MARIE HÁDKOVÁ

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

JAROMÍRA ŠINDELÁŘOVÁ

Purkyne University, Usti nad Labem, Czech Republic

„Multicultural“ classroom interaction – participation of migrant children

For several years now, the integration of foreigners (migrants, immigrants and refugees) in the Czech Republic has been discussed. Since these people from several countries have been living in the Czech Republic, Czech society and especially Czech schools have become more multicultural. The population of classrooms at many schools has gradually become heterogeneous in cultural and linguistic respects. This causes schools and teachers to change their ways of practising education in order to deal with this completely new and very different cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds in classroom interaction, in particular in classes in Czech (mother tongue education).

In our paper we will discuss the new situation of Czech primary schools providing education not only to native speakers of our language (of Czech) but also to various groups of migrants – mainly children of refugees, children of immigrants, children of temporary residents. Teachers of these schools are confronted daily with a twofold challenge in the area of intercultural competence, and therefore need supplementary training on two levels: pedagogy dealing with multicultural groups and methods how to teach Czech as a foreign language. While teachers have to treat their pupils equally, they must likewise as well be aware of and (especially in case of children) be very sensitive to the cultural differences.

The special language training offered these children should be concentrated largely on their need to learn the Czech language. In fact, this is the most pressing need today. The central need in learning a language (the Czech language) is to be able to communicate, understand and be understood. Unfortunately, the average teachers tend just to teaching grammar. And that is why quite often these pupils are not able to go beyond survival Czech.

Since there exist four reference level descriptions for Czech (A1, A2, B1, B2) we would find new teaching materials based on these descriptions helpful to realize this multiperspectivity. These materials (textbooks) should provide a repertoire of basic language as well as strategies enabling children to deal with their everyday school situations, strategies sufficient for most everyday needs.

From the point of view of the authors of this paper it is extremely important to classify these language needs with respect to the „Common European Framework of Reference for languages“. A further intensification of language teaching (as well as learning) is necessary in the interests of classroom interaction and more intensive personal interaction of these children.

It is desirable to develop courses for primary school teachers leading them to the planning of language learning programmes, using of methods and materials best suited to enabling different children to acquire a communicative proficiency appropriate to their specific needs. It is necessary to support developing suitable forms and instruments for the evaluation of these programmes.

At the time of writing this paper we have just started gathering data within the schools in order to gain insight in the teachers' perspectives on multicultural classes. Also we will gather ethnographic data.

Session VII: Teaching literature

TANJA JANSSEN & GERT RIJLAARSDAM

University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Describing the Dutch literature curriculum: A theoretical and empirical approach to describe the perceived and actual curriculum

In this contribution to the conference we present a framework for describing variations of ‘literature’ as part of the language curriculum in secondary education. Although the framework was designed for the Dutch situation, we believe that many parts may be recognizable in other European countries as well.

In the debate about literature education in the Netherlands, different views of literature teaching are held. These views correspond to at least four types of approaches: 1) author-oriented, literary history approaches, 2) text-oriented, structural analysis approaches, 3) context-oriented, sociological approaches, and 4) reader-oriented, text-experiencing approaches to literature. These approaches seem to go together with different general goals and methods of literature teaching. The teaching is either predominantly aimed at contributing to students’ cultural development (1), aesthetic awareness (2), social awareness (3) or personal development (4).

It is assumed that the first two approaches have been dominant in the literature classroom, at least until the 1980s. Since then, reader-oriented approaches seem to have gained ground. However, very little is known about the ‘actual practice’ of Dutch literature teachers, who (compared to colleagues in other countries) exercise considerable freedom in designing their own literature curriculum and examination program.

This motivated us to conduct a national assessment of literature teaching in the Netherlands (Janssen & Rijlaarsdam, 1996; Janssen, 1998). The study’s main purpose was to systematically describe the form, the contents and the results of the teaching of Dutch literature or fiction in the final grades of secondary education. In particular, we wanted to examine to what extent the four approaches were to be found in actual practice. In our study, we made a distinction between three levels of curricula: the *perceived level* (the curriculum as reported by teachers, in questionnaires and interviews), the *operational level* (the curriculum as observed in the classroom) and the *achieved level* (learning effects of the curriculum as reported

by students). In this contribution we limit ourselves to the first two levels: the perceived and the operational curriculum.

To examine the *perceived* curriculum, a survey was held among 600 teachers of Dutch literature (about 25% of the population). The teachers filled in a questionnaire about their general aims and about various aspects of their literature teaching (time spent on literature, choice of subject matter, types of literary texts discussed in the classroom, classroom activities, textbooks used, methods of evaluation). Results showed that there were large differences between teachers in the content and form of their literature teaching. However, we also found evidence of four 'profiles' of literature teaching, depending on the teacher's main aim: literature teaching as Cultural development, Aesthetic awareness, Social awareness and Personal development. These four groups of teachers significantly differed from each other in their choice of subject matter, the types of literary texts discussed, and in teaching methods.

To get insight into the *operational* level of the curriculum, literature lessons of representatives of the four profiles were observed. We focused on the teachers' task demands, as they appeared from an analysis of teacher questions and assignments. Results showed that the task demands of the Cultural and Personal development teachers were largely in accordance with their primary objective and their self-reported curricula. The task demands of the Social and Aesthetic awareness teachers, however, differed from what we expected on the basis of their self-reported objectives and curricula.

We conclude that the four main objectives of literature teaching (Cultural, Aesthetic, Social and Personal) formed a good starting point for describing differences between literature curricula. Teachers' general objectives go together with particular contents and form of their literature teaching. Furthermore, we conclude that a distinction should be made between the perceived curriculum (as reported by teachers) and the operational curriculum (as observed in the classroom). These two curricula do not always converge.

KARI SALLAMAA

University of Oulu/Helsinki, Finland

Constructing a European Canon and its didactic implications

The presentation will deal with questions of cultural competence through literary education, as it has a vital importance in preserving and promoting cultural values, strengthening individual and national identity and a humanistic European consciousness. And as literature is the most complex and enriching use of language, it carries an important role in broadening out the learners' emotional and intellectual *Weltanschauung*, their all-over competence in society and culture.

Literary education is an especially complicated issue in multiethnic school classes. Immigrant children and youth need a general overview of the literary traditions and modern literature of the receiving country, but at the same time preservation of their national and ethnic identity demands knowledge about their own literature and their cultural heritage. But it is also important to broaden out native pupils' insights into these foreign literatures.

