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Dear Colleagues

On behalf of the Organizing Committee, I would like to welcome you to our conference Who needs languages? Micro and macro perspectives into language education policies. The conference is simultaneously the 28th International Summer School for Applied Language Studies at the University of Jyväskylä, thus continuing the long tradition of our university serving as an important arena for vibrant activities around applied language studies. The conference is hosted by the Centre for Applied Language Studies, the Department of Languages, and the Language Centre at the University of Jyväskylä.

In the increasingly complex and diverse world of today, questions of language education are crucial for all societies and a better understanding is needed of language education policies, of their micro and macro dimensions as well as the explicit and implicit decision making processes involved in this area. That language education policy is a topical concern also shows in the conference programme: we are delighted to have around 150 conference participants from all continents to discuss and present topics that span across various educational contexts and address a rich set of questions relating to language education policies. I’m convinced that the conference will offer us fresh outlooks and a deeper understanding of the multidisciplinary and multidimensional field of language education policies and of its complex social, cultural, and economic dimensions.

The conference programme includes keynote sessions, invited workshops, paper sessions, a panel session, and poster sessions. We hope that you will enjoy these bright days of June with us in Jyväskylä and that the conference will be a rewarding and memorable experience for you, both intellectually and socially!

Tarja Nikula
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Head of the Centre for Applied Language Studies
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## PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MONDAY June 7</th>
<th>TUESDAY June 8</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY June 9</th>
<th>THURSDAY June 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-10.00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Plenary Martyniuk MaA 103</td>
<td>Poster session 1</td>
<td>Plenary Keating MaA 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.30</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Parallel paper sessions 4, 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Poster session 2</td>
<td>Parallel paper sessions 12 &amp; 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>Plenary Lo Bianco MaA 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-14.00</td>
<td>Parallel paper sessions 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Parallel paper sessions 7, 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Panel Session: Juffermans &amp; Van der Aa</td>
<td>Parallel paper session 14 (CLIL) &amp; possible AILA Europe session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-14.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-17.00</td>
<td>Workshops: Clara Keating MaB 102</td>
<td>Workshops: Joseph Lo Bianco MaB 102</td>
<td>Workshops: Muirí Ó Laoire MaB 102</td>
<td>Parallel paper session 15 (CLIL) &amp; possible AILA Europe session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teija Kyllönen, Taina Saarinen &amp; Sari Pöyhönen (in Finnish) MaC 102</td>
<td>Eija Aalto, Karin Rapatti &amp; Kaisa Tuksi MaC 102</td>
<td>Christine Hélot MaC 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00-19.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Social programme</td>
<td>Social programme</td>
<td>Social programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General information

Coffee breaks
Coffee, tea, fruit, and cookies are available for conference participants during the scheduled coffee breaks. They are included in the conference fee, and served in the lobby of the building MaA.

Cloakroom
There is a cloakroom on the first floor of the venue (MaA). It is not guarded, so please leave your valuables in your hotel.

Computer and internet access
Conference participants can use computers and access the Internet free of charge in the computer lab MaD 206 which is located on the 2nd floor of the building MaD. The lab is open daily 8-19.00. You will find the necessary username and password in your conference package. If you wish to access the wireless network connection jyu-guest, contact the Conference Desk.

Conference badge
Your name badge is included in the conference package. The badge entitles you to enter all conference rooms and attend the academic events arranged for the participants, as well as coffee breaks, the get-together party (Monday), and the reception by the City of Jyväskylä (Tuesday). We kindly ask you to wear the badge at all times during the conference. The members of the organizing team are wearing blue badges.

Conference info desk
The Conference Desk is located on the ground floor of the venue, close to the Auditorium MaA103. The desk is open on Mon 9-18.00, Tue 8-18.00, Wed 8-18.00, and Thu 8-17.30. You will recognize the members of the conference staff by their blue name badges. The phone number of the Conference Desk is +358 50 5919322.

Electricity
The electric current in Finland is 220V (230V), 50 Hz.

Evaluation questionnaires
To let us know your opinion about the conference arrangements, please complete the evaluation questionnaire at the end of the conference. You will find the questionnaire in your conference package. Please hand it in at the Conference Info Desk.

Language policy
The official language of the conference is English. However, we encourage the use of other languages in slides, handouts etc. Unfortunately, no interpreting services will be provided for any sessions.
Lunches
There are a few possible restaurants at which you can have lunch. Restaurant Wilhelmiina is situated on the ground floor of the venue (MaA). You can also enjoy your lunch at Restaurant Piato in Agora or at the restaurant of Hotel Alba which are both located close to the venue. The restaurants Ylistö (building YFL) at the Ylistönrinne campus on the other side of the lake, and Ilokivi (building YOT) and Lozzi (building P) at the Seminaarinmäki campus up the hill are also within a short walking distance from the venue. For locations, please consult the Map of University Campuses in the conference package.

Messages for participants
All messages for participants will be placed on the notice board on the ground floor of the venue close to the Conference Info Desk.

Notice boards
Notice boards are located on the ground floor of the venue, next to the auditorium MaA 103 and the Conference Desk. Possible changes and updates to the programme will be announced on the notice boards at the start of each day. On the notice boards, you will also find the sign-up sheets for workshops, and information on lunch menus in the campus restaurants.

Smoking policy
Smoking is prohibited indoors in public spaces and in public transportation in Finland, i.e. in the campus area you are only allowed to smoke outside. Please take notice of the signs TUPAKOINTI KIELLETTY (No smoking). Trains and some restaurants have a special smoking room.

Social programme
The conference fee includes two events:

• Get-together party held in Restaurant Ylistö in the building YFL on Monday, June 7 at 7 PM. Street address: Survontie 9.
• Reception by the City of Jyväskylä at the Jyväskylä City Theatre (Jyväskylän kaupunginteatteri) on Tuesday, June 8 at 7 PM. Street address: Vapaudenkatu 36.

In addition, there is an evening cruise on the s/s Suomi on Wednesday, June 9 which is not included in the conference fee. Information and registration at the Conference Info Desk. Cost of cruise 21 €, additional cost of buffet dinner 20 €.

Staff assistance
There will be several assistants who are responsible for taking care of the practical matters during the conference. They will be wearing blue name badges.
**Tipping**

Tipping is not expected in restaurants, cafés or bars in Finland.

**Transportation (local)**

The venue is within a walking distance from the city centre. You can use local buses to get from the centre to the conference venue and back. In the city centre, buses leave from a street called Vapaudenkatu, and the buses 5, 20, 26, take you all the way to the Mattilanniemi campus. If you are staying in Laajavuori, take the bus 25 or 25K to City Library; from there, walk downhill for about 10 minutes. A single journey costs EUR 2.90. If you wish to use a taxi, please call +358 100 6900; there are also TAXI stops where free taxis wait for customers.

**University bookstore**

The university bookstore Kampus Kirja sells books, t-shirts, office supplies and souvenirs, among other things. The store is located at Gummeruksenkatu 6.

**Venue**

The conference will take place at the Mattilanniemi campus. The street address of the conference venue is Ahlmaninkatu 2. The Conference Desk is located in the MaA lobby on the first floor. The conference rooms are MaA 103, MaA 210, MaB 102, MaC 102, and MaC 302. Conference participants can also use the computer lab MaD 206.
CALL FOR SPECIAL ISSUE SUBMISSIONS
Micro and macro perspectives into language education policies
Deadline for declarations of interest: August 1, 2010
Deadline for submissions: September 30, 2010

We welcome contributions to the special conference issue Micro and macro perspectives into language education policies of Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies.

The submissions should be based on conference presentations, and they should offer fresh outlooks on language education policy, acknowledging its multidisciplinary and multidimensional nature, and its social, cultural and economic dimensions. Where and by whom are language education policy decisions made, explicitly and/or implicitly? How do educational systems respond to the challenges of multilingual societies? Critical views will be presented in order to understand the current developments and challenges of language education from both micro and macro perspectives.

Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies is a peer reviewed international open access electronic journal sponsored by the Centre for Applied Language Studies at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. It publishes articles that share an applied, interdisciplinary orientation to issues of language in society. More specifically, the journal’s areas of interest include language education, multilingualism and multiculturalism, multimodal literacies and pedagogies, issues of identity, language assessment, and language education policies. The working language of the journal is English but papers and other contributions can also be published in other languages.

We ask all of you who are interested in submitting an article to this special issue to mail a declaration of interest to the guest editors (see below for contact info) by August 1, 2010. The final manuscripts should be submitted via the Apples electronic platform at http://apples.jyu.fi by September 30, 2010. Instructions for authors are available at the Apples website. All submissions are double-blind reviewed by at least two external reviewers.

We are happy to help you with anything concerning this special issue and looking forward to your contributions!

Guest editors:

Sari Pöyhönen, University of Jyväskylä, sari.h.poyhonen@jyu.fi
Taina Saarinen, University of Jyväskylä, taina.m.saarinen@jyu.fi
http://apples.jyu.fi
A text, some debate, and the talk of teachers: Dimensions, problems and rights in language education planning today

In this paper, I will try to account for the complex reality of language education planning in diverse socio-political and economic contexts and develop a framework for teachers and applied linguists to support participation in policy debates.

I will propose a model that involves three dimensions: a textual (legal-political) element, in the hands of policy makers and conducted with the instruments of law and administration; a discursive (argumentative-rhetorical) element which is citizen-centred and conducted with the tools of debate, argument, and persuasion; and a performance dimension, in the hands (or mouths) of teachers, whose enactment of linguistic choices shapes and directs the communicative fortunes of learners.

Language policy and language education planning (LP) arose within the discipline of applied linguistics during the 1950s and 1960s, partly as a response of developed country experts to developing country problems. In recent years, LP has endured radical critique for being overly descriptive and technical and, for some critics, for complicity in the exercise of power over the lives of minority and vulnerable populations. Responding to these critiques has enriched the field of LP in academic and scholarly concepts, but today it is an unwieldy and still formative field of scholarship. In actual LP practice, however, public officials rarely draw on the conceptual, theoretical, or empirical repository of knowledge generated through LP scholarship.

In this paper, I will take examples from extra-national, national, and sub-national contexts of communicative interaction in diverse parts of the world. The model I propose aims to produce a more dynamic characterisation of the communicative realities of a rapidly globalising world with the weakening of national states, the integration of economies, but the persisting inequalities of economics and opportunities across the world. My aim is to allow professionals to help shape policy interventions in the interests of language rights, multilingualism, and social justice, as well as additive bilinguals for global communication.
Supranational level of language education policies – a Council of Europe perspective on language education

Language use plays a key role in all forms of education. It involves more than just a command of linguistic means of communication. Language is a tool for acquiring and transferring knowledge, an important aspect of the development of the person, as both an individual and a social being, a means of and a factor in understanding and making sense of reality, and a vehicle for imaginative creativity. Language education is, therefore, a fundamental element of good quality education.

For the Council of Europe, the right to good quality language education, in the form of plurilingual and intercultural education, is seen as both an integral part and a major component of quality education. Nevertheless, education systems also fulfil functions and respond to aims that cannot be reduced to the educational entitlements of those concerned. They have to take account of societal expectations, scientific, technical and economic developments, and collective interests, both national and other, that affect education in various ways and serve to modify or guide the exercise of a universal right to quality education.

In my talk, I intend to review recent Council of Europe initiatives to address these issues, and offer some thoughts on shaping a new European language education policy and practice. The presentation will deal with the current project to promote plurilingual and intercultural education, with a particular focus on the right to quality education based on fundamental Council of Europe values. The project aims to raise awareness of the transversal nature of language education and, in a rights perspective, takes into account all the languages and language varieties in, of, and for education.
Language provision and the state: Imaginations of schooling from a migrant perspective

This presentation focuses on the ways in which the value and purpose of mother tongue schooling is represented in two different contexts of migration in Europe. I will be drawing on broader sociolinguistic and ethnographic research conducted among Portuguese migrants in the UK in the 1990s by Clara Keating and on research with a similar approach among Eastern European migrants in Portugal in the early 2000s by Olga Solovova. Even though with different aims, both research projects included interviews with parents, with organisers of mother tongue classes, and with educational officers, analyses of official policies and documents related to the provision of Portuguese in the UK and Russian/Ukrainian in Portugal, as well as ethnographic observations, not only in mother tongue classes but also in other contexts, such as households and community associations. These two contexts point, in an interesting way, at the intermediate sociolinguistic status of Portuguese, acting both as a state dominant language and a minority language (migrant and lingua franca) within the same European geopolitical space.

The comparison between these two contexts has three different aims. First, it shows how the specific ways in which complementary schooling and provision of mother tongue is being ‘imagined’ in particular local settings have been shaped by broader historical processes, differently narrated by different nation-state projects. Second, it brings to the fore an explicit focus on the migrant perspective. This adds an additional layer that recognises and explains local understandings of and local investments – or non-investments – on language policies, language use, and language maintenance. Third, it indicates the existence of overlapping versions of schooling and language prestige at play in the same space, affected by co-existing, sometimes contesting historical narratives.

The paper ends by reflecting on the comparative perspective as a way of locating research in multi-situated and polycentric critical ethnography that acknowledges the formal, the informal, and the rhizomatic dimensions of language use in late modern societies, thus providing tools for both researchers and researched to assess scope for transformative action.
Regimes of Portuguese in different multilingual contexts in Europe

This workshop will lead participants to engage in a comparative research approach to multilingual contexts. Underlying this comparison is the broad aim of building an understanding of how different regimes of language come to be embedded in particular historical contexts. The focus of this comparison will be Portuguese. The data utilised compares discourses about the teaching and learning of Portuguese in two different multilingual contexts in Europe: European Portuguese speakers in London, UK, and Russian/Ukrainian speakers in Portugal. It draws on broader sociolinguistic and ethnographic research conducted among Portuguese migrants in the UK in the 1990s by Clara Keating and on research with a similar approach among Eastern European migrants in Portugal in the early 2000s by Olga Solovova. Both research projects included interviews with parents, with organisers of mother tongue classes, and with educational officers, analyses of official policies and documents related to the provision of Portuguese in the UK and Russian/Ukrainian in Portugal, as well as ethnographic observations, not only in mother tongue classes but also in other contexts, such as households and community associations.

By adopting and engaging in research perspectives that align with the values, the opinions, and the trajectories of speakers of the minority language in a dominant context – the Russian/Ukrainian-based perspective in a Portuguese dominant Portugal, and the Portuguese-based perspective in English dominant UK – participants will be asked to analyse, from one or the other perspective, textual artefacts, chosen events, and excerpts of interviews with migrants that relate to the teaching and learning of Portuguese. This will be followed by a plenary discussion on the findings of the two groups and on the possible insights on the different regimes of Portuguese in both contexts. The workshop concludes with a discussion on the research methodological issues that arise from collaborative and comparative research of this kind.
Kielikoulutuspolitiikka kunnassa – opettajat kielikoulutuspoliittisina toimijoina?

Kielikoulutus on hyvin tärkeä osa kunnan järjestämää koulutusta kaikilla koulutusasteilla. Kunnilla on opetuspalvelujen tarjoajana tässä hyvin merkittävä rooli, sillä niiden tarjoama kielikoulutus luo omalta osaltaan pohjaa maamme kansalliselle kielitaitovarannolle. Suomessa on viime vuosikymmeninä enenevästi siirretty koulutuspoliittista päätösvaltaa kuntiin.

Työpaja perustuu tekemämme tapaustutkimukseen kahden kuntaliitoskunnan kielikoulutuspoliittisista prosesseista. Tutkimusaineistomme koostuu muun muassa näiden kuntien kuntavaaliehdokkaille tehdystä kyselystä sekä opetustoimen virkamiesten, koulujen rehtoreiden ja opetuslautakuntien jäsenten haastatteluista. Kysyimme esimerkiksi, miten kielikoulutus heidän mielestäan asemoituu kunnan koulutukseen? Entä miten kuntapäätäjien omat arvot sekä käsitykset kieliä ja kielitaidosta vaikuttavat järjestettävään kieltenopetukseen?

Tutkimustuloksista selviää, että kuntavaaliehdokkaista puolet oli sitä mieltä, että kieltenopetuksen kehittäminen on erityisen tärkeää, kun kunnan koulutusta kehitetään, mutta haastattelujen perusteella taas kieltenopetus ei näyttänyt olevan mitenkään etusijalla verrattuna muuhun koulutukseen. Sitä ei myöskään koettu koulutuspoliittisesti erityisen tärkeäksi kuntien opetuslautakunnissa. Näyttää siis siltä, että vieraiden kielten opetus ei näy paikallisesti kuntatasolla sen paremmin kuin valtakunnallisesti. Tästä herääkin kysymys, missä kielikoulutuspolitiikkaa sitten tehdään, jos ei kunnissa.

Työpajamme tarkoitus on herätellä kunnan kielikoulutuksesta vastaavia tahoja pohtimana uusia näkökulmia erityisesti juuri kielikoulutuksen järjestämiseen. Samalla työpajan tarkoitus on antaa opettajiille, kuntapäätäjille ja muille toimijoille välineitä hahmottaa itseään kielikoulutuspoliittisina toimijoina kunnassa. Millaisia rooleja ja vastuuta heillä on, kun kunnassa suunnitellaan ja toteutetaan kielikoulutusta? Miten eri toimijat voivat omalta osaltaan olla vaikuttamassa siihen, että kunnissa jatkossakin opiskellaan vieraita kieliä?
Lo Bianco, Joseph  
University of Melbourne, Australia  

A closer look at making and shaping language education policies and practices

In this session, I will extend the theoretical underpinning of my keynote to look closely at what language practices are, (arguing that these are frozen past policies, made policies taken for granted), and contrasting these with the residual practice of here-and-now communication. By destabilising our sense of what we have inherited, we can expand our sense of power over the resources from the past and influence them for better directions in the future. I will look closely at several settings, Australia, Sri Lanka, Singapore, China, and the United States, contrasting the claims of bilingualism, English and the questions of language education, heritage and communication rights, ‘mainstream’ representations of opportunity and advantage, comparative statistics about education performance. These will be tied to the framework of language education policy proposed and struggles around what language policies ‘should say’.
 Language teaching and diversity: Teaching of Finnish in plurilingual context

The workshop will concentrate on issues of majority language teaching in a plurilingual context. The focus will be on the teaching of the Finnish language both as a mother tongue and as a second language. Usually these are considered as two separate fields. The ultimate aim of the workshop is to explore the interface between conventions applied in these two language teaching traditions. In order to encounter plurilingual language learners, it is vital to accomplish an approach that embraces the teaching of a mother tongue and the teaching of a second language as two facets of the common enterprise. The workshop is aimed at bridging the dichotomy of the One (mother tongue) and the Other (a second language) in the field of teaching Finnish by applying three perspectives which are the curriculum, the concept of language skills, and plurilingualism.