Literary competence is important in developing discourse about cultural values and anti-racist attitudes among learning people. Literary competence should also be directed towards creativity and taking advantage of the aesthetic aspects language beside values and humanistic attitudes expressed through speech and script. This productive attitude helps to raise sovereign personalities and citizens, Kant's *mündige Personen*. There exists too much of reproductive and consuming attitudes in society.

The paper is a continuation of my project Constructing a European cultural archaeology (see my articles in Kiefer – Sallamaa 2005). My aim is to publish a work of articles concentrated if this subject in strengthening a European consciousness.

But his topic needs also knowledge and experience about the major works of European literary heritage. The focus of this presentation is to draw attention on an all-European literary field marked by some canonical cornerstones of important works. I shall present this paper for to discuss possibilities to construct a European canon and the problematic of its curricular and didactic implications.

Developing a new European consciousness when enrolling up Europe's cultural borders it would be important to develop this kind of a literary canon ready to be applied in schools. Of course it can not be any overt list of great works, but a an implicit, mental system based on European humanistic and democratic values. It can be reached only by large and representative discussions between MTE and foreign language teachers in schools and universities as well as educational clerks both nationally and internationally.

Naturally it must be adapted with suitable didactic methods on various grade levels. Reader-response learning is the standard model, but the writer-response method is more instructive (Blazic 2005).

Literary canons bring up various overt and hidden values, and their adapting to education brings up more. There exist many kinds of camouflage even on classics based on political, social, ethnic and sexual taboos. Deconstruction of such restrictions is an important task for literary education in school.

A European canon could be partly expressed in curricula, but again there will be hiding the basic problem: there lies a gap between curricular rhetoric and classroom practices, that must be filled out in benefit of the latter. According to Piet-Hein van de Ven (2004) we should at least ask, why something should be taught and/or learned and on which ground this conviction is based.

In literary education can be put an important question, does processing of a text fulfill more the curriculum and the insights of the teacher, or does it express the needs of the student. In referring canonical texts the learner's emotional and intellectual reflections are more valuable than reproducing of traditional canonical attitudes. An international canon should not in such a degree be threatened by such stereotypical schemes.

References

- Kiefer, S. – Sallamaa, K. (eds.) 2005: *European identities in Mother Tongue Education. Texts from the EUDORA intensive program MTE during the summer school in Tolmin, Slovenia 2004*. Trauner Verlag, Linz.
- Blazic, Milena: From reader-response to writer-response theory. In Kiefer – Sallamaa 2005, pp. 236-263.
- Van de Ven, Piet-Hein, in Ongstad, S. – van de Ven, P. – Buchberger, I. (eds.) 2004: *Mother tongue didaktik. An international study book*. Trauner Verlag, Linz.

GIUSEPPE LONGO

University of Venice "Ca' Foscari" / University of Verona, Italy

Teaching literature: how? Towards new paradigms in the didactics of literature

In teaching literature one is often faced with a situational problem, as research work in this specific field has not given positive results. Psychologists and pedagogues study the methods of learning and the behaviour of the individual who gets aware of the reality around him/her, whereas the literary man analyses a text from a historical, philological and critical point of view. It is essential to work out a possible ideal mediation to deal with the two positions. This responsibility is to be taken by didactics and by teachers of literature, keeping in mind two important points: a) what type of literature is to be taught to today's students? b) what aims and methods are - and should be - used?

The aim of the study is to identify the well-grounded paradigms of the didactics of literature by determining: a) the psychological characteristics of an adolescent studying and learning literature; b) the pedagogical foundations in motivating a young learner; c) the teaching methods that can promote literary appreciation. In addition, the research aims to provide teenagers with coping strategies, which enable them, from a psychological point of view, to face everyday challenges successfully by exploiting literature.

The purpose of the study is also to understand: a) the cognitive functions and situations involved in learning literature; b) the reader's emotional response to texts and genres; c) the most suitable teaching methods in order to create reading-oriented students not only able to enjoy and interpret literary texts but also eager to choose new ones and to discover their hidden meanings autonomously. The topic is related to the aim of the conference because it deals with the analysis of the objectives and methods of teaching literature in secondary schools, *a parte subiecti* (the student) and *a parte obiecti* (the subject). The study, which is at the beginning, is based on the attempt to define literary competence and its connection not only with the theory of literature, but also with some perspectives recently proposed by cognitive and neurocognitive sciences. The paper focuses on the research of teaching methods really suited to prove how literature can help students face the complex process of building up their

personality by answering both the requirements of the native cultural background and the demands of adjusting themselves to a new multicultural environment. It would be very interesting to analyze if different European literary curricula can already share some methodological teaching strategies based on a one-to-one student-oriented approach.

Session VIII: Reading literacy

MARLI TIJSSEN

Centre for the Innovation of Vocational Training and Adult Education in the Netherlands (CINOP)

Levels of Dutch in upper-secondary vocational education and the use of the CEF for the description of language proficiency of the language of school education

Relation of the topic to the aim of the conference:

- contribution to analysis and research on language of school education in the Netherlands, based on empirical data;
- the use of a framework of references (based on the CEF) for the language of school education.

In 2004 CINOP, a national organisation for innovation of vocational and adult education in the Netherlands, has investigated perceived and actual levels of proficiency of Dutch as L1 in upper secondary vocational education. In this study the Framework of References (based on the CEF) for Dutch as a second language

(L2) was used by lack of a framework for Dutch for school education (Dutch standard language, L1)).

The descriptors and can-do statements of the Framework of Dutch as a second language in combination with examples of tasks in educational settings on these levels, were used to interview teachers and students by self-assessment on the actual and perceived attainment levels of the language of school education (L1).

This study revealed that students in upper secondary vocational education proved to be not proficient enough in Dutch as L1 to function sufficiently in vocational settings they were trained for. The all-over conclusion was that the level of proficiency in upper-secondary vocational education is going down every year for different reasons:

- growing number of second generation immigrant students in vocational education who started in primary and followed secondary education in L1 but speak another language at home.
- decrease of reading culture; reading books and papers by youngsters is going down in favour of chatting and the use of internet
- decrease of instruction of Dutch (L1) as part of the curriculum.