The National Curriculum defines different syllabuses for Finnish as a mother tongue and Finnish as a second language. In the workshop, the syllabuses are explored focusing on language structures and literacy skills. How are they comprised in the curriculum? How does the curriculum meet the plurilingual context? How could syllabuses form a continuum?

The concept of language skills will be studied through different types of exercises. How do they train language skills? What kinds of learning processes do they engage?

Plurilingualism is a resource for language teaching that, as of now, has not been fully discovered. How can teaching of Finnish benefit from a plurilingual learner group? How can the plurilingual group increase language awareness and motivate learning?

Within these three perspectives our aim is to build on the experiences of both teachers and learners.
Kielistä kiinni! Kielivalintoja tukevan teemapäivän suunnittelupaja

Siitä, miten kielivalintoja kunnissa markkinoidaan, on tullut kielikoulutuspoliittinen väline ja asennekysymys. Kielivalinnoissa on myös pitkälti kyse kieltenopettajien omasta aktiivisuudesta sekä innokkuudesta järjestää erilaisia valintoihin liittyviä teemapäiviä. Markkinoinnista ja viestinnästä on tullut yhä tärkeämpä väline kielivalintoja tehtäessä.

Työpajassa on tarkoitus tarkastella kielivalintoihin liittyvän ennakkomainonnan tärkeyttä. Pohdimme yhdessä, minkälaita viestintää oppilaille ja vanhemmille on suunnattava ja mikä merkitys viestinnällä on kielivalintoihin.

Suunnittelemme työpajassa konkreetisesti oppilaille toteutettavaa kielipäivää.
The workshop will invite participants to consider the concept of a language policy (LP) trajectory, i.e. policy from its negotiation and articulation to its implementation. The focus will be, in particular, on aspects of LP implementation in institutions and organisations, e.g. schools, colleges, health services. It is proposed to explore and discuss how social actors working within organisations draw on their professional and personal experiences, as well as on existing discourses to raise questions, criticise, defend, or reject LP and justify the way they have responded to it either as individuals or as an organisation.

Recent language policy research highlights individual and collective agency in the processes of language use, attitudes, and policies (Ricento 2000). People on the ground charged with implementation are not the passive receivers of policies or the vague resisters once depicted in research accounts, referring to public body practitioners (Ball 1997; Shohamy 2009), but social actors who can exercise agency, albeit within constraints imposed by organisational structures. The aim is to show that language policies are not merely implemented, but are actually shaped on the ground (Ball 1997) since “it is in local decisions that planning has its ultimate impact” (Ó Laoire 2007: 167). The orientation taken in the workshop conceptualises policy implementation as a continuing process of construction by those involved. Policy implementation manifests itself in many bilingual and multilingual contexts as a struggle for meaning, as a variety of social actors actively engage in the planning, interpretation, modification, and/or (selective) implementation of policy, in accordance with existing institutional practices, external pressures, and individual preferences.

Examples from a case study of the Official Languages Act (2003) will be given and participants will be invited to explore and discuss examples of implementation from below (subaltern agency) drawing on their own sociolinguistic contexts, research studies, data, and interests.

References


“Tell me how you talk”: Language diversity at primary level in France

The workshop will start with the projection of a documentary film (Feltin 2008, 50mn) entitled « *Tell me how you talk* » which relates the stories of teachers, parents, students, and researchers in France involved in a school project linking home and school knowledge and building on students’ and their parents’ plurilingual repertoires. Comparing the film to their own experiences of intercultural education in their respective educational contexts, participants will be asked to reflect on the reasons why schools should support home languages and how it can be done. Several theoretical notions will be presented briefly to frame the discussion such as learners’ voice, power relationships in the classroom, and empowerment and the role of parents.

The main question the workshop will address is how to develop plurilingualism and intercultural projects from the start of schooling, based on all the home languages children bring with them to school. Various examples of pedagogical activities will be proposed to participants using children’s literature in different languages and language awareness approaches.

The ultimate aim of the workshop is to challenge teachers with the idea that they can be agents of change in their own schools, exploring how, in their daily work, they renegotiate and recreate their own language policies through the pedagogical choices they make with regard to the diversity of languages spoken by their students (and their parents).
Analysing Voice in Educational Discourses

Conveners:  
Van der Aa, Jef  
University of Jyväskylä, Finland  
Jufferman, Kasper  
Tilburg University, The Netherlands

This panel addresses the notion of ‘voice’ in educational discourses from a variety of perspectives that are rooted in ethnographic approaches to language and education research (e.g. Hymes 1996). ‘Voice’ is the ability of an individual or a group of individuals to be heard and understood on their own terms (Blommaert 2008). In educational research, these voices include those of teachers, pupils, parents, politicians, policy makers, but also include our own voices.

Within the scope of this panel, we want to examine how in a linguistic free market (meaning in the absence of a very compelling language policy) informal social rules and ideologies of language (e.g. regimes) relate to individual multilingual and literacy practices (i.e. repertoires). In some contexts, policy is more heavily reinforced than in others. This has serious consequences for the study of ‘voice’ in a variety of different contexts worldwide, since enabling these ‘voices’ seems to be the “force for enhancing children’s own learning and promoting the maintenance and revitalization of their languages” (Hornberger 2006: 277).

Because educational research is such an arena of intercultural communication, and because it is ‘the hardest science of all’ (Berliner 2002), we propose this panel as methodological and empirical reflection on whose voices are articulated, recognised, misrecognised, understood, and/or misunderstood in educational data of various natures (classroom observations, focus group interviews, writing assignments, children’s classroom narratives etc.) and in different sociolinguistic contexts.

Ethnographic research involves collaboration between ethnographer and ‘ethnographees’ – the human subjects we do research ‘on’, ‘for’, and ‘with’ (Cameron, Frazer et al. 1992). Research with an ethnographic agenda falls or stands with the input given, and collaboration granted by human subjects in the field. To put it in a one-liner, there can be no ethnography without ethnographees.

Questions are seldom innocent (cf. Briggs 1986), also in educational research. Very often, part of the answer is embedded in the question itself. Questions can impose categories on the ethnographees that may not be locally relevant, and this may silence or misrecognise the voices we aimed to study. This potentially undermines the articulation of locally grounded perspectives on linguistic diversity and an understanding of real language practices in and out of school, both of which are crucial for democratic language education policies. With this panel, we aim to show, by several descriptive analyses, that voices can be restored and re-articulated in the analysis through careful textual analysis and critical self-reflection.

This panel aims to bring together self-reflective studies of voice in very diverse educational contexts in places such as Finland, Holland, Belgium, Barbados, China, Russia, and the Gambia.
Getting and losing voices: Language use and identity construction among migrant children in China and Chinese diaspora

This paper explores the notion of ‘voice’ in the discursive process of identity construction among migrant children both in China itself and in the Chinese diaspora. Inside China, the phenomenal rural-urban migration started in the 1980s; for three decades this ongoing internal migration has formed a migrant population as sizable as ten percent of the country’s total population. It is a direct result of China’s dramatic economic growth and its increasing participation in the world economy. In terms of trans-national migration, China has been one of the major emigrating countries and its diaspora can be found, literally, all over the world. Both types of migration, internal as well as international, are local presentations of the globalising processes, and in such dynamic and procedural processes, people are getting or losing voices, some voices are silenced, whereas others gain new meanings when people travel across geographical as well as symbolic spaces. The present paper reports on a joint ethnographic research conducted between 2006 and 2010 among internal labour migrants in China as well as Chinese immigrants in the Netherlands. The fieldwork data show that, both in China and the Chinese diaspora, migrant children deploy language (i.e. their home dialects, Standard Chinese, languages of the local communities such as English, Dutch) and other semiotic resources creatively in order to have their voice heard and to have themselves understood in their participation in social life at school, and such voicing processes are always deeply ideological.

The Bakhtin’s notion of ‘voice’ is concerned with the ways in which speech forms can be typified as widely recognised characterological figures such as classes and profession (social voice), or individual, locally situated personhood (individual voice). Recent development of this notion moves to ‘voicing contrasts’ and ‘enregistered voices’ (Agha, 2005). Blommaert (2008) argues that ‘voice’ is essentially a social construct and is deeply positioned in social structure; it converts socially ‘loaded’ resources into socially ‘loaded’ semiotic practice. Some linguistic resources, such as a standard accent, suggest prestige, while others (e.g. vernaculars) are stigmatised; some accents are mobile across various social and geographic spaces, others are strictly local. Voice, thus, rarely functions in a neutral context; different voices enter into dialogue, and some gain recognition, while others are silenced. We shall present three examples from our fieldwork data to illustrate how various voices – voices of migrant children, voices of their local counterparts, those of the teachers, of the headmaster – are all played out in the institutional contexts. Furthermore, we shall reflect on the voice of the ethnographers and the impact of the ethnographers’ voice on those of the ethnographees (Van Camp and Juffermans, this volume).
‘Please don’t speak like takakontti did aukea’: Navigating language choice and seeking voice in an English language primary school classroom in Finland

Voice may be considered a ‘manifestation of one’s agency through language’ (Cana-garajah 2004: 268). For a child educated through a foreign language, finding voice is about finding a means of expression through the target language. In this paper, I will examine the problems of voice that occur when student actions conflict with teacher expectations surrounding language use. An institutional policy of English only in this classroom trickles down to impact micro-level interactions in ways which alter student participation in classroom life.

This paper focuses on classroom interaction drawn from an ethnographic study situated in the field of sociolinguistics, drawing upon field notes, audio-visual recordings, artefacts, and interviews. While engaging in a microethnographic analysis of interaction (Erickson 1992), I draw on methods of discourse analysis (Gee 2005) to look how code becomes a cause for teacher sanctioning, a problem of communication with parents, and an issue of classroom membership.

Children are expected to speak only English in this first and second grade classroom, however, most of the students whose parents enrol them in this class use Finnish as a mother tongue. Two students are featured in my analysis of interactions where language choice or use is problematized or contested: Lucille and Aarto. Lucille is a newcomer and uses French at home, English at school, and studies Finnish as a foreign language. Aarto is a Finnish student who struggles to articulate himself through English, and thus, has a diminished voice in this classroom. Voice and code are inextricably and interchangeably tied in this setting. In one instance, Aarto mixes English and Finnish in attempting to describe a movie to peers, and is heavily sanctioned by the teacher. This teacher has locally interpreted how best to ensure the use of English, thus differentiating this English medium class from both CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classes also offered within this institution. However, through such interactions, Aarto is singled out by the teacher and marked as a child who is struggling in the English program. On the other hand, regardless of the institutional label and associated norms of language use, this is still a classroom in Finland as recognised by newcomers such as Lucille. Lucille has limited opportunities to interact in Finnish within the class, and yet, the use of this code is an integral part of school life and membership. While Lucille, like Aarto, struggles to find voice here, she is vocal and persistent in seeking a more powerful voice.
School practices limit what voices are available to students (Toohey 2000). My analysis reveals that policies for language use, beyond impacting newcomers, also impact some Finnish students. This localised framework for interaction, meant to optimise the acquisition of English, results in the marginalization of some. Such a micro-level examination of voice and linguistic inequality reveals the social impact of macro-level language policies on the youngest learners in society. Further, such research addresses a universal question in education: which students succeed and on whose terms?
Within the research program of the International Mother Tongue Education Network (IMEN), we were involved in a number of comparative case studies in the field of mother tongue education, including the teaching of official national languages as well as minority languages. The main aims of these case studies were to investigate ways in which mother tongue education appears in different countries and how differences and similarities in this respect can be understood as reflections of the various national and cultural contexts in which the lessons take place. In our studies, we used ethnographic methods for data collection leading to extensive ethnographic corpora consisting of documents, field notes, classroom observations, transcripts, and audio tapes of long interviews and observed lessons. In order to be able to analyze these data in an international comparative perspective, we used Frederick Erickson’s (1977) method of key incident analysis which we combined with international triangulation.

Within the context of an IMEN project on ‘Multilingualism, mother tongue education and language policy’ that took place in the Russian Federation Republic of Bashkortostan, we came across a key incident that was selected for international triangulation by our Russian colleagues. The key incident was taken from a lesson in Secondary School Number 127 in Ufa, the capital of Bashkortostan, and the title given to it was ‘If Shakir had not changed his family name into a Russian one, he would not have survived the orphanage’. The lesson was about a ‘Hero of the Soviet Union’ who died in the Second World War, and turned out to be selected by our colleagues as an example of ‘good teaching practice’.

In our triangulating analysis of the fragment, we were struck by the fact that it hardly contained any features we would expect to be present in classroom interaction such as false starts, repetitions, incomplete sentences, language mistakes, etc. This might be due to the transcription, to the translation process, or to the fact that there seemed to be a lot of reading aloud and reciting in the classroom. Nevertheless, the fragment represents a clear example of what Keith Sharpe (1992) on the basis of an in-depth analysis of a grammar lesson in a French primary school, coined as a ‘catechistic teaching style’. The catechistic teaching style, according to Sharpe, does not aim at eliciting the pupils’ own ideas on a certain topic in their own words, not the pupils’ voice so to say, but rather at having the pupils reproduce fixed formulas learned from the teacher at earlier occasions.

In my paper, on the basis of the Bashkortostan as well as some other key incidents, I will go into the characteristics of the catechistic teaching style and try to explain its connectedness to aspects of national identity as, for example, emerging in contemporary attempts, at least in Western Europe, to develop and fix a so-called national educational canon, thereby ultimately diminishing the pupils and teachers’ voice.
This paper is about language in education in The Gambia (West Africa). As a British post-colony, English has remained The Gambia’s official language, which is most noticed in the formal education system where it is the sole medium of instruction and literacy learning. The nine or so local languages, including Mandinka and Wolof, thrive in the more informal domains but have largely been neglected as resources for formal teaching and learning. In 2004, however, a new education policy was adopted that provides the introduction of (five) local languages as subjects at the basic, secondary, and higher education levels, and as medium of instruction in pre-school and in the first three years of basic education. Five years after the inception of this policy, little of these objectives has been put into practice yet (McGlynn & Martin 2009).

In order to give audience to local voices in the Gambian debate on the medium of instruction, ethnographic research was carried out on parent-teacher meetings as well as pupils’ writings in both urban and rural schools. The data presented here consist of a transcribed group discussion in rural Gambia involving teachers, parents, local politicians, and an interpreter, as well as the researcher herself (Kirsten). A fundamental misunderstanding in the interview, which led to mutual frustration, is the ethnographer’s plural conceptualisation of local language(s) as local languages versus the ‘ethnographees’ singular conceptualisation of local language(s) as moo fing kango ‘black people’s language’ (in Mandinka). Despite the interviewer’s insistence on asking which local language was to be introduced in their school, no straightforward answer was given to this question. By resisting the interviewer’s question, the interviewees made a collective statement against compartmentalising multilingualism, or against seeing multilingualism as ‘multiple monolingualisms’ and favoured a more vague concept of language, which is in English best captured perhaps by ‘languaging’ (Mignolo 1996). Introducing local language(s) in Gambian schools, it was suggested, should be possible without formally determining which one(s) are legitimate to use in particular schools. In other words, to put it somewhat cryptically, our ‘ethnographees’ ‘language’, but do not need languages.

It is argued that in ethnographic-style research on language ideologies, it is not enough to just analyse and interpret local voices, but that we also need to take our own voices into account by critically examining the interviews as intercultural communication (Briggs 1986) and by interrogating our own epistemologies about linguistic diversity and education (Collins 1998). In taking vernacular voices (‘their ideologies’) seriously and mobilising them to guide our understanding of local ecologies of language, we are able to ‘disinvent’ the mainstream sociolinguistic construction (‘our ideologies’) of language as countable, discrete entities, and imagine a more African perspective on ‘local languaging’ (Makoni & Trudell 2009).
Restoring voice: An Independence Day narrative in a Barbadian classroom

Ever since Jakobson’s (1960) ground-breaking work on the poetic function of language as a meaning-making device, the significance of poetics and style in everyday interactions has been receiving close attention. As the ensuing research has suggested, the poetic/stylistic organization of discourse can be crucial to the construction of voice by the speaker, to the speaker’s self-positioning toward discourse, and to the reception of discourse by others as authoritative, legitimate, and persuasive (Maryns and Blommaert 2001). In other words, the speaker’s ‘poetic competence’ – to coin the term – appears to be a crucial component in one’s ability to make meaning that is being socially heard. But what happens in those “sites where different systems of meaning-making meet” (Blommaert 2006: 181); where speakers’ communicative success depends on the narrative ability to produce a compelling performance in a language variety in which some may not have an adequate ‘poetic competence’?

In this paper, I will consider some of these issues within the context of a Barbadian classroom where students and teachers alike negotiate two linguistic systems: Standard English, the legitimate language of education, and Bajan (an English-related Creole). School children in Barbados have different linguistic repertoires which consist of unevenly distributed resources: some children speak Standard English very well; others have a more limited competence. Furthermore, because the mode of the acquisition of Standard English is primarily through the “lecture hall transmission” (Volosinov 1973: 74), for many students, their control of the formal resources of that language does not extend to the stylistic ease in the management of these resources. Yet, in order to be heard in the classroom, students have to write and speak in the Standard. The student who is Creole-dominant in the classroom setting is likely to be considered lazy or learning-disabled. However, such a perspective does not take into account the child’s narrative/stylistic skills in Bajan.

Through the analysis of a child’s narrative about Independence Day, I show the child’s stylistic resources, such as the verbal mastery of rhythm, the selection of metaphorical resources for the story, and the overall organization of the narrative. In an effort to identify some of the implicit formal characteristics of Bajan verbal arts, I situate this narrative in the context of other examples of Bajan discursive performance.
Are we voicing the unvoiced or busy with ethnographic blunders?

As all ‘walled-in organizations’ (Goffman 1961: 169-170), primary school classrooms are characterized by a demand put on the individual. That is to adopt a voice and be visibly engaged in the activity of the organization at appropriate times. This obligatory endorsement in the activity of the organization tends to be seen as the ability (or lack thereof) to give one’s own commitment and one’s own acceptance of the implications that being part of a certain organization has for the identity of the participant. Following this line of thought, this paper deals with the concept of voice that is here understood as the capacity of either an individual or a group of individuals to make themselves understood in a socio-cultural space (Blommaert 2005). More precisely, the paper deals with how voice is employed by primary school pupils from immigrant minority background to sabotage the identity construction brought forward by authoritative voices in two regular multicultural primary school classrooms, one located in Flanders and one in the Netherlands (see Spotti 2007, 2008).

First, the paper draws on a key incident gathered during the Flemish case study. In so doing, it looks at how, during a classroom interaction aimed at introducing immigrant minority pupils to the classroom’s guest, the identities of these pupils are either ascribed as ‘exotic’ or ‘normal’ on the basis of what according to the class teacher is the aim of the more powerful voice in the classroom, i.e. that of the visitor. The teacher’s identity ascription manoeuvre, however, is mocked by a pupil who through identity sabotage, manages to avoid the engrossment of his identity in the organizational activity that is at play, that is of being ascribed to an emblematic identity based on his surname.

Second, the paper draws on a key incident gathered during the Dutch case study. In there, it focuses on a verbal interaction that has taken place among two immigrant minority pupils of Turkish background and the ethnographer, i.e. myself. The pupils’ emblematic use of an Arabic sentence that belongs to Dutch pop culture leads to a manoeuvre of language sabotage that allows them to move away from the voice of the ethnographer and from the patterned sociolinguistic realities that the ethnographer impinges upon them.

The paper concludes with some considerations on the consequences that the (mis)match between the voices of the class teacher, of the pupils, and of the ethnographer may have for the reconstruction and articulation of the ‘cultural ecology’ (Rampton 2005) that lies beneath the verbal exchanges taking place in a regular multicultural primary school classroom.
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Language education policy in higher education in Israel: From a micro perspective to a macro perspective?

This study is a descriptive survey that portrays language education policy in higher education in Israel over a centennial. Due to the socio-political processes in the global and local arena, it was assumed that several forces would be involved in language education policy: the penetration of English into the academic domain worldwide would influence language education policy in this context as well, local forces that represent the language rights perspective would defend Hebrew against English, and local forces that represent a more global perspective would attempt to include Hebrew and English as mutually exclusive. It was also assumed that these forces would influence declared policy as well as policy de-facto (Shohamy 2006) over the years.

The following study aimed at identifying these forces and at describing the relationships between these forces, and between language management and language practice. The theoretical organizational framework (Spolsky & Shohamy 1999) of policy, ideology, and practice was used for this purpose.

The study used a mixed methods approach. The population included students of all degrees in four disciplines: medicine, nature studies, philosophy, and education. These disciplines were found in other studies (Gunnarsson 2001; Ammon 2001) to exemplify differences in language practices following the penetration of English into the academic domain. The students filled in a questionnaire, and lecturers were interviewed. Two of the three universities were chosen since they were the first universities that were established in Palestine, and the third was a relatively newer one. In order to investigate former and current language management documents such as regulations, theses and protocols of university senate meetings were looked at. The interviews also provided data regarding current beliefs and language practice of lecturers and students, and the questionnaires given to students informed about students’ language practice.

By and large, findings suggest that there were two distinct periods in language management. In both periods, the same agents were involved in policy: university senate members and the Academy of the Hebrew Language. The first period began in 1913 with the “language war” over the medium of instruction at the first university, the Technion. A policy of “Hebrew only” was adopted and was in effect in the four disciplines until the 1970s. During the second period, attempts to instill a more macro perspective of language policy were made. One attempt to change language policy was made at a senate meeting at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem in 1982 where a more flexible policy that allows writing theses in Hebrew or English was suggested but turned down. Another attempt to change the declared policy took place at a senate meeting in 1994. The two forces involved in policy expressed opposing views and a decision to postpone the decision was accepted. The status-quo in the “Hebrew only” policy has remained intact.

However, policy de-facto has changed in the second period. Although Hebrew is still used as the oral medium of instruction, Hebrew and/or English are used as the written medium of instruction in all disciplines but education.
Internationalisation and the invisible language: “Foreign language” degree programmes challenging Finnish higher education

Finland is among the countries with the highest amount of English-taught programmes in higher education (Wächter and Maiworm 2009). It seems that while the stated purpose of introducing, developing, and supporting foreign language programmes in Finnish higher education is largely motivated by demands for increased internationalisation of HE, languages do not play a big role in the vocalized policies (Saarinen 2010).

Finnish universities are currently implementing a fundamental higher education reform of 2010 which has, for the most part, been motivated with the international attractiveness of Finnish universities (Ministry of Education 2009). This and other current policy processes challenge Finnish higher education not only from the point of view of internationalisation, but also from the fundamental perspective of universities and polytechnics as national institutions (providing a public service) in a globalizing world. These structural changes also force the universities and polytechnics to rethink their language of tuition, as English increases its share in a system traditionally dominated by Finnish and, to a smaller degree, Swedish.

This proposal deals with the internationalisation of higher education and the position of languages in it. It analyses whether and how languages are presented in the internationalisation policies and foreign language degree programmes in Finnish higher education. Do languages have a place in the internationalisation discourse of higher education? Or are languages taken more or less for granted?

The paper utilises discourse analytical methods (Fairclough 2003); more precisely, it analyses the appearances or absences of language by looking into the different ways in which languages are (explicitly) or are not (implicitly) represented: is knowledge of a foreign language (in practise English) presented as necessary for internationalisation? Is implicit or explicit reference made to (mere) participation in foreign language study programmes providing the students with increased language or intercultural skills? Are languages and/or communication and/or intercultural skills mentioned specifically as programme contents? For the implicit references to languages, tools from linguistic pragmatics (such as analysis of pragmatic presuppositions) will be used.

The analysis is based on a discourse analysis of the introductory and promotional texts for foreign language degree programmes in five Finnish universities and five polytechnics; the internationalisation strategies for Finnish higher education; and the Finnish International Study Programme Database. Particular attention will be paid to the representations of languages in the programmes, and to the relationship between representations of language and representations of internationalisation.
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Attitudes and motivational factors behind Finnish business students’ choices of foreign languages

During spring 2009, an extensive survey was carried out at five Finnish universities (the Turku School of Economics, the Helsinki School of Economics, the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration at the University of Oulu and the University of Jyväskylä). The survey was targeted at business students who take part or who took part in language courses organized by the language departments or language centers at their university. Language education is an important part of the curricula in the business schools and faculties. It is obligatory to study at least one foreign language beside Finnish and Swedish but it is more common to study more than one.

By means of the survey, we sought to determine the attitudes and beliefs of the students towards a variety of aspects concerning foreign language learning, choices of foreign languages, and plurilingualism, such as:

• What kind of foreign language skills and language-in-practice experiences did the students gain before they started their university studies?
• What are the students’ attitudes towards foreign language learning in general and towards the different languages offered at their universities?
• What are the motives for choosing certain languages and not choosing others?
• What are the students’ attitudes towards plurilingualism?

The electronic survey was returned by over 2,000 students, and the answers offer an interesting insight into the students’ motives and attitudes. The analysis shows that the students have already at the beginning of their university studies a broad range of knowledge in several foreign languages and take actively part in the language courses offered at their universities. The attitudes towards foreign language learning are mainly very positive, as are the attitudes towards plurilingualism which the students consider very important for their studies and future professional life. The results of the survey also show that the students are able to formulate clearly their motives for choosing certain languages and not choosing others. The main factors they take into consideration are former language experiences, being able to reach functional skills in the foreign language, the importance of certain languages for the professional life or for leisure time, but also factors such as the (believed) difficulty of certain languages, or social and affective factors. The analysis shows distinctive traits of motives for studying different languages and shows also some differences between the universities, the major subjects of the students, and sexes. In this presentation, the central findings of the survey will be presented and possible implications for the work of the language departments/centers will be discussed.
Influence of community initiated language schools on micro-language policy

Language planning and policy (LPP) emerged as a field in which professional linguists consulted with national (often post-colonial) governments to shape language learning and use from the top down. Standardization was a common goal, for the purpose of building national unity. Activities to promote standardization included developing writing systems, making dictionaries, and creating technical terms for the national language.

Since then, along with developing a greater interest in maintenance and revitalization of minority languages, planning and policy has expanded to consider the mid-level language policy of individual institutions-workplaces, schools, the mass media, religious organizations, etc.

More recently, linguists have looked at the LPP actions that individuals take within their own spheres of influence, e.g. teachers in their own classrooms. Baldauf, Li, and Hudson describe this as “micro agency” (Baldauf, Li, and Hudson 2007). Although a growing body of research is addressing language policy at this micro level, many theoretical constructs of language policy continue to reflect a macro or top-down approach.

In this paper, I will examine the elements of Hornberger’s “integrative language planning and policy framework”, itself a compilation of work from other LPP theorists. These include the activities and goals of status, acquisition, and corpus planning of language form and use in the context of an educational setting.

I will compare the actions and goals of the integrative LPP framework with the stated and observed actions and goals of the leaders of three community initiated language learning schools/organizations, one in New York State, a Mandarin language school in Corning, NY, one in Oregon, a Native American Athabaskan language school, and the last a dialect club, Nortamo Seor, which attempts to preserve the traditional Rauma dialect.

I interviewed these leaders about the creation of their school/organization, their established language policies, and how they attempt to preserve their languages/dialects in a predominately monolingual setting.

I will approach this comparison of theory and data from two opposing perspectives. On the one hand, are there LPP actions and goals of the schools/organizations I interviewed that are missing from Hornberger’s framework? In other words, is there evidence that Hornberger’s framework is limited to the macro policy perspective? How could the framework be expanded to include micro approaches?
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Mind the gap! Young immigrants in national and local language education policies in Finland

In Finland, the current national curriculum sets functional bilingualism as a goal of immigrant education. Moreover, one of the main missions of basic education (i.e. grades 1–9) is declared to be to ‘support each pupil’s linguistic and cultural identity and the development of his or her mother tongue’ (National Board of Education 2004: 12). This highly ethical objective can be considered quite ambitious, taking into account that more and more students in Finnish schools are plurilingual. Similar ideals are presented in the most recent development plan for education and research, published by the Finnish Ministry of Education:

‘All pupils must be able to maintain and develop their mother tongue in addition to learning Finnish or Swedish. (…) Measures will be taken to support the equal provision of instruction preparing for basic education, the teaching in the mother tongue and the teaching of Finnish or Swedish as a second language.’ (Ministry of Education 2008: 47.)

On the basis of these quotations, Finland gives an impression of an educational paradise where all students are ensured to have equal opportunities. Our research findings show, however, that there is a gap between the national language education policies and the local interpretations and implementations of them. The municipalities and even individual schools are entrusted to execute the official language education policy in practice, and they obviously engage in this differently. Therefore, it is the local authorities’ awareness of and attitudes towards issues related to immigration that have an especially central role in defining the educational settings in which immigrant students go to school.

The findings to be presented are based on our web-survey study How is multilingualism encountered in Finnish schools? In our study, 217 teachers responded to a questionnaire of 75 statements designed so that they reflect a large variety of concerns and conflicts commonly reported by teachers. The respondents took stock of the familiarity of the described phenomena and, thus, reported how common they were in their school environment. They could also give additional information on their viewpoints, so both quantitative and qualitative data were obtained.
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Multilingual policy in primary languages education: Training teachers to integrate a wide range of languages across the curriculum

The National Languages Strategy for England calls for the introduction by 2010 of an entitlement to language learning for every pupil in Primary schools from age 7 to 11. This strategy provides the potential for the introduction of a wide range of languages into the Primary School curriculum to reflect the multilingual context of England. However, in national pilot studies of the introduction of the Primary Languages Strategy, French is by far the most dominant language being introduced, and European languages tend to predominate (DfES 2005). The focus of Primary teacher preparation for language learning entitlement by 2010 has tended to be the teaching of specific (mostly European) languages by subject specialists. This could lead to the isolation of language teaching from the rest of the curriculum if Primary class teachers are not fully involved in language teaching.

This paper will investigate the possibility of taking a more multilingual approach to language teaching in Primary schools. It will report findings arising from initial teacher training provision for mainstream Primary and Early Years teachers in a multilingual London context at London Metropolitan University. This provision takes an integrated multilingual approach to preparing student teachers for the Primary Languages Strategy.

The paper will show examples from teacher training sessions as well as evaluative data from questionnaires and a focus group discussion. These reveal student teachers’ responses to the teaching sessions, their attitudes towards languages and their perceptions of language teaching roles as class teachers. The paper will also refer to data from an audit of student teachers’ linguistic knowledge and skill. Analysis of the data shows a wide range of existing linguistic and cultural knowledge, experience and skill among student teachers, relating to a number of different languages, including those spoken by minority communities. These could be utilised to support a more multilingual approach to language teaching in schools. The data also show the impact of the training focus on student teachers’ motivation and confidence to include the teaching of languages in their roles as Primary class teachers. This paper concludes by considering the implications for language education policy in Primary schools in England. It shows that by drawing on the existing language skills and knowledge of classroom teachers it would be possible to:

a) introduce the teaching of a wider range of languages to include minority heritage and community languages as well as so-called majority languages,

b) integrate the teaching of languages with the whole curriculum.
Parents, teachers, and early start language-in-education policies: Longitudinal perspectives on implementation

“Can an early start to language learning ‘work’ in England?”
“Is it necessary for children in England to learn an additional language?”
“Which language should they learn?”
“Can parents speak any other languages?”

The above questions reflect some of the investigations conducted with parents and teachers over a three year period as one part of a longitudinal study researching the introduction of foreign languages from the early phases of compulsory schooling in seven European countries (ELLiE 2007-2010).

This paper explores the responses of parents and teachers in one region of England where foreign languages have been introduced over a five year period in advance of the required entitlement for all seven year olds introduced officially in January 2010. The paper will draw on data collected from 40 teachers and 160 parents of children in the ELLiE study schools to tease out the extent to which this large-scale reform of the primary school curricula (Edelenbos et al. 2006) is viewed positively and considered effective.

Data collected at the start of the study suggested that whilst teachers were enthusiastic about the potential merits of an early start, considering it likely to contribute substantially to learners’ early confidence and competence in language learning, parents were generally less certain about this potential. Reportedly, very few offered the kinds of additional home support that Szpotowicz & Szulc-Kurpaska (2009) recommend as vital to the child’s developing positive self-perception of language learning, with many even declaring themselves unaware of the existence of foreign languages on the curriculum. Parents appeared uncertain of the potential advantages of early language learning and even of the relevance of learning languages at all. This data contrasted significantly with parental responses in the other six countries included in the study, where mainly English was selected as the first foreign language on the grounds that it was a necessary skill both as a lingua franca and for future career advancement. In addition, it was considered valuable as a tool for raising intercultural awareness and sensitivity.

Towards the end of the study perspectives are changing. Early signs from data currently under collection are that teachers have found implementation challenging, with linguistic progress being quite limited for some children. Parents, however, are considerably more aware of their children’s developing language skills than at the start of the study and comment favourably on their potential benefits. The final section of the paper will critically examine the implications of relatively limited support from parents for young language learners in England and review options for raising greater socio-cultural awareness, drawing on evidence of societal influence from data in other countries of the ELLiE study.
In an increasingly multicultural society, primary schools in the Republic of Ireland have been adopting individual language policies to cater for the needs of speakers of languages other than English. The aims of this paper are threefold: to examine the overarching national language policies guiding practice in individual schools, to present the case of one school which has been commended by the inspectorate for effective Whole School Planning for supporting children who have English as an Additional Language (EAL), and to present some data which looks at the area of home language maintenance in the context of EAL for young children. Classroom observations were conducted in one Junior Infant classroom on a weekly basis over a three month period, focusing on the L2 (English) and L3 (Irish) acquisition skills of three children who spoke languages other than English upon starting school. The practices adopted by the teacher to interact with these children and the language acquisition rates of the children in English and Irish will be examined from a sociocultural perspective. Data gathered from a questionnaire sent to mainstream classroom teachers (n=99) looking at the issue of home language maintenance among children with EAL will also be examined briefly in conjunction with some data gathered on the same topic through focus group interviews carried out to inform the questionnaire. This paper seeks to situate the practices and policies engaged in at a micro level in classrooms within the macro perspective of circulars and curricula proposed by the Department of Education and Science and the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment for supporting and including children with EAL in the mainstream classroom. The discussion is situated within the perspective of advocating for Linguistic Human Rights (LHRs) in the primary school.
Experiences of learning and using different languages: School vs. out-of-school contexts

This paper will report on the past experiences of learning English or Swedish by students whose first language is Finnish. They are currently enrolled on a five-year language teacher education program in Finland. Importantly, the two languages being studied differ in their status: officially, Swedish is a second language in a country which is bilingual (Finnish, Swedish) by law, while English is regarded as a foreign language. At school, English is the first foreign language chosen by the majority of grade 3 pupils to study; and Swedish, the other domestic language, a compulsory school subject from grade 7 onwards. However, in reality English is widely used by young people in their spare time, while Swedish is used mostly in bilingual or Swedish-speaking communities.