The new campaign against low literacy for 2006-2010, started by the Ministry of Education in the Netherlands, will fight against reading and writing problems, but will also contribute to the prevention of low-level literacy in education. Regional Colleges for vocational training will have an active role to play. In the next 5 years CINOP will support the implementation of language policy in secondary and upper secondary vocational education, the development of a language portfolio based on a framework for the language of school education. Furthermore CINOP will support the enhancement of teachers' expertise, both vocational as language teachers and how they can work together in education .

In my presentation I would like to discuss the methodology and the results of the above mentioned research and discuss the use of the Common European Framework , developed originally for Second Language Proficiency (L2) for the description of proficiency of L1 (and L2) of youngsters in educational settings.

Questions as “Are the descriptors useful at the different levels, e.g. the A1 level ? “What should be added or changed for instructional purposes ?” and “What are the experiences in other countries on this issue?” are of great interest.

References

- Bersee T. , Tijssen M., e.a., 2004: *Onderzoek Nederlands in het MBO*, CINOP, 's-Hertogenbosch.
Driessen M., Liemberg E. e.a., 2004: *Referentiedocument Talen in het MBO*, COLO.
OCW, directie BVE, 2005: *Het aanvalsplan laaggeletterdheid “Van A tot Z betrokken”*, Den Haag.

IRENE PIEPER

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany

Reading literature: a major sub-discipline in German primary and secondary education under challenge

The paper offers an analysis of the role of literature in German mother tongue education (main content area 1b) focussing grade 1 to 10. It is linked to my current research on reading literature in early secondary school and is specifically prepared for the conference.

Reading literature certainly is a central dimension within mother tongue education in Germany. It also often forms the main domain within teacher training at university: Having the choice, many students stress “Literaturdidaktik” rather than “Sprachdidaktik”, “Literaturwissenschaft” rather than “Sprachwissenschaft” or “Linguistik”, especially when aiming at secondary education. However, despite its central position within education and teaching practices the systematic position in a framework of mother tongue education is not at all clear. This becomes obvious in the current situation.

Facing the shift towards students’ “output” rather than institutional “input” researchers point out the lack of systematic approaches to conceptualise “reading literature” in this perspective. What are the competencies students should acquire? How can the different levels of competencies be modelled? What is the relation between reading literacy and the/a concept of reading literature? How does the concept of competences fit to the ideal(s) of literary education (personal development, socialisation, cultural involvement)?

The implementation of educational standards (Bildungsstandards) serves as a challenge to traditional concepts – which are in themselves diverse. It also initialises a critical view of these concepts. Focussing on Middle School and Gymnasium may be one of the reasons why more systematic approaches to the acquirement of competences from early childhood to early adulthood in the field are insufficient. The changing role of text (traditional canon vs. orientation towards students’ interests and developmental aspects) is also a problem.

Historically reading literature used to be an important area of learning how to read within secondary education. A certain emphasis on literary education – “literarische Bildung” and “ästhetische Erziehung” – is characteristic especially within Middle School and the Gym-

nasium. Within primary school a more integrated approach (learning how to read and how to write; being introduced to the cultural context) can be observed.

A curriculum towards reading literacy in a broader sense (including different kinds of texts and functions of reading), covering primary and secondary education, has long been missing and is only now being developed in various places.

The paper focuses on the aims and the curricular implementation of literary education within Germany and its present changes. The federal system offers a certain diversity (here three states are selected and compared). Also the specific structure of secondary education has its impact on the way literary education is laid down. At the moment regional curricula and nationwide educational standards coexist. A certain shift towards more integrated concepts of mother tongue education as well as of teacher training and research can be observed. It is especially in this area that an inter-European-perspective seems necessary and helpful.

Issues to be discussed:

- What is the role of reading literature within the diverse European curricula?
- Personal development and “Bildung” in the field of literature and aesthetics: How do other European countries deal with this notion?
- a comparative perspective on integrated concepts of mother tongue education: reading literacy and reading literature.

References

Bildungsstandards der Kultusministerkonferenz: www.kmk.org

Kämper-van den Boogaart, Michael (2003): Bildungsstandards für den Deutschunterricht. In: *Deutsch Didaktik. Leitfaden für die Sekundarstufe I und II* /M. Kämper-van den Boogaart (ed.). Berlin: Cornelsen. 288-302.

Spinner, Kaspar H. (2005): Der standardisierte Schüler. Rede bei der Entgegennahme des Erhard-Friedrich-Preises für Deutschdidaktik am 27. September 2004. In: *Didaktik Deutsch 18/2005*, 4-13.

GERHARD RUPP

Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

Promoting reading literacy in mother tongue education: how teaching German at German secondary schools can help raise the level of reading proficiency of 14- to 16-year olds

In Germany and many other OECD countries, the outcomes of national and international reports on the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) have had a number of inevitable policy implications in the area of reading literacy. The comparatively poor performance of German students on PISA reading literacy calls for new measures to improve literacy development at German secondary schools. This paper proposes a model for carrying out reading tests based on new categories for the analysis of student reading achievement. It argues for the compilation of databases containing a wide range of texts relevant to the individual and social life-world of the students. The paper presents a sample reading test put to several groups of German 15-year olds, seeking to derive insights about their reading proficiency not only at this particular age, but also about the mid- and long-term development of their reading proficiency.

German 16-year olds and their counterparts in other OECD countries should, at least, meet a certain minimum standard of reading literacy. This applies to both non-linear, expository texts, and to literary texts. Moreover, ensuring this minimum standard of reading proficiency will enable students to cope with written information and task instructions in all manner of contexts, not least with the example texts and questions used in assessment tests like PISA.

Literacy development is a process of increasing complexity, moving from one step to the next and arriving at ever more complex stages of reading proficiency. Dealing with texts, it should be noted, is always a combination of specific reading strategies and certain cognitive frames stimulated by, and corresponding to, various texts and text types. The reading strategies used, and the accumulation of knowledge engendered by them, follow a natural order of increasing complexity. They are best taught by keeping to this order in which they are ideally acquired. The reading strategies do not necessarily square with the overall ontogenetic development of the students. They represent specific forms of language processing and knowledge production, which students should acquire as a basic repertory. It is crucial that the selection

of curricular materials be sensitive to and take into account this successive evolution of reading literacy to promote literacy development.