Viewing language learning as a sociocultural activity (e.g. Lantolf 2000), we sought to find out what semiotic resources or tools the students made use of in learning English or Swedish – school contexts compared with out-of-school contexts.

The study is part of a longitudinal project entitled From Novice to Expert. The data come from a questionnaire administered to first-year university students of English (N= approx. 120) at the beginning of their studies, and corresponding data collected more recently from students of Swedish (N= some 80) as part of another project. The questions concerned the students’ experiences of learning the languages when they were still attending school. More specifically, the students were asked to account for what they, in their opinion, had learned of the languages when studying these at school and when using these in out-of-school contexts.

The questionnaire data collected were subjected to qualitative content analysis. Interestingly, the responses revealed similarities in the semiotic resources and learning opportunities made use of by both students of English and Swedish in the school contexts. By contrast, differences were found in these respects from one language to another in the out-of-school contexts. Other similarities and differences (both in experiences and beliefs) were found from one language to another, and also from one context to another (school vs. spare time).
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How is language education policy constructed in national curricula? An example of mother tongue and literature

In Finland, like in many societies today, education is an institutional system with many bureaucratic layers. The institutional nature is made visible in the policy documents that direct and regulate schooling and teaching. Among these documents, the national core curriculum is one of the most important.

A core curriculum describes and defines the objectives and contents for learning. Because of its selective and prescriptive nature, a curriculum is a strong instrument for education policy. The selection of the objectives and the contents of a curriculum convey the value judgments and the appreciations that education policy decision makers – and in the end, current society – have. Some things are considered to be more important than others, for example, because they develop individual spiritual growth or the competitiveness of the society – thus, these things are also mentioned and stressed as the objectives and the contents of a curriculum while others may be ignored.

This presentation concentrates on the concept of reading literacy as it is represented in the curricula from the standpoint of language education policy. The presentation is based on my dissertation that focuses on the concept of reading literacy and the way it is taught and learned. The data consists of four national Finnish curricula for mother tongue and literature from the years 1970, 1985, 1994, and 2004. The focus of the study is on the trends and changes in how reading literacy is understood. These trends and changes build up, for their part, the Finnish language education policy for basic education.

In this presentation I show how the meanings for reading literacy are constructed in the curricula and what these meanings are. I have picked up and grouped the descriptions of reading literacy according to the following themes:

- How is the concept of reading literacy understood in the curricula?
- What does it mean to be reading literate?
- For what purpose and how is reading literacy assessed?
- What types of texts are mentioned? How are texts treated in school according to the curricula (textual functions)? In other words, whose language is taught in school?
- What domains of the reading literacy are mentioned in the curricula?

These themes are particularly interesting because they formulate the language education policy guidelines for the instruction of mother tongue and literature.
Language of communication vs. language of identification?

It is a truism to say that English has become the dominant means of international communication. Recent research has shown that this situation has led to severe disadvantages for non-Anglophones in general and in academia in particular. There is a growing awareness of the dangers arising from the dominance of one language over all other languages. It results in a reduction of discourse patterns and a tendency towards a unilateral approach to research. The prevalent use of English favours Anglo-American ideas and authors and leads to a devaluation of other foreign languages. Furthermore, it provides English-speaking countries with enormous additional income.

Against this background, a number of authors have recently stressed the functions for which foreign languages are learned. They make a distinction between a ‘language of communication’ and a ‘language of identification’. The terms, which were coined by the German linguist Werner Hüllen (1992), have recently been popularised in the context of English as a Lingua Franca (e.g. Erling 2005; House 2005; Knapp 2008). English, it is said, can be used as a language of communication without necessarily being a language of identification. As it is used for practical communicative purposes, correctness and particular stylistic features associated with the speech community from which it originates are of lesser importance. Recent developments in European language policy seem to be focused in the same direction with the proposal that the EU should advocate the idea of a “personal adoptive language”. This language should be freely chosen by every European and it should be “different from his or her language of identity, and also different from his or her language of international communication” (Maalouf 2008).

The paper examines the use of the terms ‘language of communication’ and ‘language of identification’ in the literature and discusses the possible consequences their accentuation might have for language learning. It challenges the existence of the dichotomy with regard to the English language as it is used today. It will be argued that the accentuation of the pair of terms, ‘language of communication’ and ‘language of identification’, is more a reflection of current problems in international linguistic communication than a way to solve them. It can be seen as an attempt at justifying the hegemony of English and, at the same time, as a consolation for the fact that English is not a genuine lingua franca, as it is at the same time a mother tongue for a segment of its users. Their type of English, i.e. native-speaker English, is considered to be the most authentic and prestigious form and, therefore, the target norm of the majority of its users, as surveys show. Learners and users of English do not want to acquire and apply the language merely as an instrument for communicative purposes. Based on the insights that, firstly, language cannot be restricted to its referential function and, secondly, that identities are non-fixed and multiple, the paper will show a number of language practices that are used by non-native speakers of English to display identity.
Who needs which language? Language change in Finland and Ireland in the nineteenth century

In 1800, almost four times as many people, over three million, spoke Irish as spoke Finnish. A century later in 1900, however, as national agitation for independence grew in both Ireland and Finland, the countries had become almost reverse mirror images linguistically. A tiny fraction of Irish people habitually spoke Irish, but Finnish had become the overwhelmingly dominant language in Finland. This paper will ask why the fate of the “native language” was so different in the two nations, and attempt to draw conclusions relating to historical contingency, agency, and issues of language and identity. The methodological approach of the paper is comparative historical analysis. The Irish sections draw on my 2007 book, American Indians, the Irish, and Government Schooling: A Comparative Analysis (University of Nebraska Press), which is based on archival research in Ireland, on autobiographies, and published primary sources. The Finnish sections of what is an exploratory paper are based on published secondary literature, mostly by Finnish scholars, and also benefited from detailed critical comment by a number of Finnish historians. The educational policy implications: the paper emphasizes the complexity of issues relating to language and national identity, and also warns against assuming the inevitable collapse of vernacular languages in the face of imperial or dominant languages. This has policy implications, at both governmental and educational levels, especially for supposedly dying languages such as Irish and Sámi languages. Even if under heavy threat, they do not have to die.
To be or not to be taught? The dilemma of L2 Swedish in Finnish language education

Finland is constitutionally a bilingual country. In practice, this means that the two national languages, Finnish and Swedish, have equal status in society, i.e. central services, such as healthcare, education, and administration, are given in both languages. What makes this unique is the proportional difference in the number of L1 speakers. In Finland, Finnish is the first language of about 90% of the population, whereas only 5.4% have Swedish as their mother tongue. It can be considered even more unique that the vast Finnish-speaking majority is obliged to study the minority’s language in comprehensive school, even in regions where Swedish-speaking population is as good as non-existent. At the same time, Finnish authorities are worried about the narrowing diversity of language skills among Finns, as fewer and fewer pupils and students study languages other than the two languages required by the curriculum, i.e. the mandatory second national language and one additional foreign language which, in practice, is English. The number of students of French and German, then again, has diminished noticeably during the past fifteen years.

This paper discusses the background for this demographically anomalous situation which has partly been claimed to lie behind the decline of language skills. In addition, arguments presented for and against maintaining the present system will be examined. Furthermore, some suggestions put forward to develop the Finnish language education scheme (Pöyhönen & Luukka 2007) will be presented and discussed. Finally, the people who face the dilemma of L2 Swedish in their everyday lives will have their say: How do teachers of L2 Swedish feel about the subject they teach?
Challenging dichotomies: On the uselessness of a general majority/minority languages opposition

Until quite recently, language policy theory used to put emphasis on the role of the nation state and its institutions as the primary engine of language policies and management. Recent formulations based on economic models (de Swaan 2002) have insisted on considering the gross economic value of languages in order to predict the results of language policy. More recent approaches (e.g. Spolsky 2004, 2009; Ricento 2007) have rejected these strongly interventionist/deterministic models, and insisted on the importance of taking the plurality of language policy agents into account in order to duly understand both the success and the failures of language management efforts.

This change of perspective becomes especially illuminating when considering the results of policies in contexts where the different languages in competition cannot be neatly depicted as either majority or minority. In these contexts, which may, in fact, constitute the majority of the multilingual contexts, each language has a particular value in each domain and is, therefore, (un)learnt and (not) used according to local ecolinguistic dynamics.

This paper will present some of the results of a quantitative research on language maintenance, learning, and shift among primary education pupils carried on in the comarca (‘county’) of Osona (Catalonia, Spain). In this predominantly Catalan speaking area where more than 30% of the school population speaks languages other than Catalan as L1, a complex linguistic ecology develops.

In first place, contrary to the expectations of the aforementioned models, so-called “majority languages”, i.e. Castilian and English, do not get the upper hand. Both languages are taught, and at least Castilian is learnt by all pupils to a high degree of competence. Nevertheless, both languages remain restricted to specialised functions: both languages are used for specific cultural consumption practices, and Castilian is used as an ethnic language within Hispanophone circles. In second place, Catalan and not Castilian becomes the lingua franca among the children of all origins, to the extent that it even encroaches on family language uses of alloglots. In this respect, Berber, the L1 of around 10% of the population, is firmly established as the community language of the Moroccan first generation, but gives way to Catalan as the everyday language of the second generation. Finally, Arab remains associated to religious practices for Muslims and, in some cases, to cultural consumption (satellite TV and music).

The data from Osona are clear evidence that the majority/minority dichotomy proves totally insufficient to predict the results of a local ecolinguistic system and
does not furnish language-in-education planners with the necessary basis to design a successful strategy to manage linguistic diversity. In such a context, at least four factors arise as crucial to turn linguistic diversity into a profitable resource: (1) Up-to-date data about the local linguistic ecologies, not restricted to school practices, but including also information about out-of-school language learning processes; (2) well-formed, deeply committed educational teams; (3) a sufficient degree of institutional autonomy – both for schools and for teachers; (4) financial and educational resources. In short, a perspective based on an educational sociolinguistic approach.
Ethnic “othering” vs. the multilingual reality: The case of Hungarian teaching in Austria

The aim of this paper is to highlight the discrepancies between intentions and practice in language education (and, specifically, language teacher training) policies, as exemplified by the case of Hungarian in Austria: how the fact that policy-makers still think in terms of monolingual “ethnic groups” (Volksgruppen) affects the situation of the Hungarian language in Austria. The traditional language communities, for which the law on ethnic groups (Volksgruppengesetz) was passed, hardly exist anymore: the “old” Hungarian minority in the province of Burgenland is bilingual in German and Hungarian which is only seldom transmitted to the youngest generations, and this is the case with most post-WWII and post-1956 immigrant groups as well. On the other hand, there are 35–40,000 Hungarian-speaking recent migrants living in Austria who are not covered by the Volksgruppengesetz. The millennial presence of Hungarian in Austrian society and culture is hardly acknowledged in Austrian public discourse; instead, despite lip service to the multilingual traditions of Austria and the legacy of the Austro-Hungarian empire as well as frequent references to modern multilingualism as something positive and progressive, Hungarian is typically “exoticized” and “othered”.

This discrepancy is also reflected in the aims and reality of the teacher education programme existing since the 1980s at the University of Vienna. Despite its political legitimation (securing the language education for the Hungarian minority in Burgenland), the teacher training programme is oriented towards teaching Hungarian as a foreign language. In reality, Hungarian teaching – from kindergarten to university – should be able to deal with a wide spectrum of bilingualism and extremely heterogeneous teaching groups (from dominant-Hungarian speakers, e.g. commuters, to “latent speakers” with minimal exposure to Hungarian and even German-speaking monolinguals); for this, however, there are no separate resources available. Thus, neither the schools nor the teachers are adequately prepared to face the reality of multilingualism in its various forms.

In this paper, these problems are analysed from the point of view of teacher training at the University of Vienna, especially with respect to the on-going planning of new teacher training curricula and the heated political debate on school system reform in Austria. Part of the data stems from our practical experiences in teaching heterogeneous groups and observing the study and career paths of the students. We will also analyse the principles behind the legislation, university curricula, and official directives and statements concerning the teaching of Hungarian in Austria, especially in the light of different models of minority language teaching as dealt with e.g. by Cenoz and Gorter (AILA Review 21, 2009). One of our main points is that modern European minority languages such as Hungarian in Austria typically do not fit into models with strict distinctions between “mother tongue” and “foreign language” but call for more fine-grained and flexible language education policies.
Language conflicts and linguistic policies in education: The case of Francophone minority education in Alberta

Although there has always been a Francophone presence in Alberta and although this Western Canadian province was born officially bilingual, teaching in French was forbidden in public schools from 1892 to 1968. This policy could have caused a “linguistic reduction” (Boyer 2006) and established English as the only language of communication and education. However, Alberta now boasts 33 francophone schools, a French-speaking university campus as well as many French immersion schools where English students from about forty towns - called “Francophiles” - can attend school in French.

This presentation will not aim to discuss the possible failures or successes of the linguistic policies applied in Alberta schools. It will focus rather on the impact of the minority context on the policies implemented “in vitro” (Calvet 1993) by educational, political, and juridical authorities.

The first issue addressed in this presentation is how, from an institutional point of view, French education has been rooted in a historical struggle to strengthen Francophone rights in a now monolingual Anglophone province. The historical and juridical context has caused a certain division between Francophone and “immersion” programs. On the one hand, Francophone schools now manage their own French programs directed exclusively to native French-speaking students who are able, to a certain extent, to prove their French linguistic background. On the other hand, immersion programs, which are dedicated to native English-speaking children, are operated by Anglophone school divisions. This reality brings into question what constitutes the local linguistic identities. Indeed, who are those Francophones that are authorized to attend Francophone schools? And who decides?

Then, the presentation will explore two different paradigms – the postmodern one and the structural one – concerning both identity-related and linguistic and cultural pluralism in order to determine how these factors may have influenced educational and linguistic policy in Alberta.

At the methodological level, the presentation relies on the analysis of discourse from Franco-Albertan institutions and data gathered in a current study on the linguistic and identity-related representations of teachers and students on a Francophone university campus in Alberta.
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Language policies in conflict: Which language to practice and how?

In this study, the characteristics of Singapore’s multilingual nature and cultural diversity are examined by means of exploring bilingual family language policies. My focus is on children’s bilingual and biliteracy development in three bilingual sets: Chinese-English, Malay-English, or Tamil-English. Recognizing language policy as a political decision reflecting the socio-cultural-political ideologies ascribed to a particular language, this study explores to what extent language policies at governmental and institutional levels influence and interact with family language policies, and how these interactions between macro level language policies and micro language policies in private domains influence the patterns of language practices of bilingual families. Language policy contains three interrelated components: language ideology, language practices, and language management (Spolsky 2004). The language policies adapted by Singaporean bilingual families are examined with focus on language management, visible and observable efforts, carried out by the parents to influence their children’s literacy and language practices, and on how these efforts as mediational tools provide affordances and constraints in developing bilinguals.

Language management in this study refers to home literacy practices of bilingual families, including home literacy environments, parental involvement, and different forms of family capital invested in the meaningful literacy practices of bilingual children (Curdt-Christiansen 2009; Curdt-Christiansen & Maguire 2007; Li 2007; Gregory & Kenner 2003). In order to document how parental language interventions contribute to children’s biliteracy development, a survey was sent to 500 P1 parents to collect data about the various biliteracy activities in home domains, including availability of books in two languages, frequency of parent-child book-reading before and during the first year of schooling, variations of book-reading, guided TV programme watching, library visits, tuition enrollment, and structured instruction.

The study indicates that the disparate ways of language management employed by parents from different socio-economic backgrounds reflect a complicated mosaic of beliefs and practices underlying structural and power issues evoked by languages in this multilingual society. The results of the study confirm that unequal access to the means and tools affect the cognitive and the biliterate development of children. These unequal devices and interventions employed by the families can, thus, constrain parents with limited English-education background from actively investing and participating in their children’s bilingual education and may reduce the opportunities to facilitate their biliteracy development. This study has significant implications with regard to the politico-economic accessibility which linguistic (literacy) abilities/disabilities offer or prevent from. It politicizes the perpetuation of socioeconomic inequalities by questioning “the dichotomizing of languages as having instrumental (language of wider communication) or identity (mother tongue, heritage language)
functions” (Ricento 2006: 233). It highlights the critical role of language played in perpetuating social inequality and the impact of socio-political intervention of language policy, especially LOI on parental language intervention in managing their children’s biliteracy development.
**Language ideology practices among the parents of the New Taiwanese Children**

This study examines language ideologies among Vietnamese female spouses and their Taiwanese husbands as the parents of so-called ‘New Taiwanese Children’ who now account for one in seven of first-year primary school children (Ministry of Interior 2009). The language ideologies are treated as language policy when it comes to their decisions taken in favour of transmitting or abandoning the linguistic heritage of the mothers, in this case, Vietnamese.

The study draws upon the theoretical frameworks of language ideology (Woolard 1985; Woolard 1998; Woolard and Schieffelin 1994) which is essential for the interpretation of linguistic structures. Thus, the ideologies are considered language policies embedded in linguistic practice and mediate the parents’ perception of language and social structure. The data used in this paper are from formal and informal audio-recorded interviews with the parents of New Taiwanese Children. The analytical framework adopted is discourse analysis, incorporating ethnographic description. The analysis focuses on language choice and aspects of talk as linguistic practice.