The present paper tackles this task in several steps; first, it puts forward new categories for the analysis of student reading achievement, taking up proposals which have emerged in the wake of PISA, specifically recent contributions by Heiner Willenberg and Juliane Köster. The paper surveys these approaches to devise and back up the model for carrying out the reading tests it seeks to introduce.

To carry out these tests, secondly, the paper argues for compiling a database with thematically pertinent and linguistically diverse texts, allowing a sufficiently nuanced and contrastive long-term monitoring of student reading achievement. Textbooks of German at secondary schools, in order to be revised meaningfully, need to operate as criteria of selection a number of key individual and social problems pertaining to the life-world of students, thus trying to establish a coherent range of competence and supplanting the often arbitrary selection of example texts to be observed.

Thirdly, the paper presents a number of sample reading tests put to German 15-year olds, on which basis it also seeks to extrapolate the reading proficiency of 14- and 16-year olds, so that a rough trajectory of reading literacy development may be sketched.

In conclusion, on a more theoretical note, the paper looks at how the development of reading literacy is related to the in-built cognitive requirements of various text types, and how it might be conceived as a continuum of increasing reading proficiency, to better diagnose at which point the provision of learning support must set in.

The paper might be seen to fit in with the second content area – “Proficiency descriptors and assessment issues” – of the conference.

References

- Willenberg, Heiner (2005): Ein handhabbares System, um Textschwierigkeiten einzuschätzen. Vorschläge für eine Datenbank von Sachtexten. In: Fix, Martin/ Jost, Roland (Hg.): *Sachtexte im Deutschunterricht. Für Karlheinz Fingerhut zum 65. Geburtstag*. S. 94-106.
- Köster, Juliane (2005 a): Bildungsstandards – eine Zwischenbilanz. Basisbeitrag. *Deutschunterricht Oktober 5/2005*, S. 4-10.
- Köster, Juliane (2005 b): Wodurch wird ein Text schwierig? Ein Test für die Fachkonferenz. Drei Parabeln im Vergleich. *Deutschunterricht Oktober 5/2005*, S. 34-39.

JAMES MILTON

University of Wales Swansea, United Kingdom

The Importance of Vocabulary Measures in a Language Framework: Lessons from the Common European Framework for Foreign Languages

We already have a Framework system within the area of languages and the new proposal, for a Framework system for Languages of School Education, will want to learn from this. This paper intends to describe the foreign languages Framework and draw attention to what is good about it, and to draw attention to a serious problem in its construction. This is that the absence of quantifiable language measures which makes for a less than robust system of interlanguage comparison. This point will be illustrated using vocabulary size measures and the lack of parity between English and French as foreign languages. It will argue that we already possess the language measures and much of the vocabulary information to build a vocabulary size measure into the new Framework.

The foreign language CEF has produced a hierarchy of levels which allows exams and student attainment, courses and teaching materials, in different languages to be ranked and compared in a way which was not possible before. It is a deliberately flexible system and is designed to be inclusive. The 'can-do' statement framework has been adopted by the foreign language teaching industry; course books, examinations, language portfolios and courses define themselves through the framework, and the foreign language testing system has become transparent in a way it never was before. Thus we can, or should be able to, make interlanguage comparisons. EFL exams such as UCLES's First Certificate in English, for example, and the GCSE French foreign language exam we use in Britain are both pitched at Intermediate, B2, level and learners who pass through these two exams should, in some meaningful sense, be equivalent. There is much to admire and imitate in this system.

However, the system is not as robust as might be thought. The absence of any quantifiable or objective measures of language knowledge and competence makes for odd mismatches, leads to misunderstanding, and at worst is open to abuse. It is a system which has tried to divorce competence from knowledge. There is an underlying assumption that the two are separable and the object of this paper is to argue that they are not. In the development of a first language, as in a foreign language, there is a very strong connection between a person's

vocabulary breadth and depth, and their ability to perform through language. The previous example of UCLES FCE and British GCSE French was carefully chosen because these two exams really are very different in level. Students of French in Britain complete GCSE with vocabulary knowledge only a quarter or a third of EFL learners taking FCE. They are, indeed, communicatively and functionally far less able as a result. The point of this example is to demonstrate that vocabulary measures can add much needed robustness to a framework and we should consider seriously putting them in a school's language knowledge framework.

Words are the building blocks of language, without words you do not have language, and vocabulary knowledge is strongly connected with overall language knowledge and competence. There is a tradition of measurement of vocabulary knowledge and progress in first languages and we already have models of vocabulary growth through from the first words in babyhood to adolescence and adulthood. Vocabulary measurements have been used as indicators of cognitive, as distinct from chronological, development in children. Knowledge of specialist vocabulary, for example academic vocabulary, can be used to predict fitness for university study. In a multilingual Europe, vocabulary knowledge measures can indicate the degrees of language knowledge even in individuals who are thought of as bilingual. Vocabulary measurements could be included in the proposed Framework, and the lesson of the foreign language framework is that it would be very much to the benefit of the system if they were.

Session IX: Mother Tongue as part of European Language Portfolio?

THEUN MEESTRINGA & HELGE BONSET

SLO (National Institute for Curriculum Development), The Netherlands

Some Steps Taken Towards a CEF for Languages of School Education

This paper addresses the question of comparing CEFR and LEF, deliberately ignoring the question of the use of these instruments for LAC and/or LS, because we consider it as insignificant whether the pupils learn the language inside or outside the school. In this paper we will report on three small development research projects concerning the question of the use of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001) (abbr. *CEFR*) in first language learning, which were completed in 2005 at SLO (the National Institute for Curriculum Development of the Netherlands).

The *Common European Framework* describes 6 levels of language competence, providing ‘a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe.’ (ibid 2001, p.1). SLO has been asked from several sides to consider the possibility of a framework for mother tongue education that is more or less connected to the *CEFR*.

The first question has been posed by the Dutch government, i.e. the Ministry of Education. On behalf of the Ministry SLO is working on the implementation of the European Language Portfolio in schools for secondary education by a digital form of the portfolio on a website (www.europeestaalportfolio.nl). Part of the project is the exploration of an application for Dutch as a mother tongue. Background of this question is the government’s wish for a common framework for the learning, teaching and testing of (modern) first, second and foreign languages.

The second question was posed by an association of language teachers which asked SLO to develop a language portfolio related to the *CEF* to be used in primary and secondary education in Fryslân, especially at the transition of primary to secondary school. Fryslân is a bilingual province of the Netherlands where Dutch and Frisian are both first and second languages of the pupils in the classroom. Behind this question lie the big differences in proficiency of Frisian of the pupils who study Frisian language in secondary education.

Thirdly a coordinating commission for adult education (BVE-Raad) has requested SLO to explore the use of a *CEF* Language Portfolio for Dutch for migrants in the description of the acquirable competences in various professional educations. This question was inspired by the actual use in the Netherlands of a framework for Dutch as a second language, to describe the language competences that young adult first language learners will be needing in professional contexts.

In the first and the third project intuitive methods have been used (*CEF*, 2001, p. 208), consulting experts directly and in a committee. One of the outcomes is a clear and urgent call for speed in the creation and execution of plans towards a framework for L1.

In the second project, an elaboration of *CEFR* called *Taalprofielen* and a language portfolio for Dutch as a second language have been examined and used to develop descriptors and examples, leading to a language portfolio with checklists for pupils in Fryslân which will be tested in the educational field.

In this paper we will, among more, present an overview of the decisions that have been made in order to develop the Frisian version of the European Language Portfolio and some of the checklists, in this way showing the most practical experiences of the three research projects.

PETER BROEDER & RITA SORCE

Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Managing diversity in multilingual Europe

Of course, developing competence in more than one language is a potential benefit to all language learners. Linguistic research has never pointed out that offering more than one language to language learners is a threat to their language development but, on the contrary, a major boost in their lifelong learning process (see Broeder & Murre 2000). Early language learning is recommended by European language policy, and many member states have taken steps to introduce foreign language learning, or initiation into foreign languages, in the educational curricula. The problem remains, however, that the languages imposed are often not the languages that fit in with those already developed (to a varying extent) by the pupils, e.g. minority languages. Rather, the tendency is to opt for languages which are – in the short term - economically and politically dominant. Ultimately, this tendency goes against the principle of European linguistic diversity.

As Europe is moving further towards professional and educational mobility, and at the same time rapidly expanding, there is a growing need for instruments which can enhance the multilingual competences of its citizens. As an instrument for registration and documentation of linguistic competence, the ELP does not only enhance competence-based learning in formal education, but also validates linguistic experiences and competences gained outside school. From the perspective of multilingual competence, this is a crucial bonus compared to the traditional national language educational systems which depart from the principle of monolingualism (one national language), adding a limited number of official foreign languages at a later stage. The educational principle of monolingualism has had its merits in the past, but has indeed become very artificial in the light of contemporary and future, multilingual European society (cf. Broeder & Extra 1999).

Especially for young Europeans who speak other (minority) languages at home – in large urban areas this is often the majority – the ELP represents a different approach. Instead of having the feeling that their mother tongue competency, which is part of their cultural identity, is a stumbling block, they are encouraged to develop this competency further, in addition

to the official languages learnt at school. According to the principle of ‘additive bilingualism’, this will contribute to their self-esteem and their motivation to participate in formal education and society at large.

Since 1998, the Netherlands has been gaining experience in developing a language portfolio for education. The Dutch project was carried out under the auspices of the National Bureau of Modern Foreign Languages in collaboration with the European Platform for Dutch Education. The language portfolio projects in the Netherlands focused on different target groups. In the present contribution the focus is on three language portfolios that have been developed for three target groups:

- (1) primary school children (Aarts & Broeder 2003),
- (2) primary school teachers (Aarts & Broeder 2004, 2005),
- (3) adult students in higher education (Sorice & Broeder 2005).

These language portfolios were put into practice by Babylon, the Research Centre for Studies of Multilingualism in the Multicultural Society at Tilburg University.

Firstly, we will present empirical findings, evaluations, opinions and show the good practice portfolio users. The practical experiences of children as well as teachers are taken into account.

Secondly we will go into recent research findings with the three pertinent ELP’s (pupil, student, teacher) in digital learning environments: i.e. (1) modality (audio and/or visual) effects through a digital coach, (2) the blended learning methodology in higher education, and (3) the competence based e-training. In this respect the as yet unexplored opportunities of cyberspace are germane. It is a reasonable conjecture that digital (language) learning environments with sufficient infrastructural support will boost the portfolio methodology as well as the underlying principle of self-regulation in independent life-long continuous learning (see the websites www.taalportfolio.com and www.taalportfolio.info).

References

- Aarts, R. & P. Broeder (2003), *Taalportfolio basisonderwijs*, Alkmaar: Europees Platform (European Language Portfolio. Version for Primary Education, Council of Europe. Accredited model No. 33.2003).
- Aarts, R. & P. Broeder (2004), *Werken met taalportfolio's in het basisonderwijs. Leerlingenportfolio en Docentenportfolio*, Alkmaar: Europees Platform.
- Aarts, R. & P. Broeder (2005), Establishing language portfolios in primary education: The importance of practical experiences of pupils and teachers, In: N. Alexander (ed.), *Mother tongue-based bilingual education in Southern Africa. The dynamics of implementation*, Capetown: PREASA, University of Capetown.
- Broeder, P. & G. Extra (1999), *Language, ethnicity and education*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Broeder, P. & J. Murre (2000) (eds.), *Models of language acquisition: Inductive versus deductive approaches to language learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sorice, R. & P. Broeder (2005), *Language Portfolio Higher Education*, Babylon: Tilburg University.

GEORGY KHRUSLOV

Pushkin Institute of Russian Language / Institute for Ethnic Issues in Education,
Moscow, Russian Federation

General Analysis of Current National Curricula in Language(s) of School Education in Russia

Modern Russian with its population of 145 million is a multi-ethnic state where people speak more than 160 languages (www.perepis2002.ru). According to the law, Russian as the official state language of the Russian Federation is learnt in institutions of general or professional education.

Besides, about 30 mother tongues are in use in Russian schools as medium of instruction, and 45 mother tongues are learnt as subjects. Language education in general is regulated by the state educational standard of general education (*gosudarstvennyi obrazovatel'nyi standart obshchego obrazovaniya*, www.edu.ru) which has three parts: goals of language learning; obligatory minimum of content of basic educational programmes; requirements to the level of graduates' proficiency.