The results of the study show that although there is no difference in the knowledge of Mandarin Chinese (the language of school instruction) between the New Taiwanese Children and their Taiwanese counterparts, their parents, however, hold more favourable attitudes towards transmitting the local language, Taiwanese, and Mandarin as a way to enhance children’s socialization into mainstream society. International-marriage families as such have lost their mechanisms and grounds for the transmission of Vietnamese completely, and no measures for intergenerational language transmission are taken. The ideologies, therefore, have played a considerable role in imposing, and hence perpetrating, the reproduction of the ideology of linguistic inequality and social inequality for the majority of Vietnamese immigrants.
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The rise and fall of Finnish language-in-education policy – A blueprint for how to bring about a crisis

The conference title is challenging – Who needs languages? The question is, of course, rhetorical since obviously everybody needs language and probably more than one. Thus, the non-rhetorical question is rather more like this: Who needs what languages for what purpose and at what level and why? Such information forms a basis for creating a policy for by what means such needs can be fulfilled.

Language planning and language policy have become a well-established domain/discipline in applied linguistics since the pioneering work by Haugen (1966), Ferguson (1966), Tauli (1968), Kloss (1969), Fishman (1971), and Das Gupta (1973). Systematic attempts to define national and transnational language policies have also been made beginning with the Unesco recommendation for enhancing the use of the “vernacular” in education (1953). A sign of a maturing field is the first comprehensive volume on language planning by Kaplan and Baldauf at the end of the millennium (1997).

Finland, with her special linguistic situation, has been concerned with linguistic legislation from the very beginning of its history as an independent republic in 1917, with fundamental linguistic rights embodied in the constitution and further elaborated in other legal documents. Finland has also had five blue-ribbon committees (usually with strong stakeholder representation) dealing specifically with language planning and many times more with a more limited brief.

Language education was quite strongly emphasized in education planning leading to the dismantling of the (selective) dual school system and the introduction of the uniform, non-selective comprehensive school. Language education was, thus, made a regular part of the curriculum for all pupils of compulsory school age, continued strongly in upper secondary schools, included on all vocational education, and its role in higher education was consolidated. All of this led to a substantial increase in language study in the “golden era” from the early 1970s to mid 1980s.

However, since the middle of the 1980s, there has been a constant decline which has, by now, reached a level which can be labeled a “crisis”. Furthermore, there are no signs of a positive turn. In fact, it can be predicted that the crisis will deepen. This decline can be traced back to a number of decisions taken in general educational planning and policy-making. It can be shown what impact each decision has had.

This presentation will outline the rise and fall of Finnish language education and show how policy-making has provided a blueprint for the current crisis. Some suggestions will be made how the trend could be reversed.
Learning how to read and write in two languages? Experiences from a bilingual project in Germany

The talk is based on an ethnographic study which was conducted (2003-2008) in a German Italian bilingual project in a state primary school in Frankfurt, Germany. The project is set up as a two way immersion programme involving children from both monolingual German and bilingual Italian-German backgrounds. Teaching takes place in both languages across the curriculum and is delivered by teachers from German and Italian background, either separately or as a team in one class room.

The focus of this study has been on bilingual literacy teaching and learning which takes place in both languages at the same time. In this talk, I will present a DVD which has been produced with participants of the project including the voices of teachers, children, and parents. The product engages with the approach towards simultaneous bilingual literacy teaching as it has been developed by teachers in the programme over the last 5 years. They explain the aims and teaching strategies also commenting on educational material which needed to be adapted to the bilingual format (such as bilingual reading material, tasks, wordlists, self-made dictionaries). The DVD contains extracts from interviews with teachers, children, and parents. It also includes sequences of classroom interaction documenting learning routines (such as the introduction of a new letter in two languages) and allowing a wider audience to get a sense of how the concept has been put into practice and how children made use of this particular frame. In interview sequences, teachers also address commonly voiced questions and criticisms about bilingual education and bilingual literacy teaching in particular (viewed as being too difficult or confusing) sharing their insights with a wider public. Furthermore, the talk includes some analysis of transcribed video data which highlights particular learning processes related to bilingual literacy teaching that can be fruitfully explored across educational contexts.

The DVD is as an outcome of our collaborative research activity involving practitioners and academics. Through this medium, we wish to contribute to the shaping of a more multilingual educational landscape by sharing local expertise more widely and by highlighting the benefits and potential resources that can unfold in bilingual education.
Possibilities, parental motivations, and actual classroom language practices: Regional heritage language teaching in bilingual primary education in Alsace

Situated along the French-German border and having been ruled by both nations for periods of its history, modern-day Alsace has inherited a complex sociolinguistic situation. Since its introduction in 1991, the number of children enrolled in bilingual primary education in the region has steadily increased to over 14,500 pupils through public and associative ABCM schools. Alongside other associative schools, such as the Diwan schools in Brittany and the Calandretas in the Occitan-speaking region of France, the ABCM school network operates private bilingual primary school classes and is partly supported by the national education system. Although it has been in existence for nearly two decades, the teaching of the Alsace regional heritage language remains a widely debated subject. Regarded as the language of reference of the dialects spoken in the region since the fourth century, standard German has been given a privileged position in the bilingual school curriculum, whilst the presence of the traditionally spoken Alsatian varieties remains largely ambiguous in many cases. Nevertheless, the Strasbourg local education authority actively advises dialect-speaking parents with children following bilingual primary education to maintain the use of Alsatian in the home.

In this paper, we will examine the possibilities for the use of Alsatian in bilingual primary schools in the region, in both the public and associative sector. Following extensive fieldwork in Alsace in 2009, which included detailed classroom observations in several bilingual primary schools, as well as interviews and surveys with representatives from the local education authority and the ABCM network, heads of schools, teachers, and parents, this paper will analyse the status of the classroom as a language contact zone. At the macro level, what are the opportunities and limits for employing Alsatian? Why are an ever-increasing number of parents in Alsace choosing a bilingual education programme for their child? Do they consider it as an elite form of education which has as its aim the mastery of two dominant European languages, French and German, or as a means of preserving the regional heritage language? At the micro level, how is Alsatian actually being used in the classroom, if at all? As the intergenerational transmission of the French regional heritage languages has been decreasing across the board since the mid-twentieth century, Judge suggests that for their survival, “in the short term, everything depends on education in the RLs” (2007: 233). We will evaluate if bilingual primary education in Alsace is currently being employed to revive the regional heritage language, in its traditionally spoken form as well as the standard written variety, German, or rather as a tool to promote a prestigious, foreign neighbour language.
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L’enseignement bilingue français/allemand à l’école en Alsace (brochure for parents published by the Strasbourg local education authority)
http://www.eltern-bilinguisme.org/pdf/Plaquette.pdf
The National Bilingual Programme in Colombia: Imposition or opportunity?

Historically, domains of bilingual and multilingual use in Colombia, as in other Latin American countries, have been positioned at two opposite poles of the social scale (Hamel 2008): so-called ‘elite’ bilingualism, and the bilingualism of the indigenous communities and the speakers of Creole languages. The National Bilingual Programme, which was created by the Colombian Ministry of Education in 2004, has focused on offering all students in the country the possibility of becoming bilingual in English and Spanish as part of a vision of increased productivity in a globalised world, as hitherto, access to bilingualism had been the privilege of students in private schools catering for the higher socio-economic strata of society.

However, the language and education policies promoted within this framework tend to foreground the development of English at the expense of bilingual competence in Spanish and English. Moreover, the bilingual policy has been strongly criticised by several Colombian academics with regard to what they consider as the imposition in the Colombian context of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages as a point of reference to ensure “standards of quality which are internationally comparable” (Ministerio de Educación Nacional 2006), the disregard of local knowledge and expertise in informing glocal perspectives (González Moncada 2007), as well as the exclusion of other types of bilingualism (in other foreign languages and in the indigenous and creole languages spoken in the country).

In this paper, I will present the results of studies carried out in Colombia in order to argue that there is a need to recognise the importance of the contribution of bilingual education programmes to the creation of a more tolerant society, as well as increased national productivity. I will also maintain that restricting the notion of bilingualism to Spanish/English bilingualism in the National Bilingual Programme leads to a distorted view of the complex interrelationships between languages, cultures, and identities in the Colombian context. I will end by indicating some of the linguistic and educational policy issues which need to be resolved in order for Colombia to develop a more equitable multilingual language and education policy.
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Medium of instruction policies in postcolonial Hong Kong – the national or international agenda?

Hong Kong is a city in southern China where more than 90% of the population is ethnic Chinese and 95% of them speak Cantonese (a Chinese dialect) as their usual language. After 155 years of British governance, the sovereignty over Hong Kong was returned to China in 1997. Since then, the medium of instruction (MoI) policies of Hong Kong have undergone great changes. Before 1997, more than 90% of the secondary schools used English as the medium of instruction (EMI). After the political handover, regardless of the strong resistance from parents and schools, a mandatory mother tongue education policy was imposed by the new Hong Kong government in 1998, which forced the majority of secondary schools to use Chinese as the medium of instruction (CMI) while only the elite schools could retain the EMI status.

However, after implementing the mandatory mother tongue education policy for 10 years, the government finally called to relax the policy in 2008 so as to allow more use of English in the secondary school system. Starting from the academic year of 2010-2011, the labels of EMI and CMI schools will no longer exist, and secondary schools can use different instructional languages for different subjects or classes as deemed appropriate.

The Medium of Instruction (MoI) policy in Hong Kong has never been a simple educational issue, but that of political and social concerns. It serves not only teachers and students, but also the public and the government. In 1997, it was the national agenda that brought in the mother tongue education policy; 10 years later, English-medium education was revived when the national agenda was replaced by the international agenda.

This presentation will adopt a meta-analysis approach. Through an analysis of related government documents, news commentaries, and journal articles, the presenters will reveal to the audience 1) the change of the MoI policies in Hong Kong in the past decades, 2) the public psychology and the government ideology underpinning the changes of the MoI policies, and 3) the role and status of English in relation to other local languages in a postcolonial city.
Micro & macro perspectives into language education policies on tertiary CLIL business courses at Austrian universities

With the advent of the Bologna reforms and the consequential internationalisation of higher education, foreign language skills have gained vital relevance at the tertiary level. Numerous Austrian universities offer, in response, a variety of courses in English – not only to accommodate exchange students but also to hone the existing English skills of local students. Business students in particular need adequate English skills in order to be prepared for future job demands. Consequently, the use of English as a medium of instruction (CLIL) has become increasingly popular at Austrian business departments. A smooth implementation of CLIL at the tertiary level is, however, not always possible as coherent language education policies and transparent methodologies are frequently missing.

In this paper, we will address this lack of transparency and stress the need for raising awareness among CLIL practitioners by combining macro and micro perspectives in order to gain a comprehensive picture of tertiary CLIL practice in Austrian business studies and at the WU in particular. Our new research project is, thus, built on two methods both of which focus on the macro as well as on the micro level. Firstly, we will talk about our current examination of CLIL at various business schools across Austria, which is based on a status quo analysis of the overall Austrian CLIL market and on an analysis of CLIL lectures at the WU. While the former identifies rationales and existing language policies, the latter describes specific pedagogical components of effective CLIL lectures. Secondly, we will introduce our qualitative study which consists of semi-structured interviews with the four main stakeholders, namely curriculum planners, lecturers, students and alumni, in order to uncover their perspectives, needs, and objectives. These two layers of our empirical study and the dual focus on the macro and micro level will ideally set the stage for more coherent policies and better networking opportunities for CLIL practitioners throughout Austria.

More specifically, on the macro level, findings will result in a collection of parameters meant to assist curriculum planners in the implementation process of CLIL and, on the micro level, results will be used to create a reference guide for university lecturers practicing CLIL at business departments. Since we have just started this new research project, we will not be able to present specific outcomes, yet we do think that we have progressed far enough to provide valuable insights into our research interest, design, and methods.
Contexts, conflicts, and consequences: Critical perspectives on language education policies in an ESP learning environment

While the significance of context is generally appreciated in theorising on language teaching and learning, the notion of context is frequently restricted to specific factors studied in isolation. As a consequence, the varieties of situations that are typically subsumed under the learner’s ‘context of situation’ range from broader societal issues to national and supranational educational policies. As these issues seep into the institutional context, it is crucial to recognise their complex interaction as a potential source of conflict, which is particularly relevant to the learning environment as the locus of bottom-up vs. top-down influences.

It is against the backcloth of these remarks that this paper addresses the impact of language education policies on the ESP programme of a business school, i.e. the WU Vienna University of Economics and Business. Compounding the array of conflicts encountered at the tertiary level in the European context in general, the study of an ESP-based approach to teaching and learning adds another dimension in terms of the dynamic tension between General English and Business English as educational targets.

Adopting a both micro and macro perspective on contextual- and learner-related variables, the potential interplay of these factors was tackled by means of a three-fold analysis. The first analytical stage involved identifying the contextual variables that typify the educational setting of the ESP learners at hand. Secondly, this micro-perspective was broadened to include educational policy factors ranging from competence vs. skill learning, EFL vs. ESL-based teaching on the one hand, to learners’ school socialisation or their experiences abroad on the other. In order to pinpoint the learner-related variables in more detail, a third, empirical stage was included, with focus group interviews serving as its database. The interviews were conducted in 2009, and each of the three groups consisted of advanced business students enrolled in an international programme. Students were briefed and prompted by questions concerning their experiences with language learning. The transcripts of the interviews were used to design a corpus analysable both quantitatively and qualitatively within the methodological framework of critical discourse analysis (CDA). The critical analysis served to deconstruct the learner discourses prevailing the discussion of values and beliefs associated with language teaching and learning.

From a macro-perspective then, the findings of the three-fold analysis will be discussed in the light of language educational policies in the European context, which will be shown to be at variance with the predominant discourses in this domain. For example, the present study has revealed that students tend to situate language learning outside the institutional context, assuming that they will benefit from this learning experience to a larger extent than from institutionalized learning. This discrepancy of learner and official, education-policy discourses on the one hand and language learning ideologies on the other begs the question as to who exactly is advantaged rather than disadvantaged by language education policy decisions.
Globalization has created a plethora of new challenges and opportunities for learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Concomitantly, institutions of higher education have had to reevaluate existing policies in order to arm their graduates with the skills necessary to navigate the ever-evolving needs of a professional and global citizenry. To foster this, many universities in Japan have turned to internationalization. One result of this has been that the number of students participating in short-term study abroad (SA) programs has increased dramatically.

Whilst SA programs proliferate, the expense to the learner to participate in such programs has also escalated. In order to offset these spiraling costs, some universities have started to explore alternative methods to deliver EFL study abroad programs. Whereas historically, most Japanese university students sought out English education in English-speaking countries (e.g. Ireland, England, the U.S.A., Canada, etc.), recently an acceptable alternative has been for Japanese EFL learners to participate in SA programs in non-English speaking countries (e.g. Thailand, the Philippines).

This longitudinal study investigated the affective outcomes of short-term SA participation by 36 Japanese EFL students who traveled to a non-English speaking country (Thailand) for English language study. A battery of tests was administered to analyze five affective factors: self-confidence, language anxiety, integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and willingness to communicate. These affective factors were measured three times over the course of the study; before, during, and after the SA program. Of the five affective factors measured, all but language anxiety realized significant changes. In addition, an analysis of student journals provided further insight into the actual changes that occurred. Within the context of these results, the author proceeds with a discussion on the multidimensional nature of language education policy, particularly in regards to study-abroad programs.
The role of languages at Finnish universities

The promotion of multilingualism is one of the objectives of the European Union. However, in academic contexts, internationalisation and multilingual expertise are often understood as using English in teaching, research, tutoring, and administrative communication, and English has become the most important lingua franca. To explore the role of different languages at Finnish universities, an online-survey amongst the staff was conducted in November – December 2009, with 3605 respondents. In this paper, we will present the results of this survey focussing on the following questions: 1. How important are different languages considered in a university working environment by the staff at Finnish universities?, 2. What are the language skills of the Finnish university personnel?, 3. What languages are used in academic contexts at Finnish universities?, and 4. What are the possible reasons why other languages than English should be used in university contexts? The results show that 92.8 % of the respondents judge the use of different languages very important or important, but foreign language skills and use are rather limited. The value of different languages for academic working environments seems to be dependent on the field, on the one hand, and the personal interests and individual language learning history, on the other. More detailed results will be available at the time of the conference.
Who uses foreign languages in Europe and why? Results from Eurobarometer surveys

Knowledge of foreign languages has been measured in Eurobarometer surveys regularly since 1976. Recently, also the level of language skills, the usefulness of foreign languages, and the actual use of foreign languages, as well as willingness to learn more languages has been asked about. The question about the actual use of foreign languages appeared in the survey first in the year 2000 in Eurobarometer 44LAN which was specially targeted for language-related issues. The same question was asked also in Eurobarometer 64.3 in 2005.

This paper analyses the frequency of foreign language use and situations in which foreign languages are used in the member-states of the European Union in 2005 and in 2000, and pays attention to the fact of who needs languages in practice on the basis of various socio-demographic variables.

A significant amount of those who know a foreign language do not use it regularly. Of all Europeans (citizens of the member-states of the European Union), 22% use foreign languages daily, an additional 13% use them often and still an additional 22% occasionally. Using foreign languages (daily or often) is most frequent in Luxembourg (95%), Latvia (82%), Netherlands (70%), Estonia (68%), Malta (68%), Denmark (66%), and Sweden (63%), while in Ireland, Great Britain, and Portugal only 15% use foreign languages regularly.

The language used most often is English which is used by 22% of Europeans either daily or often, followed by German (6%), French (5%), Spanish (3%), and Russian (2%). The role of English as a regularly used language clearly surpasses other languages. As an occasionally used foreign language too, English is ahead of the others: 16% use English occasionally, followed by French (9%), German (7%), and Spanish (5%).

About 10% of Europeans do not use a foreign language even occasionally even if they indicate a good knowledge of a foreign language, but on the other hand, foreign languages are used also by many of those who do not report that they could speak them well. Some languages are seldom used even among those who can speak them, and for example, Russian is used by only 50% of those who can speak it.

The use of foreign languages takes place most often on holidays abroad and in work-related activities. Languages which are used occasionally are usually used during vacations abroad, while daily language use is often related to work.

This paper analyses who use foreign languages regularly and in which spheres of life foreign languages are usually used. The paper also asks if language skills are just an option which needs to be there even if actual needs are not present all the time.
The government-sponsored English language schools during the U.S. military rule of Korea 1945-1948 and their effects on English language education in Korea

This paper examines the roles that the government-sponsored English language schools played during the American military rule from 1945 to 1948 and their effects on the development of English language education in Korea. In order to achieve the research goal, the paper reviewed and analyzed documents and data on the history of Korea, Korean education, and English education in Korea, particularly during the periods of the Japanese colonial rule and the American military occupation. Korea was under the Japanese colonial rule from 1910 to 1945 when Japanese was the language of primacy and, thus, the status of English, along with other languages, weakened significantly. Particularly in the last decade of the Japanese rule, as Japan engaged in a war against the United States and its allies, the colonial government declared English as an enemy language and intensified the suppression of Anglophone elements. Japan’s sudden surrender in August 1945, however, brought WWII to a close, and in September U.S. forces arrived in Korea. The U.S. Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) ruled over the southern half of Korea for three years, while Soviet Union troops occupied the northern part. In the South, the English language regained wide popularity, and English language education came to be in great demand. The government introduced a range of English-related policies and actions that strengthened the status of English. One such action was to establish government-sponsored English language schools: the American Language Institute (ALI) and the Military Language School (MLS). The ALI was originally opened to train prospective and current government employees, but later extended its responsibilities to the training of secondary- and tertiary-level English teachers and other private citizens. The Institute focused on nationwide teacher training in particular. Despite the extensive training it gave to multiple groups of Koreans, the ALI was closed upon the cessation of the American military government in 1948. Meanwhile, the MLS was an English language school for potential officers. Its apparent purpose was to provide English and military training for Koreans with some military experience so that they could assist American commanders. The school trained the Korean Constabulary’s first generation of officers and produced 110 officers who later played crucial roles in the foundation of the Republic of Korea. The MLS was an expedient English language school that lasted only five months; thus, its contribution to English language education is negligible. In brief, the two government-sponsored English language schools did not survive long enough to leave lasting impacts on English education in Korea. Instead, Korean English professors and teachers who had been educated in Japan or in Japanese-founded schools continued to dominate and lead the field of English language education. This is why Japanese influence on English education has been persistent until recently.
Language and intercultural competence: Soft power weaponry for the military

One common perception is that the military domain needs weapons systems and arsenal (sophisticated hardware), and well-trained personnel to handle them reliably and efficiently. While true, it is also far from the total picture. The military domain is increasingly occupied with peace-related matters of concern such as how to promote the likelihood of peaceful relations (i.e. prevention of armed conflicts), how to assist in restoring confidence and cooperation in conflict areas (e.g. crisis management), etc. All these require a variety of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Like in all walks of life, interaction and communication are an inherent part of all military-related actions. The research on language-in-education planning with the Finnish Defence Forces, which is the topic of this presentation, addresses interaction and communication through the English language as it is the official language of international military operations.

Countries need language policies and language planning to manage challenges related to intercultural communication and interaction. As a specific domain, military education also needs language education planning for fulfilling the evolving needs of language/communication skills in a lifelong perspective.

This presentation will discuss a variety of viewpoints on language policies between two very different kinds of countries. While the United States is a superpower emphasizing the national security since a lack of foreign language and intercultural competence has obviously become a security issue for the nation, Finland is a small country focusing on Nordic democracy and multinational cooperation, division of work, international interaction, and cultural impacts. Due to this apparent dissimilarity between the two countries, language education policies will be looked at both generally and within the armed forces especially. The Finnish context will be compared to the American context as outlined in a report by a blue-ribbon committee set up by the National Research Council in February 2006 and reported in 2007 (International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America’s Future).

Finally, a systematic and comprehensive model of operational language-in-education planning, proposed for the Finnish military language education, will be illustrated. The model is based on the findings of the author’s long-term research and development programme including a number of various types of needs analyses. While it is an important component in military language education planning, there is a need to find out what really counts in communication and interaction in carrying out military-related tasks and missions. A current challenge is to define what the crucial intercultural communication skills that should be included in the predeparture education of officers assigned abroad are.
Policy-making in the mind: A socio-cognitive approach to language education policies

The paper reports work done in the research project Dialogues of appropriation in which different learning environments and different languages have been studied in a dialogical, socio-cognitive framework. Arguing on interviews, observations and policy documents, we will try to disentangle the web of implicit beliefs, concrete manifest practices, and institutional documents that are involved in the individual processes of language learning. The paper is, thus, an attempt to make the different sets of data ‘talk’ with each other and deepen our understanding of how the macro and micro levels of language education policy may be connected.

Using examples from our data, we will discuss learners and teachers’ beliefs that include notions of ‘language’ and ‘learning’, but also beliefs about why languages are learned and who the decision-makers are. Discussing the potential origin of these beliefs using dialogism as a framework, we aim at illustrating the kinds of discourses that learners and teachers draw on in their conceptualisations and the authoritative voices they seem to borrow in expressing their beliefs. Are legislators, teachers, parents, employers, or institutions understood as policy makers? To what extent do the learners experience themselves engaged in the policy-making? How do teachers interpret and apply policy documents, such as the national core curriculum, in their everyday practices? How do the macro and micro levels of language education policies interact with each other?

Drawing on our socio-cognitive approach, we argue that beliefs – either explicitly expressed views or more implicit assumptions - are part of the learning environment, that is, part of the mindscape of the learning process. Thus, various beliefs about ‘language’ and ‘learning’ as well as the beliefs about why each language should or should not be learned either provide affordances or set constraints for the learners. What learners grow to see as learning opportunities and how they understand the reasons and goals of their learning process (e.g. self-regulated vs. other-regulated; choice vs. obligation) will influence the process of learning and its outcomes.
Tales of Gnostic nightmares and cases of cognitive dissonance: Another perspective on mother tongue education

The case for Mother Tongue Education (MTE) has been very well argued in the relevant literature (Bamgbose 2000; Kamwangamalu 2004, 2005; Nolasco 2009; UNESCO 2008, 2003), to name a few sources. Nolasco (2009) argues that “studies in the use of languages in education are conclusive—when mother tongue is the medium in primary instruction, learners end up being better thinkers and better learners in both their first AND second languages.” The UNESCO (2003, 2008) sponsors/cites studies that demonstrate that instruction in the mother tongue is “beneficial to language competencies in the first language, achievement in other subject areas, and second language learning”. Bamgbose (2000) concludes that “if education is to be meaningful for most of the African population..., there is no alternative to mother tongue education”. Kamwangamalu (2000) argues for the empowering aspect of mother tongue education.

These studies present the issue of mother tongue education from this facet: “What do we gain from educating children through the medium of their mother tongue?” In addition to that perspective, I would like to contribute to existing knowledge of the subject by proposing a paradigm shift summarized as: “What kind of cognitive pitfalls do we create for children as we poorly educate them in a language that is totally foreign to them?”

Therefore, through personal experience in Mauritania and preliminary research, I would like to approach the topic by arguing from the perspective of the setbacks and instances of cognitive dissonance brought about by education through a second/foreign language.

To illustrate these pitfalls, here are a few examples. In my primary school years, my peers and I were abruptly confronted with paradoxes that we had to resolve; often, we did not. For instance, zero, which has no computational value in Fulani, thus ceased to mean “nothing” as it previously did for all of us growing up. Therefore, we struggled to understand how something could be and not be at the same time; what we referred to in Fulani as depth became height; the width of a table in Fulani became length as we studied triangles; the earth was a round object; the moon ceased to have religious or spiritual significance; and winter, spring, summer, and fall were references where temperatures rarely dropped below 80 degrees Fahrenheit.

Decades of living in the West gave me a vantage point from which I can now reflect on and understand the sources of many years of frustration in primary school—frustration caused by our inability, as little children in primary school, to understand simple concepts that are taken for granted by most children in the West; frustration caused by our inability to understand simple concepts that are either totally unfamiliar to us, or that have been de-familiarized for us, because they were packaged in a foreign language, wrapped in a foreign culture and delivered by clueless educators. Those dark days, I refer to as “Gnostic nightmares.”

Through illustrations and preliminary research in the area, I hope my presentation to make a case for researching these instances of cognitive dissonance.
Language education viewed from different perspectives:
Perspectives from classroom-based research

As Sheen (2002) points out, one of the current debates in applied linguistics focuses on the most effective form of grammar instruction in the communicative classroom (Lightbown 2000; Norris and Ortega 2000). The debate revolves around the degree to which teachers need to direct learners’ attention to understanding grammar whilst retaining a focus on the need to communicate. Thus, on the one hand, there are those who advocate separate and explicit attention to grammar and the teaching of discrete points of grammar (e.g. De Keyser 1998). There are other researchers, on the other hand, who advocate minimal interruption to communication by limiting attention to grammar (Doughty and Varela 1998; Sheen 2002). They claim that teaching grammatical forms in isolation usually fails to develop the learners’ ability to use forms communicatively.

This piece of research focuses on two different language and teaching contexts: England and Turkey. These two contexts are analysed since both Modern Foreign Language (MFL) syllabuses in England and Turkey assign different emphases on grammar teaching and form-focused instruction. The MFL syllabuses in the Turkish National Curriculum appear to put relatively more emphasis on developing students’ awareness of language. Therefore, the hypothesis put forward for this study is that the grammar teaching and form-focused instruction in the two countries will be different and this difference will impact classroom interaction.

There is a dearth of empirical classroom-based data to establish what teachers actually do in the classroom and how they implement the objectives of language teaching and learning in the classroom context. It is particularly important for this study to establish the type of real classroom-based data which might provide directly relevant information for language teachers in the two different contexts. As Nunan (1987) puts it, it is necessary to have a realistic awareness of what is happening in the classroom in order to assist teachers in their professional development.

Systematic classroom observations and classroom audio-recordings are the main data collection methods in this piece of research. A semi-structured interview schedule was also used in this study to interview the modern language teachers in order to provide their perspectives on what was happening in the classroom.

The data in this research was collected in secondary schools in both England and Turkey. More than 50 lessons were observed at two levels (13-14 and 14-15-year age groups). In Turkey, English classes were observed whereas in England, the observation was conducted in German and French classes. The participants in this study were modern language teachers and non-native speaking students.

Language teaching in secondary schools observed in England and Turkey appears to have more similarities than differences, despite classroom culture differences.
in the two countries. Although the orientations of the classrooms and the emphases in the MFL syllabuses are different, teachers’ practices, on the other hand, are found to be quite similar.

Contrary to expectations, this piece of research also failed to provide clear evidence about the effect of focus on form/meaning on students’ use of target language.
Pedagogical challenges of the language policy in education informed by linguistic assimilation strategies

Language skills remain essential in fostering employment and mobility opportunities. They allow language speakers to play a dynamic role in the social and political processes, which is the fundamental democratic value in the multilingual societies. It is in this regard that the language policy should always be the priority of educational systems, seeking sustainable social cohesion.

The aim should be to develop learners’ potential through an integrated approach that fosters equal opportunity and takes into account key plurilingual functions. However, in countries where the language policy in education is informed by politics, the linguistic assimilation approach enforces exclusion and social devaluation of a language spoken by the majority of the population. This leads to various challenges in the effective implementation of the policy in educational settings.

In Rwanda, as a case study, Kinyarwanda and French were the only official languages until 1996. Following the return of the Anglophone rebel movement that seized power by arms in 1994, English language started to gain the status of the language of the elite, education, and opportunity, despite being spoken by few people. It is in 1996 that English became Rwanda’s third official language.

Combined with the unilateral decision to cut relations with France for political reasons, the Rwandan government initiated to switch the entire education system into English in January 2009, hence purging effectively the country of French triggered hot debates relating to the implications for students, teachers, and educational systems. Many critics believe that the move was also designed to secure the Rwandan membership request to join the Commonwealth and to cut its ties with France and the International Organisation of La Francophonie. As the switchover to English dominance is a challenge in a country where more than 98% of schools were teaching pupils core subjects from about the age of nine in French, teachers went on training to face the challenges triggered by the rapid implementation of the new language policy.

However, in August 2009, the Ministry of Education had to retire 1,363 primary school teachers who could not cope with the intensive training undertaken to embrace English as the new language of instruction. If francophone teachers need time to attain sufficient English fluency to be able to teach it and in it, with very limited resources, one would wonder how the linguistic assimilation approach will deal with the apparent, painful pedagogical transition.

Since the implementation of the Rwanda’s language policy gives some students access to the few Anglophone teachers, it obviously creates inequalities among learners. This paper raises questions of the way language policies in education often serve the interests of a politically dominant minority group within multilingual societies. It
demonstrates how language policies could marginalise majority learners while granting privileges to minority elites. It highlights many pedagogical challenges that the implementation of Rwanda’s linguistic assimilation strategies present. The paper underlines the relevance of a multidirectional interpretation of language policy which is not only influenced by politics but also driven out of the structure of social priorities and classroom experiences.
Language education policy in the UK: Is English the elephant in the room?

This paper addresses recent language education policies in the UK, highlighting a number of discrepancies and apparent contradictions, and asks if discourse analysis of these language policies, in relation to a critical evaluation of language teaching outcomes, can reveal underlying rationales that might offer coherent interpretations of these discrepancies.

Using an interdisciplinary approach, the research draws on Critical Discourse Analysis of both official government policy texts, politicians’ statements, and media discussions, as well as of the new discipline economic linguistics, and relate our findings to UK statistics on language learning and linguistic proficiency.

Among the analysed texts will be:
- House of Lords debate on Modern Languages 3 Dec 2009 (Hansard report)
- The Dearing Review
- Quality and Broadsheet newspaper articles dealing with two policies in the public eye: Primary Languages and abolition of compulsory language education age 14+
- Politician’s quotes on these policies

These will be evaluated against statistics both from CILT (The National Centre for Languages) and international sources.

The UK can draw on L1 speakers of the - arguably - most powerful language in the world today (Grin 2001), a fact conspicuous by its absence from the above mentioned texts. Despite some rhetoric to the contrary, a tacit assumption that English alone will suffice for economic success can be traced in the discourse.

Following detailed text analyses and statistics of language proficiency in the UK, language policy in the UK and its (lack of) success is interpreted as mainly driven by the pragmatic assumption that raising proficiency standards and language take-up are not essential for the UK; however, some concessions to progressive aims such as multi-lingualism and multi-culturalism can equally be traced in policies and public debates. The paper will conclude with evidence from economic linguistics demonstrating that the UK misses out on large revenue because of lack of linguistic skills in the workforce.
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One English, two Englishes, and new order

Due to political considerations in Pahlavi government in Iran, the spread of teaching and learning English as a second language became dominant in the educational system in the second and upper levels of curriculum and, in some places, in the first levels. This was based on the claim that due to the need for adjustment to the rapidly growing technology and communications, the country must be equipped with suitable tools the ground of which is learning English. The restrictions of applying the education of English in some fields (such as non Persian-speaking minorities living in remote areas with no knowledge of the language and religious schools in which Arabic was learned) together with the worldly approach dominant in the books with words for money, clothes, and so on, brought on a conflict over the kind of the second language requirement. The dominant regiment voted for English. The rise of revolution in Iran in 1979 changed the balance. Based on ideological and religious beliefs, the establishment of new regiment in Iran limited the education of English to higher levels and eradicated it from schools to strengthen the foundation of teaching Arabic as the language of religion. On paper, everything was ideal and perfect but, in practice, many unexpected problems arose. The requirement of communicating with the developed countries to get new technology and even propagating revolutionary thoughts narrowed the grounds for teaching Arabic as the second language in the educational system. Scientific progress made in English-speaking countries forced most of the young graduates to learn English in informal institutes and neglect learning Arabic in school. Even the materials in English books taught at schools were based on religious doctrines, inducing the government beliefs about the superiority of men over women and avoidance of wealth. The comparison of textbooks shows a closed system of thought in drawing the society and social relationships. Women were at home and men at work, women were nurses while men were doctors. This conflict with social reality and political issues contributed to a new attitude toward teaching a foreign language. The results of this research show disinterestedness in learning Arabic, and meanwhile, there has been a great tendency to know English. This paper scrutinizes different grounds for the need for a foreign language especially for minorities and predicts the declining and precarious future of language teaching in Iran based on the discourse analysis of textbooks.
Danish only or? The case of bottom-up policies in the Danish public school system

When it comes to the choice in language of instruction, Denmark has a very clear “Danish only” educational language policy. Specifically, this means that the Ministry of Education sets the official policy which is manifested in the rather wide curriculum. Yet, at the same time, the municipalities are responsible for carrying out the local education policy, implying that the local authorities can set their own curriculum for the schools in their district as long as it fits the general goals set by the national authorities. This relationship between the national and the local authorities means that the local authorities are allowed autonomy as long as it is kept within the general framework of the national curriculum and its principles.