In educational institutions the state standard is being realized through sample programmes (*primernye programmy*) in each separate subject and basic curriculum (*bazovyi uchebnyi plan*) for each stage of school education. The standard is made up of federal and ethnic/regional components. Schools may also introduce schools' and pupils' components of education to provide optional and individual studies.

General goals of Russian language education as a part of the federal component are as follows: to master Russian as a means of communication in everyday life and professional activity; to develop and educate schoolchildren as personalities, to socialize them; to give access to culture and literature of the Russian people, to achievements of world science and culture; to form general educational skills and habits; to teach the skill to live in a multiethnic country in tolerance etc.

Obligatory teaching Russian as one's mother tongue in common Russian schools covers 735 hours, including 210 hours in grades V-VI, 140 hours in grade VII, 105 hours in grade VIII, 70 hours in grade IX. Teaching Russian in common ethnic school covers 630 hours, including 140 hours in grades V-VII, 105 hours in grade VIII-IX.

Goals of non-Russian mother tongue education in native schools as a part of the ethnic/regional component of the standard aim at communicative, linguistic and ethnic/cultural competencies of schoolchildren. To design this component is a competence of LEA not to exceed, however, the maximum load for learners of each grade.

Foreign language education is again regulated by the federal component of the standard. The goal for schoolchildren in acquiring foreign speech competence is to develop communicative skills in speaking, hearing, reading and writing; skills to plan one's speech and non-speech behaviour; to overcome language deficit while receiving and giving information, and also to use a foreign language as a means of forming an integral picture of the world etc.

The Council of Europe current project could turn fruitful for Russian researchers, language teachers, curriculum designers and ministry authorities in several aspects: to exchange experience and work out common terminology for language education at school in different countries; to discuss ways to raise efficiency of teaching both Russian, non-Russian and foreign languages, in particular through teaching integrated subjects and using correlated methods etc.

References

- G. Khruslov. Standard Language Teaching and Multilingualism in Russia. In: *Histories and Case Studies of Mother Tongue Education in Eleven Countries* Prepared by Sjaak Kroon & Jan Sturm. Tilburg/Nijmegen, October 1995. – p. 290-308.
- Languages and learning in multilingual schools – creating a network for a teacher training curriculum.* – Council of Europe. European Centre for Modern Languages. Report. Workshop No.15/96 – Graz, March 1998.

Session X: LE curriculum

ANNE-MARIE BROI

Office de la statistique et de l'informatique scolaires (OSIS), Neuchâtel, Switzerland

BRIGIT ERIKSSON

University of Applied Sciences, School of Education, Zurich, Switzerland

HarmoS – language 1: “The development of a model of competences for the language 1 (language of education) and the development of minimal standards for grades 2, 6 and 9 in Switzerland”

HarmoS is a national project, started in 2002 by the EDK (Swiss Conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education) to harmonise the educational systems of the 26 cantons of Switzerland. The aim of one of the sub-projects is to define minimal standards for grades 2, 6 and 9 in L1, L2, mathematics and sciences on the basis of a common competence model. This model forms the basis for the operationalisation of educational aims, which permit a control of the output of the educational system through test-procedures. The project is inspired by similar projects in other countries (Germany, Canada, USA) and refers to the works of Weinert & al. (2001) and the expertise of Klieme & al. (2003). According to these works, competence is considered as a disposition or as an individual potential to be realized when a person successfully copes with problem-based tasks.

Our report presents some of the main aspects of a first draft of a competence model L1. Our competence model is defined as a model of language activities including the two following dimensions: language as a system and language in use.

To illustrate our model, we will demonstrate through the example of the modality of speaking how the different levels of the model fit together: the aspects of language activities (situating, planning, realising, repairing, evaluating) and the descriptions of language competences, which together form the basis for the development of tasks.

We would like to discuss the following points:

- *Modalities*: In our project we determine - differently from the Common European Framework of Reference - four main modalities of language activities (speaking and writing; listening and reading). Oral and written interactions are not summed up in a modality of their own but are considered as lying in the continuum between the productive and receptive competences and can be attached to one of them. Does this decision with regard to language practice in school represent a loss or a chance?

- *Standard German and the Swiss Dialects*: A special problem is encountered in the German part of Switzerland: In our project we register the language abilities of students in

standard German even if the L1 of Swiss German students includes also Swiss German Dialects, a factor which is not taken into account in our competence model. In particular, students in lower classes do not have at their disposal all the norms of standard German. What are the implications for the model and for the determination of minimal standards?

- *Multilingualism*: Our competence model is focused on the language of education and only implicitly takes into account the existence and the conditions of multilingualism. How can multilingual aspects be integrated into the model of competences, how can bridges be built between the models of competences for L1, L2 and so on?

- *Cultural acceptance and suitability*: Each region of Switzerland – especially the different language regions – has, on the basis of its specific cultural background, developed its own language didactics with its own values and attitudes and with different views of language as medium and of language as subject. How can the different Swiss cultural school backgrounds be respected by following one model of competences?

References

- Swiss Conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education EDK, 2004: *Harmos: finalités et conception du projet*. Generalsekretariat Informationsstelle IDES.
- Klieme, E. & al. (ed.). 2003. *Zur Entwicklung nationaler Bildungsstandards. Eine Expertise*. Bonn: IOS Press: Amsterdam.
- Weinert, F.E. (ed.). 2001. *Leistungsmessung in Schulen*. Beltz: Weinheim/Basel.

MINA DREVER

Training and Development Agency – TDA – for schools, Portland House, United Kingdom

Interactional corrective feedback in first language (L1) and second/foreign language (L2) acquisition and learning: does it have the same effects?

Issues related to the question of interactional corrective feedback permeate the remit of the working group charged with developing a Language Education Framework (LEF) for policy makers, educators and learners' in today's Europe. The questions underpinning corrective feedback are whether it is desirable or necessary, or both, and why, to all language learners, in all the domains of language use to be considered by the LEF working group and to which levels of competence in the domains. Until roughly the middle of the last century an elitist status was accorded to the ability to speak French, enhanced by the notion that language learning was an impossibly difficult intellectual ability achieved only by the very clever. This attitude was reflected in the sterile and uninspiring focus on grammatical study far removed from the languages of social interactions.