Yet, since the first “internationale linie” - an optional line where the language of instruction is other than Danish - has begun in the public school ‘Købmagergades skole’ in Fredericia in 2001, a new trend of bottom-up policy has been taking place, mostly on the level of micro language planning. This means that a growing number of schools providing an international line have emerged in the Danish public school system. These schools, mostly placed on the outskirts of Denmark, choose other languages than Danish as their language of instruction for some of their classes in what they call an ‘international line’. Some of these schools are within the framework of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) while others represent total immersion where all subjects are being taught via other languages. As of today, schools operating the lines work with dispensation and are not approved as mainstream because they contradict the official policy of Danish as the only language of instruction.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the philosophies, rationale, and motivations behind these bottom-up policies of language education in Folkeskolen (K-10) in Denmark. Based on interviews, observations, and questionnaires, the study will provide a survey of the exact, detailed policies of those schools, their educational ideologies, and the pedagogical methods. Secondly, it will analyze what it is that facilitates the development of such a policy. Thirdly, the study will look into the relationship between the schools, the local authorities, and The Ministry of Education trying to give an ‘in-depth understanding’ of the quality of the relationship and how it is manifested in the schools. Thus, the study will provide us with a deeper understanding and support for gaining understanding as to the growing phenomenon of negotiating language policies with a particular emphasis on ‘language policy from below’.
The essential role of the language of instruction in enabling access, quality, and equity in education

The purpose of this presentation is to illustrate the essential role played by the language of instruction in improving educational access, quality, and equity. Examples are taken mostly from low-income multilingual countries in which I have worked, but I also make reference to northern contexts with similar issues.

When the school fails to use a language that the learner speaks and understands well, the school fails the learner in virtually every way. Teaching through a foreign language has been called “submersion” (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 2000) because it is comparable to holding learners under water without teaching them how to swim. So why do schools throughout the world continue to use languages that children do not understand, languages that even their teachers may have difficulty speaking?

There are many reasons, some of which are benign and some less so. In the worst cases, the aim of schooling is to erase learners’ languages and cultures and assimilate them into dominant society, meanwhile depriving them of their civil, human, and linguistic rights. In more benign cases, the aim is to provide maximum exposure to a second (foreign) language with the hope that it will improve learners’ future opportunities, a hope which their parents share. There are also cases of benign neglect, where the same type of education is offered to all, regardless of learners’ linguistic and cultural backgrounds, resulting in inequitable access to learning.

The presentation begins with a discussion of the obstacles to access, quality and equity when a foreign language is used as medium of instruction. Classroom discourse from Mozambique (Chimbutane 2009) is used to demonstrate the difficulties for teaching and learning. Next comes a brief review of how and why learners’ home languages should be used for literacy and learning and how teaching additional languages should be part of a systematic approach to the school curriculum through bi- or multilingual education. Data from Ethiopia (Heugh et al. forthcoming) is used to demonstrate the benefits of maximum use of the mother tongue for instruction. The presentation concludes with a critique of current efforts in educational planning and practice, and some directions for future research.
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Migration, integration, and language education policies – stakeholders’ views to language proficiency

Migration is not a new phenomenon in Europe, not even in Finland, however, the scale and importance of migration is. Officially, Finnish migration policy can be described as tolerant and against assimilation. According to the Integration Act (493/1999, §2) integration is defined as “1) the personal development of immigrants, aimed at participation in work life and the functioning of society while preserving their language and culture; 2) and the measures taken and resources provided by the authorities to promote such integration.” Even though the aims of this integration policy seem positive, its success has attracted very strong criticism, especially on how the language proficiency of immigrants meets the requirements of labour market and daily life in the host society.

In this paper, we will analyse immigration policy in Finland and how the policy is realized in practice. The focus will be on the ways language proficiency is defined both politically and pedagogically in the discussion of experts, i.e. civil servants and language educators. The discussion in the media on immigrants’ language proficiency is also analysed.

The paper concentrates on the following questions:
1) How is language proficiency constructed by the experts in discussing integration into Finnish society, especially in terms of labour market?
2) What kinds of definitions of language proficiency are represented in the media discussion by various stake-holders?

The data of the study consist of the expert interviews conducted in 2009 and 2010 in the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Employment and the Economy, in the local settings by coordinators of immigration and integration education, and by the language educators working in the integration education for adult immigrants. The media data is collected from the national and local newspapers from 2008 onwards. The data is analysed by means of content analysis focusing on how language proficiency is understood and how sufficient proficiency for different purposes is verbalized.

The results show that language proficiency seems not to be understood as a continuum but is referred to as both a fairly clear border line and an on-off phenomenon. Therefore, immigrants can be referred to as persons who have no command of any language. Also requirements of language proficiency are discussed, but there are contradictory views on what amount of proficiency is sufficient for different purposes. Thus, language proficiency emerges as a monolithic concept which does not take into account the nature of language proficiency and the process of language learning.

The study has not only scientific significance, but also societal impact in the areas of language education policy, immigration policy, and labour policy. It gives infor-
mation on the mismatch of the policies and practices that can be applied by policy makers, civil servants, employers, and language educators in developing integration education and constructing a common understanding of language proficiency as a part of the integration process.
The paper discusses the relationship between CEFR and research based knowledge on the development of writing skills of L2 Finnish learners. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment (CEFR) is currently being adopted throughout Europe as the international yardstick: it is often used as a basis for high-stakes examinations, such as the ones for acquiring citizenship. Finland has pioneered in adapting the CEFR for the new National Core Curricula for schools and for the National Certificate language examination. The CEFR, however, is not empirically based: the descriptions are mainly based on the experiences of language teachers and educators.

The Finnish project CEFLING, which is part of a European network SLATE, aims to relate the “can do” statements used in the CEFR and National Curricula to learners’ actual linguistic performance. The main research question in the project is: Which linguistic features characterise learners’ performance at the proficiency levels defined in the CEFR and its Finnish adaptations? The project connects two disciplines: second language acquisition and language assessment, integrating also educational and social aspects.

The data includes writing performances of young people (grades 7–9, 12-16-year-olds) and adults learning Finnish as a second language. Based on the data, the target level of the curricula and the level required for citizenship (B1) will be discussed in the presentation: how do the language proficiency and literacy skills at this level meet the challenges of education, working life, and society (see e.g. Pavlenko & Lantolf 2000)?

As an example on learners’ writing skills at B1, we will present data examples from different genres (e.g. message and argumentative text). The data consists of communicative assignments, and thus, texts will be examined from the perspective of communicative skills, linguistic resources, and membership in diverse communities.
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Languages and language policy in Germany: A holistic approach

Germany is, surprisingly enough, a rather exotic country with regard to the academic field of language policy and planning. In contrast to many other countries, the topic is rarely discussed or taught at German universities, public debates are rare, and it is also remarkable that there have so far been very few studies that have dealt with issues of language planning.

Wherever topics of language planning in Germany have been dealt with, these have usually taken place within clear boundaries. Examples from various fields within language planning are the long-lasting debate on the orthography reform in the 1990s and early 2000s (corpus planning), topics that deal with language and migration (mostly concentrating on language acquisition planning in formal education and with a frequent focus laid on the “problem” of migrant multilingualism), or mostly local debates on minority language status planning such as in the cases of Sorbian, Frisian, or Low German.

What is almost entirely missing, however, is an attempt to see languages in Germany from a holistic perspective. If such a view was applied, it would become evident that the number and types of varieties which would have to be taken into account are as diverse as in most other countries. The varieties which could be considered would be:

- Standard German in the context of the international role of German as a pluricentric language of wider communication;
- other varieties of German (dialects, sociolects etc.);
- Low German as a regional language;
- autochthonous minority languages;
- migrant languages;
- languages in education.

In my paper, I will therefore first present some existing measures for language policy in Germany. I will then discuss briefly some of the reasons why there has never been awareness for a holistic approach to language planning in German society and why it has hardly been discussed by politicians and scientists in Germany. And finally, I will make some suggestions into the direction of such new policies and argue why German society could benefit from a new strategy of planned multilingualism in the country.
Towards a language policy for education in Suriname

The Republic of Suriname is a former Dutch colony on the Caribbean coast of South America. It has some 20 different languages, including indigenous Amerindian languages, Creole languages, and a number of European and Asian languages brought to the country by colonisers and immigrants. The official language in Suriname is Dutch and the main lingua franca is Sranan. Notwithstanding the fact that Dutch is the official language of the country and the language of education, many children, especially from the interior districts, have other home languages than Dutch and are confronted with Dutch as a language of instruction only when they first arrive at school. Needless to say, but this potentially hampers their educational careers. Against this background, the Ministry of Education in Suriname decided to take steps towards developing a language policy for education and asked us to provide them with empirical data on multilingualism and education in Suriname on which this policy could be based. More specifically, the Ministry asked if it would be useful to use other home languages than Dutch as languages of instruction in the classroom. In order to collect the data that we needed, we carried out a country wide home language survey with 22,643 students and 3,785 teachers in primary and secondary education, asking questions about home language use, proficiency, choice, dominance, and preference. We, furthermore, collected data on the languages that the students and the teachers used at school and on the teachers’ experiences and opinions regarding multilingualism and education.

In our paper, we will, first of all, deal with the home language profiles of the students and teachers, and their opinions on language and education in multilingual classrooms. In doing so, we will use Spolsky’s (2004) distinction in sociolinguistic language policy research between what people do with language, what people think about language, and what policy documents say about language. After that, we will go into the policy recommendations that we formulated for the Surinamese Ministry of Education and into how these were received by the Ministry and the public. In doing so, we will also critically reflect upon our so-called scholarly and independent role as participants in the policy making process. This policy cycle can basically be considered as an arena in which different actors with different positions, perspectives, ideologies, interests, and objectives (such as government officials, teacher trainers, inspectors, teachers, parents, students) try to advocate their version of a language policy for education in such a way that it is accepted as the dominant version. We will finish with a plea for in-depth classroom case studies that can shed more light on language policy in practice.
Implementing educational innovations in a primary school: A case study

The overall dissatisfaction with the way foreign languages are learnt in primary education in Catalonia has encouraged some schools to undertake changes in their Linguistic Projects. CLIL has been seen as one of the best ways to improve students’ proficiency, which has encouraged the emergence of CLIL programs in many schools. However, little research exists (see Naves and Victori, forthcoming) into the efficiency of those programs. This study attempts to fill this gap partly by presenting a longitudinal case study, before and after implementing a CLIL program in a school, among other innovation changes.

The study began 3 years ago in a primary school which aimed at improving their students’ English proficiency. The measures implemented were: introducing story telling and other activities in English with students aged 2 to 7, setting up a self-access center and teaching science through English from 3rd to 6th grades. Serving as both an external counselor and a researcher allowed me to follow the implementation process and gather data throughout the program’s stages. The main objective was to trace the effect of the abovementioned changes on the learners’ overall proficiency and motivation, gather the participants’ views, and analyze emerging problems or challenges.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to analyze the changes introduced. Among the former, questionnaires were distributed among students; teachers and the headmaster were interviewed as well as some focus groups of learners; and a few class observation sessions were done. Quantitative data was also gathered from students who participated in CLIL instruction by using a listening comprehension test, dictation, cloze text, written composition, and an oral test. Data was gathered in three time periods: at Time 1, before the CLIL program was implemented, data was collected from students who had only received regular ELT instruction - the control group. This data was compared with that collected in subsequent years from students of the same grade: after 1, 2, and 3 years of CLIL instruction.

Data collected after T2 showed that although CLIL students performed better in some aspects and clearly showed a high motivation for the CLIL classes, there were no major significant differences between the CLIL and non-CLIL groups. These results were mainly attributed to the limited CLIL instruction the former had received and to the inadequate profile of the teacher, as noted in the class observations and interviews. Changes were introduced into the program, among them hiring a new CLIL teacher who was proficient in English and received extensive training in both CLIL methodology and self-access centers. T3 results are currently being analyzed. Our final results will hopefully show whether there has been an overall improvement in all aspects analyzed and, if so, the extent of this improvement. Results obtained with the qualitative data gathered will also be reported.
Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has been part of EU Language Policy since the 1990s, and in recent years, the implementation of CLIL has greatly accelerated across the EU. This presentation shares insights from action research carried out within three critical communities involved in the launch of a CLIL science programme for 7th graders in a lower secondary school in Central Finland. The three communities are: the local educational community, the school community, and the classroom community. By building a relationship with these communities, the researcher has been able to enter into the process of launching a CLIL programme. Through dialogue with the teachers involved, the co-planning of courses, and classroom observation, an inside view of this complex process was opened to the researcher. Participation in this process has highlighted the challenges faced by both professional communities and individuals when working to transform CLIL-as-policy into CLIL-in-practice.

Drawing on a socioculturally informed theoretical framework, the community context for this research is understood in historical terms as the accumulation of social practices within education, as well as an on-going process with a high degree of knowledge and action potential. As a multi-layered exploration of policy-into-practice, this research capitalizes on the sociocultural understanding of knowledge as co-constructed and culturally-embedded.

The findings from this research provide some indication of the extensive challenges facing educational communities when introducing innovative change in language education. By highlighting the difficulties this community encountered, it is hoped that policy makers become aware of the value of community when introducing change. Furthermore, the findings from this research hope to indicate ways in which support is required both by educational communities and individuals, and issues which need to be addressed with regard to CLIL. The findings also indicate the benefits of facing the challenge of educational innovations and the unanticipated ways in which change can enrich educational communities and practice.
Integrating subject and language aims in CLIL: Design and implementation of a rubric for cross-curricular integration

In the Netherlands, bilingual education aims at integrating subject and language learning in the secondary school curriculum. In a previous study (De Graaff et al. 2007), it was found that subject teachers in Dutch bilingual education, being non-native speakers of English and without any professional background in second language pedagogy, were able to apply implicitly principles for effective second language pedagogy, such as providing rich linguistic input, focusing on meaning and form, providing opportunities for pushed output and interaction, and paying attention to language learning strategies. But do schools and teachers really integrate content and language in the bilingual curriculum? An exploratory survey showed that most bilingual schools treat content and language as completely separate subjects: subject teachers teach in English but without any adjustments to the language curriculum; language teachers do not pay attention to the topics or the assignments their pupils are working on in parallel subject classes.

In a design-based study, we aimed to find effective and feasible principles and methods for integrating subject and language in cross-curricular assignments and projects. A rubric was developed and applied to describe the level of such integration, focusing on criteria such as organization, collaboration, aims, tasks, performances, feedback, and assessment. With teacher teams from five different bilingual schools, several cross-curricular activities were developed and implemented, including subjects such as geography, history, biology, religious studies, economics, social studies, and English. Using the rubric as an inventory tool, we will discuss some examples of integrated lesson-plans and their implementation in teaching practice. We will argue that both subject and language teachers in CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) play a crucial, yet, distinctive role in providing integrated opportunities for subject and language learning. As the study shows that integration in CLIL is feasible but not self-evident, we will discuss implications for language education policy, curriculum development, and teacher training in CLIL.
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Genre-based models in multilingual syllabi: New ways of language programming for European bilingual education

With the demise of formalism in linguistics, the education of mother tongue and foreign language needs revising. Formal syllabi fall short of the two major challenges in multilingual education today: making students fit to operate in a multilingual world and making them proficient in using language – both L1 and L2 - in society, that is, having a full grasp of the academic and professional genres. This article makes an actual proposal of curriculum innovation that takes genres – with a nod to the systemic functional theory behind it - as the ultimate unit in language programming and that is being embraced in some parts of Europe under the label ‘integrated language curriculum’. The language model presented was produced and is being implemented in parts of Spain as an overall approach to language education, including L1, L2, and L3. It is meant to tackle adverse results in PISA in L1 literacy, and it poses a new way of L2 and L3 structuring in bilingual schools. The paper will show a full language programme structured around genres in preuniversity courses in bilingual secondary schools following CLIL methods. The paper shows how foreign languages when taught side by side with academic content give way to new language products with academic or social significance: genres. This new approach has been embraced as the new language education policy in Spain and is being tested in a number of centres before being fully adopted in wider contexts.
As a result of the globalizing processes that are forcing higher education institutions to internationalize (Wilkinson 2004), universities are becoming very rich environments from a linguistic point of view. Nowadays, the implementation of the Bologna Declaration and the subsequent increasing mobility of teaching staff and students have fostered linguistic diversity in the European Higher Education Space. Thus, current universities are more multilingual than ever before, and the presence of CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) in foreign languages – mainly English – is spreading. This is the case of the University of the Basque Country (UBC) in Spain, where, besides the presence of the two official languages (Basque and Spanish) in all the different degrees, the utilization of English as means of instruction is on the increase and currently reaches 5% of the academic offer. In addition, the diversity of the languages spoken by international students and teachers substantially contributes to augment this multilingual perception. This is a rather new context that demands research aimed at analyzing the university community’s awareness about the spread of multilingualism in higher education and the role of CLIL in the current lingua franca, English.

In order to boost multilingual awareness, it is indispensable to understand the personal, social, cultural, political, and economic struggles that surround the different languages in contact, while becoming critically aware of what this implies. With this in mind, international students attending the UBC were asked through discussion groups about their perceptions of the increasing use of CLIL in English. Although the participants were initially favourable to English-medium instruction, once this issue was analyzed in greater depth their comments revealed uneasiness due to the limitations the spread of English puts on the development of multilingualism and its purported detrimental effect on the learning of the host university’s language(s). Consequently, students’ insights should be deemed if higher education institutions are to provide well-grounded CLIL practices and to implement successful language policies.

Reference
Immersion versus mother tongue education

Sustained language education policies can have an important impact on the results of teaching first and second languages. This paper discusses the outcomes of a study among two groups of students with different language backgrounds in a multilingual program. The first group uses a second language as the language of instruction and for them the model is an immersion program. The second group receives mother tongue instruction. Both groups are taking part in a curriculum where content and language learning are integrated. The language is both a subject and a medium of instruction. The research project focuses on literacy skills, and in this paper, we will focus in particular on the results of a writing task reviewing, at the same time, the current educational policy.

The study takes place in the Basque Autonomous Community in Spain. In this context over the last 30 years, language education policy has transformed the education system. Today Basque, Spanish, and English are taught in a multilingual school system. Students can receive their education in one of three language models. This study focuses on the level of achievement of students enrolled in the model where instruction is through the medium of Basque, with Spanish as a subject and English as the medium of instruction for one or two subjects.

We compare the level of achievement in writing between Spanish speakers, who are in a Basque immersion program, to Basque speakers for whom it is the mother tongue. The sample comprises 165 students from three different schools towards the end of their obligatory secondary education. The participants had either Basque or Spanish as their first language. After 12 years of education, all are bilingual in Basque and Spanish but they have attained different levels. All participants completed a questionnaire to self-evaluate their writing skills and then wrote an essay in Basque. Classroom observations were conducted as well, and language teachers were interviewed. The results show interesting differences among native Basque speakers' writing levels and those of non-native Basque speakers. These differences have possible implications for educational policy, such as strengthening the focus on Basque language skills for specific groups of students, taking their language background into account.
During this presentation, I propose to refer to the phenomena of ‘language attrition’ and ‘language shift’ in multilingual settings and their possible causes which lead to an examination of the larger issue of the extinction of linguistic diversity. I will discuss this matter with special reference to the existing language education policies for tribal linguistic minorities in India and the role that a regional language plays in the decline of these underprivileged languages.

A number of India’s regional and tribal languages are at present in the threatened category. The three language formulas as well as the teaching through mother tongue come up as a muddle in India since one may often come across more than three languages in any Indian society. Therefore, through the influence of so-called mother tongue medium teaching, a tribal child generally gets accustomed to a language which is not at all his mother tongue (i.e. the national or dominant language of the region). Hence, there is a gradual decline, an inevitable language shift, and finally the extinction of a tribal language which is a frequent phenomenon in Indian society. The reach of the regional languages has not shrunk much yet in the era of globalization, but in the competitive area of social space – in administration, education, media – the tribal minority languages are losing out to English or even Hindi, the national language (e.g. the case of Great-Andamanese language community in Andaman). The other major co-official regional languages also play a significant role in the decline of the tribal minority languages (e.g. Bengali and Oriya over indigenous tongues like Turi, Malto, Bumji etc.).

The difference created by the Eighth Schedule of Indian Constitution (Articles: 344. 1 and 351) on major or minor languages is misleading, since a large number of minority languages have not been included in it. The government has recently taken steps towards the ‘preservation’ of a few endangered tribal languages; but these, ultimately, turn out to be only cosmetic changes without getting into the fundamentals of the problem. The present situation, hence, demands fresh thinking on the existing language policies; and this could be done by shifting the focus from solo Mother-Tongue (MTE) medium teaching to a Mother-Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTBME) which essentially includes the tribal languages at the primary level.

From 2004 onwards, Mother-Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTBME) has already been introduced in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa where, according to 2001 census, around 6.59% and 9.7% of the total tribal population of India inhabit, respectively. In these states, MTBME has not only reduced considerably the percentage of dropout and repetition among tribal children, but also made schooling more comprehensible and, hence, relevant for them. Mother Tongue Based Multilingual Education (MTBME), therefore, strongly argues in favor of the tribal languages and according to me, could certainly provide a solution to the problems related to the maintenance of the tribal languages in a multilingual society like India.
Language education policy as reflected on notice boards in teachers’ rooms

The following study looked at current “education policy de facto” (Shohamy 2006) in Arab schools in Israel through investigating two notice boards in two Arab schools: one in an Arab town and another in a mixed town. Since 1948, when the State of Israel was founded, declared language education policy has been bilingual: Hebrew and Arabic (Spolsky & Shohamy 1999).

Three issues of policy de facto were looked at: the agents of language education policy, the languages that appeared on notice boards over a period of several months, and the reasons for the appearance of these languages.

This research is a qualitative research that analyzed twenty board notices from each school and four semi-structured interviews with four position holders in the two schools. The board notices were analyzed according to a priori set of categories in linguistic landscape analysis and language policy. Among the categories that were identified are agents of policy, addressees of notice boards (and policy), content of texts, frequency of a certain language in the text, and the symbolic value of the language that was used in notice boards.

The assumption was that notices would be mutually exclusive, that is, each notice would be written in both languages: Arabic and Hebrew. This assumption was based on declared policy, according to which Hebrew and Arabic are the formal languages in Israel. The major finding was that there is an equal amount of notices that were written either in Hebrew or in Arabic, while there was not even one notice that included both languages. This finding did not match the participants’ perceptions regarding the frequency of Hebrew and Arabic in notice boards. Interviewees said that the notices were generally written in Hebrew and very few of the notices were written in Arabic.

The participants also mentioned that they preferred to read notices that included both languages, Arabic and Hebrew, for the purpose of more positive, better, and clearer communication. Others preferred to read Arabic since Arabic is their mother tongue. However, the participants notified that they preferred to write notices in Hebrew for pragmatic reasons. Only one said that he preferred to write notices in Arabic for two reasons: “First, the target language of the school is Arabic. Second, because the school is located in the Arab sector”.

The findings point to the status of the two languages in the context investigated, as well as to educational policy de facto. The presence or absence of a particular language on notice boards reflects its economical, political, and social status. The large number of Hebrew notices in Arab schools threatens the status of Arabic. Hebrew was found to be the dominant language in the Arab sector. It could be implied that the hidden agenda of the state is different from declared education policy of two formal languages: Hebrew and Arabic. The direction of policy de facto may be perceived as Hebrew monolingualism.
The importance of primary language education

European Commission arranged a conference on early language learning in September 2009. The aim of the meeting was to identify and raise awareness of the benefits of early language learning, promote early language learning, and discuss the related challenges. Professor Piet Van de Craen presented his scientific findings on the benefits of social, cognitive, and intrapersonal development. Siv Björklund, the leading professor of language immersion program in the University of Vaasa, introduced the results of the Swedish immersion program. They compared children who joined the immersion program in pre-school with children who took the common route. European Union has launched a campaign named Piccolingo! with the idea that every child should have the opportunity to learn two languages in addition to his or her own mother tongue.

The Finnish National Board of Education pays special attention to multilingualism in basic education. The purpose of the program called VIEKO is to offer teacher training and seminars to reinforce foreign language education. The focus of the program is to make it easier for parents and children to relate to and choose a foreign language in primary and secondary school. The political decisions in the future should take current research into consideration as well as field experiments of educational experts, i.e. teachers. Research and foreign language teaching should complete each other.

We should be careful not to have too narrow a perspective on language skills (compare with Tarja Nikula). English can be regarded as a good starting point, but it is not enough. Furthermore, a foreign language is an open door to a new language family. A primary school pupil finds it extremely interesting to discover that Swedish enables him/her to understand some expressions of other Nordic languages. We also have to move away from correctness and the predominance of written skills. Too much emphasis on correctness leads to pressure on performance and lack of motivation. Finally, we consider that attitudes are built up at an early age; a multilingual youngster keeps his/her eyes open, and for example, is ready to study/work abroad.

The focus of the poster will be, firstly, on the importance of primary foreign language education from the students’ point of view. We are going to interview some children from different age groups who have been introduced to different languages on a voluntary basis. We are most certainly dealing with pupils growing up in a quite homogeneous culture, that is, Ostrobothnia. Secondly, we would like to concentrate on, for example, Professor Piet Van de Craen’s studies on the benefits of social, cognitive, and intrapersonal development of a young learner (see above). When it comes to language education policy, we are likely to put forward at least these issues: the earlier, the better, and the importance of continuity and communication.
Language policing: A look at the micro-level policy practices of the second language classroom

With Conversation Analysis as the main research method, SLA the main area of research, and drawing on the framework of CA-for-SLA (Markee 2008), this study aims to fill the gap in the negotiation of language policy at micro level from an emic perspective. By being second language learners and attending to each other’s code switching, the participants of a second language classroom establish and achieve a common lingua franca through their talk-in-interaction.

The co-construction of “language policy” through “language policing” by the teacher and learners in a second language classroom is the focus of the study. I use the term language policing to illustrate the classroom community’s (Hellermann 2008) orientation to the code switching of its members, and how this orientation is displayed through sequences, in some cases through conversational repairs, and in others through “implicit policing”. The orientation and understanding of the interlocutors, policing the medium of conversation in a second language classroom (Mori 2002; Seedhouse 2004; Firth & Wagner 2007; Markee 2008), and its display through talk-in-interaction establishes the lingua franca, and the language policy at micro level.

The interaction of an English language classroom in Sweden was videotaped to see how the production, reproduction, and legitimisation of practices of “language policy” are actually performed in situ. English lessons of grade 9 were videotaped by three different cameras in computer labs and during regular lessons in classrooms in the year 2009.

The conclusions of this ongoing study highlight the second language learner community’s orientation to rule making for a lingua franca through talk-in-interaction. The implementation of rules through participants performing “language policing” is achieved through various conversational repairs. The study also elucidates the members’ orientation to change in participation as well as policing as a part of learning in the second language classroom. The notion of “membership” in CA (Garfinkel and Sacks 1970) is relevant to understanding “language policing” as a part of the process of language learning as it takes place.
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What kind of possibilities does elementary school EFL learning offer to the formation of fifth and sixth graders’ learner identities?

If language in foreign language learning is not seen as an isolated and fixed entity located at the centre of learning of separate individuals, it becomes as much a tool as the focus of learning. Interaction, social activity, and participation of the learners become central. All meanings can be seen as socially constructed, often negotiated and internalized by individual learners in different manners (Lantolf 2000). In meaning making processes, learners relate the world to themselves and transform knowledge according to their abilities and interests. In this activity, they do not only process information but also reflect and perform themselves as learners, i.e. do identity work. This sociocultural understanding of language learning is the background of my study. The interaction between the learner and her environment requires learner agency which is the ability of an individual to act upon the possibilities and restrictions, the affordances, that her environment offers (van Lier 2004). For my study, I have divided the affordances of the classroom context into linguistic, institutional, and social. Both, the curriculum at the macro level and the micro level social interaction in the classroom, can be understood as affordances that may help or hinder language learning.

Understanding identity as a sociocultural concept has methodologically required both the study of individual experiences and social interaction. In my ethnographically informed action research study, I have observed and interviewed fifth and sixth graders of a elementary school in Central Finland. The cases of seven key informants form the core data of my study. For a general background, data has also been collected by a questionnaire and a drawing task from over 150 of the school’s fifth and sixth graders. Most of the pupils are my own students, which has made my position as a teacher-researcher very complicated.

The seven key informants of my study represent different understandings of self as a language learner. I have named these positions The School Changer, A Student with Special Educational Needs, The “Unsuccessful Language Learner”, An Immigrant Learner, The Language User and The “Good Student”. Some of these identities are in change, but after a few years’ learning experience at school, some are already quite fixed.

Identities are formed and performed in the classroom through interaction which is taken in differently by individual learners. These identities are often dynamic, but sometimes sedimented and difficult to change. This is often the case when learners are positioned by themselves and others institutionally, in comparison to the institutional role model of a “good language learner”. This role is kept up by assessment, comparison, competition, and interaction, e.g. by the stories that the students tell about themselves and others as language learners.
The aim of my research is to make the different experiences of language learners visible for a greater understanding of what goes on in an EFL classroom. By improving the social interaction in classrooms, as well as scaffolding the individual learner, language teachers and policy makers can make a great impact in the lifelong trajectories of language users.
EFL for school children in Japan: New challenges in elementary schools

As a background, foreign language teaching in Japan, in particular English language teaching (ELT), has experienced a transition of its potential meaning in the Japanese language policy because of facing globalization across many terrains: cultural, economic, technological, and so forth. In 2002, as a turning point, English was introduced into selected primary schools across the country, and in ordinary public schools, English classes have been offered in the context of a newly-fashioned program of integrated education. In addition, beginning in 2011, English is going to be taught in every primary school in Japan as a compulsory class “English Activities (Eigo Katsudo)”.

The current study sheds light on the contrasts between ordinary classes and special needs education classes (special educational programs for those who have mental disorders, e.g. LD, ADHD, ASD, and so on), reporting how English teaching in primary schools has changed from 2003 to 2008. This is done by presenting a summary of the activity reports (including basic statistics) of ELT in primary schools in Japan offered by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), analyzing the results of the questionnaires surveying how students’ motivations and beliefs have changed, and discussing new and primary problems and challenges in teaching English in special needs education based on the results and entries of a questionnaire and interview for teachers who are in charge of special needs education classes. The problems and difficulties come from the fact that MEXT is now leaving the curriculum for ELT in special needs education and the recruitment of personnel (teachers and assistant language teachers) entirely up to schools even though MEXT has already offered a guideline for English language activity for ordinary classes.

In conclusion, the students’ responses to the questionnaires and the teachers’ self-evaluation of their teaching practices were fairly favorable and positive towards the new programs of English activities in ordinary classes. On the other hand, the lack of research in the field of foreign language teaching for special needs education might not only lead to insufficient support for them but also cause some misgivings about the legitimacy of teaching foreign languages in special needs education. Interestingly, however, the teachers have trouble with developing a methodology in their classes and worry about the influence of foreign language teaching on the children, but make up for this in passion with fully worked-out plans (IED: individualized education programs) based on their own ideas.
A study on the evaluation of an English education policy

The study aims to analyze the outcome of the TaLK (Teach and Learn in Korea) program in Korea. The English education program, TaLK, has been administered since the summer 2009 by the Korean government to achieve two aims: to decrease the English-divide phenomenon in Korea and to foster future talents who know about and like Korea. The Korean government recruits foreign or Korean-American college students from English-speaking countries twice a year and endows them with a scholarship for traveling and staying in Korea. The volunteers are expected to teach English in the after-school program in public primary schools located in rural areas in Korea while learning about Korea by experiencing the culture and learning the Korean language. The program couples each of them with a Korean college student who also volunteers to co-teach English and to assist them with their life in Korea.

In January 2009, the program produced the first TaLK scholarship students who had finished the first semester of teaching English in public schools. The study aims to evaluate the TaLK program by the outcome analysis and to provide helpful advice and guidance for improving the program. With this aim, we first conducted focus group interviews of school children, parents, school teachers, and government officials working in different levels. Based on the interviews and consultation of relevant studies on policy evaluation, we extracted six performance indicators from the perspectives of nine different parties of participants. The nine parties are composed of school children, parents, school teachers, TaLK foreign scholarship students, TaLK Korean volunteers, and four parties of government officials who participated in planning, executing, and administering the program. Then, for each party, we made up surveys comprised of questions for each indicator. The survey participants from all parties were over 1,000 people. According to the participants’ role and the similarity of the task performed in the program, we classified the nine parties into three groups, and compared the responses within each group for each performance indicator. Their open comments on the survey were qualitatively analyzed to see what they had expected, and what and how much they think the program had achieved. Based on the results, we provide future suggestions for improving the English education policy program, TaLK in Korea.
Speaking: To assess or not to assess?

As borders between countries become more transparent, individuals have come to realise that it is of utmost importance to be able to speak the lingua franca, English in most cases, to converse, train, and do business. Consequently, the testing of speaking skills has gained significance in determining the mastery level of individuals in these fields. This change has had serious implications for the actual teaching of speaking in schools and other language centres. The School of Foreign Languages at METU has already taken some steps in incorporating the speaking component in the English Proficiency Examination (EPE). In line with this development, the English courses offered to students once they come to their faculty will have to undergo a major change especially in terms of the teaching and testing of speaking skills. Teachers and students seem to have different ideas and beliefs on this issue, even with differing views within their own groups. The present study attempts to identify both the students and the teachers’ perceptions of and expectations for the “ENG102 English for Academic Purposes II” course in terms of teaching and testing speaking skills. In this respect, students were distributed a questionnaire asking their opinions and preferences in the teaching and testing of speaking skills in class. The data revealed that a great majority of students believe that speaking skills should be practiced in the form of buzz group activities and debates. As opposed to this finding, the data obtained from the interviews with the teachers revealed that teachers’ preferences varied depending on the years of teaching experience: Teachers up to 10 years of experience think that speaking activities should be done as discussions and debates, whereas teachers with more experience prefer role-plays and individual presentations. Both groups agree that speaking should be practised in this course.

Although teachers believe speaking should be assessed, students are strictly against assessment in this course. If assessment is to be done in any case, both groups agree that it should be done in class by the class teacher. It, then, becomes evident from the findings obtained through both quantitative and qualitative data that students and teachers have different opinions regarding the practice and assessment of speaking in this course, not only across groups but also within their group. Therefore, it is crucial that decision-makers take these varying opinions into consideration while designing and implementing the curricula and syllabi if they are to be implemented efficiently and realistically by stakeholders.
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Language policy development in Armenia: Pros and cons

Language policy development is an urgent governmental issue in Armenia after the destruction of the USSR. Armenian is a major language used in education and public life. It is also the main means of communication for minority groups living in the country. Language policy in Armenia is also directed towards the development of minority languages (Kurdish, Greek, Assyrian, etc). The state language supremacy is in harmony with the preservation of national minority languages.

It should be noted that a number of foreign languages are taught in the RA institutions of higher education. This fact helps to raise a mutual respect towards all cultures and the foreign language itself (this is especially important for younger generation). Thanks to this, taking into consideration cultural perspectives, one can better his/her communicative or pragmatic competence which is central to linguistic studies. Yerevan State Linguistic University where 19 foreign languages are taught (the professors are native speakers) can serve as evidence of this. The language policy in Armenia encourages people to study a foreign language as most Armenian parents are in favour of bilingual or trilingual education taking into consideration the fact that each foreign language helps a person to enlarge his knowledge and examine the world from a new aspect.

Nevertheless, due to the tendency to learn as many foreign languages as possible, the young face the problem of purification of their native language. Hence, in this respect, language planning is now directed towards the development and improvement of Armenian. Even a proposal has been made suggesting that English, Russian, etc. loan-words should be replaced with new Armenian coinages. It is no coincidence that, at present, the Terminological Committee in Armenia is working on this problem and has invented a number of new words to replace borrowings which are not in frequent use.

Thus, we can say that Language policy development in Armenia is under way and facing both positive and negative changes.