The second half of the 20th century demolished these dogma in the form of theories of natural language acquisition, applied equally to first language and second language acquisition and together they had far-reaching consequences on the teaching and learning of languages in the last three decades of the last century. Chomsky in L1 and Krashen in L2 told the world that we need not teach either first or second language and the natural approach to language learning was born. Studies after studies bore witness to the phenomenon of natural language acquisition via exposure to the L1 and/or L2 environments. These positions gave rise to communicative language teaching characterised by group work, topic-based discussions, creative writing and situational/contextual use of language in which teachers facilitate language development by providing rough tuning when it is needed. However, these theories did not go unchallenged, in the light of poor linguistic performance in national and international surveys. A number of studies in the 80s and 90s began to investigate the factors that lead to effective language learning and found that a major effective factor in language acquisition and learning – interactional corrective feedback – has variable effects on L1 and L2. In the theoretical literature on mother tongue acquisition – or L1 – there is substantial evidence that children are able to work out for themselves how language works through feedback received by adults in

their environment in the form of recasts, when an adult L1 speaker corrects the child's incorrect utterance by placing it in a correctly reformulated phrase or sentence. This reformulation is a covert form of feedback. Studies on feedback in second and foreign language learning have found that recasts used with second language learning do not work, that is they do not lead the learners, of any age, to make inferences about the language they are learning. This factor is particularly pertinent to the emerging approach to language learning that is permeating European primary classrooms: an eclectic across-languages approach that encompasses general language awareness, knowledge about language, interculturalism and cross-curricular focus. With this approach teachers must teach both content and linguistic form. "How to reinforce the substantive content of student messages while giving them messages about language form" (Lyster, 1998) will present a challenging dilemma for the teachers.

This paper reviews this position in the literature, with reference also to the author's unpublished doctoral research findings, and invites a discussion on processes that affect L2 learning in a different way to L1 learning and whether attitudes to corrective feedback should be revised in the light of these findings.

References

- Doughty, C J, and Long (eds), M H, 2003: *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Fletcher, P, and MacWhinney, B (eds), 1996: *The Handbook of child language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lappin, S (ed), (1997): *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

ZOFIA AGNIESZKA KŁAKÓWNA

Akademia Pedagogiczna w Krakowie

Wychowanie językowe jako podstawa kształcenia kulturowego

Referat prezentuje koncepcję języka polskiego jako przedmiotu nauki szkolnej na trzech etapach kształcenia, tj. w klasach IV–VI szkoły podstawowej, I–III gimnazjum i I–III szkoły ponadgimnazjalnej (liceum). Praktyczny wymiar tej koncepcji stanowią programy i podręczniki szkolne z serii „To lubię!” przygotowane w ramach tego samego zespołu dla uczniów w wieku od 10 do 19 lat.

Układ programów i podręczników ma charakter spiralny z elementami koncentrycznego i liniowego. Odpowiada idei ogólnego kształcenia kulturowego. Kształcenie takie odbywa się poprzez dwa ściśle skorelowane ze sobą ciągi: (1) kulturowo-językowy i (2) kulturowo-literacki. Ścisła korelacja możliwa jest jako rezultat wskazywanych dalej założeń podstawowych.

1. Człowiek jest *istotą dramatyczną* (Tischner), a to znaczy wpisaną w przestrzeń-scenę, w czas (historię) oraz w relacje z innymi / Innym.

2. Nie istnieje poza kulturą (Pasierb), zatem w kształceniu humanistycznym kultura jest pojęciem nadrzędnym (niezależnie od przyjmowanej definicji kultury).

3. Liczy się sposób i jakość udziału w kulturze, a to jest zależne od kulturowej kompetencji i oznacza budowanie świadomości *conditio humana* oraz poczucia tożsamości kulturowej poprzez *czytanie świata* (Eco).

4. Nadrzędnym zadaniem języka polskiego jako szkolnego przedmiotu nauczania na wszystkich etapach nauki szkolnej jest więc kształcenie owej kulturowej kompetencji.

5. Tak określone zadanie jest równoznaczne z pracą nad rozwojem możliwości i umiejętności udziału w kulturze przede wszystkim poprzez język, więc z rozwijaniem kompetencji językowej jako szczególnego narzędzia wspomagającego, budującego i zdolnego wyrażać kulturową kompetencję w rozmaitych zakresach i na różnych poziomach, co się przekłada na naukę odbioru i tworzenia tekstów językowych o rozmaitym stopniu skomplikowania.

6. Język stanowi oś kulturowej tożsamości rozumianej między innymi jako rozmaite rodzaje przynależności.

7. I nie tyle chodzi o strukturę i opis struktury języka, ile o naturę języka i to jak sposoby używania języka kształtują kulturę społeczności, która tym językiem się posługuje.

8. Chodzi także o to, jakim się człowiek staje z tego powodu, że tak właśnie i takiego języka używa, do jakich kulturowych dochodzi rozpoznań i jakim rozumieniem swej ludzkiej kondycji się odznacza.

9. Literatura jest w takim rozumieniu jednym z niezwykłych sposobów używania języka.

Programy i podręczniki odpowiadające takim założeniom mają charakter formacyjny, a formacja odbywa się:

- poprzez działania, których istotą jest rozpoznawanie, opisywanie i ocenianie oraz celowe kreowanie zachowań językowych – w odniesieniu do najrozmaitszych sfer życia i kultury;
- poprzez lekturę tekstów, które mogą stanowić punkt odniesienia, oparcia, dawać „luksus rozpoznania” własnych problemów w lekturze;
- teksty takie z reguły przynależą do „Wielkiego Czasu Kultury” (Bachtin);
- przy czym ważne miejsce jako rezerwuuar prefiguracji ludzkiego losu i metaforycznych figur „długiego trwania” (Braudel) zajmują wśród nich baśnie i mity;
- teksty prezentowane są w układach kontekstualnych, które zderzają różne wyobrażenia, postawy, poglądy na te same kwestie;
- kwestie proponowane do namysłu są przy tym zanurzone w doświadczeniu uczniów i w obserwacji otaczającego ich świata, a uwaga im poświęcona staje się elementem uświadamiania sobie, co się przeżywa;
- owo uświadamianie sobie, co się przeżywa, jest tożsame z nazywaniem i stanowi element intelektualizacji problemu;
- intelektualizacja kulturowego doświadczenia odbywa się poprzez metody pracy stosowne (1) ze względu na wiek uczniów, (2) poznawaną materię i (3) sytuację cywilizacyjną.

ZOFIA AGNIESZKA KŁAKÓWNA

Pedagogical University, Kraków, Poland

Learning through language to develop cultural competence

The present paper addresses a conception for teaching Polish as a school subject at three stages of education, in Years 4-6 of primary school, 1-3 of middle school [gymnasium] and 1-3 of high school [liceum]. The practical aspect of this conception are the curricula and textbooks in the *To lubię!* series, entirely created and written by a single team, for pupils aged 10-19.

The curricula and textbooks reflect the conception's spiral structure (Bruner) with concentric and linear elements, and its purpose of providing a general humanistic education in culture.

This type of education is designed in the form of two closely correlated threads: (1) the cultural and linguistic thread, and (2) the cultural and literary thread. It is founded on the following principles.

1. Man does not exist outside culture (Pasierb), hence in a humanistic education, culture, irrespective of the definition of culture assumed, is a fundamental concept.

2. Man is a *dramatic being* (Tischner), and this means that he is inscribed in the space (stage) of his drama, in time, and in relationships with other people.

3. The way in which people experience their *drama* depends on the quality and nature of their participation in culture, and hence on their cultural competence; and this, in the context of education, points up the need to build awareness of the human condition and a sense of cultural identity by *reading the world* (Eco).

4. The primary task of Polish as a school subject at every stage of a school education is to develop this cultural competence.

5. This definition of the objective in practice means working on developing the where-withal and capability to participate in culture above all through language, i.e. developing competence in language as a key tool that supports, builds and can express cultural competence in a range of areas and at a variety of levels. This in turn involves teaching reception and creation of linguistic texts of varied degrees of complexity.

6. Language is the axis of cultural identity understood as various types of belonging, including belonging to a cultural tradition.

7. This is a question not so much of the structure of the language or description of its structure, as of the nature of the language and of how the ways it is used shape the culture of the community that uses it.

8. It is also about what kind of person one becomes through using a certain kind of language in a certain way, what cultural experience is accumulated, and what perception of the human condition one develops.

9. In this context, literature is a particular way of using language.

Thus construed, this conception is a formative one, and achieves its formative aims as follows:

- through activities involving recognising, describing and assessing, as well as deliberate creation and “experiencing” of linguistic behaviours – in connection with a broad range of areas of culture and through interpersonal communication;
- through reading texts that can offer a point of reference, support, and the “luxury of recognising” one’s own problems in the reading;
- such texts will usually form part of the “Great Time of Culture” (Bakhtin);
- the reservoir of figures prefiguring the human lot and metaphoric characters of “long duration” (Braudel) is chiefly composed of fairy tales and myths;

- texts will be presented in contexts that juxtapose different ideas, attitudes and views on the same issues;
- the topics to be worked on are immersed in pupils' experience and in observation of the world around them, and attention paid to them becomes an element of the realisation of what we are experiencing;
- this realisation of what one is experiencing is the same as naming, and constitutes an element of the intellectualisation of the issue;
- interpersonal communication and intellectualisation of cultural experience is taught using methods appropriate to (1) pupils' age, (2) the material being worked on and (3) the civilisation context.

One difficulty is checking the effectiveness of work on developing linguistic and cultural competence organised according to this model. Another major problem is teacher education.

JADWIGA KOWALIKOWA

Uniwersytet Jagielloński

URSZULA ŻYDEK-BEDNARCZUK

Uniwersytet Śląski

Standaryzacja wymagań i osiągnięć jako konsekwencja rozwoju modelu nauczania języka polskiego jako ojczystego

Kształcenie językowe w latach sześćdziesiątych opierało się na wiedzy o systemie. Było więc faktycznie nauczaniem gramatyki. Stosowana oficjalnie nazwa – nauka o języku – miała więc pełne uzasadnienie. Jej teoretyczne umocowanie stanowił strukturalizm. Rolę płaszczyzny odniesienia przy określaniu i ocenie osiągnięć uczniów pełniła sama wiedza językowa.

Wprowadzenie do nauki o języku gramatyki funkcjonalnej spowodowało zgodnie z właściwym jej punktem widzenia zwrócenie uwagi na tekstotwórczą oraz komunikacyjną funkcję poszczególnych elementów systemu. Oznaczało to otwarcie się dydaktyki językowej na pragmatyngwistykę i socjolingwistykę. Skutkowało zaś przeniesieniem punktów ciężkości na działania językowe i ich komunikacyjną adekwatność i efektywność. Ocenianie osiągnięć edukacji wiązało się z postrzeganiem ucznia jako użytkownika języka.

Następnym etapem było ustalenie kompetencji językowych ucznia za pośrednictwem opisu umiejętności i sprawności w zakresie słuchania i mówienia, pisania i czytania oraz rozumienia. Skonstruowano wówczas *Podstawę programową*, która obejmowała obok celów i treści kształcenia również przewidywane i pożądane osiągnięcia ucznia. Ich uszczegółowienie i konkretyzacja były krokiem naprzód ku standaryzacji wymagań.

Wykaz osiągnięć ucznia stał się podstawą standardów wymagań stosowanych jako narzędzie pomiaru w badaniu wyników edukacji na szczeblu podstawowym i gimnazjalnym. Przybrało ono formę oficjalnego postępowania egzaminacyjnego (część humanistyczna).

Obecnie brakuje standaryzacji wymagań w zakresie kształcenia językowego na szczeblu licealnym. Jej wprowadzenie byłoby logiczną i naturalną konsekwencją kontynuacji wymienionego kształcenia na poziomie ponadgimnazjalnym. Należałoby je powiązać jako formę kontroli i diagnozy z maturą i uwzględnić w jej regulaminie.

Pomiędzy stosowaną aktualnie standaryzacją w zakresie nauczania języka polskiego jako ojczystego z jednej a obcego z drugiej strony zachodzą zarówno podobieństwa jak i różnice. Pierwsze wyrażają się w obu wypadkach w położeniu nacisku na użycie języka i na

jego użytkownika jako podmiot mówiący, piszący i rozumiejący. Drugie odzwierciedlają się w odmiennym sposobie badania kompetencji osoby poddawanej kontroli i ocenie. W przypadku glottodydaktyki ma on charakter analityczno-syntetyczny, w przypadku języka ojczystego – syntetyczno-analityczny.

