

СУЧАСНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ В МОВНІЙ ОСВІТІ: ПОГЛЯДИ ТА ОБГОВОРЕННЯ

MARYANA NATSIUK (Ukraine-Germany)

VIKTORIA OSIDAK (Ukraine-Germany)

ORCID 0000-0002-5887-8321

ORCID 0000-0001-7304-3026

MULTILINGUALISM IN SOCIETY AND EDUCATION: THE UKRAINIAN CONTEXT

Abstract

Due to migration and job-related mobility, the communicative effects of globalisation and multilingual societies have become the norm in Europe. Considering the need to respond to the diverse social groups on the educational level, the Council of Europe's language policy goals are oriented toward plurilingual and pluricultural learner groups (Council of Europe, 2020). The purpose of this paper is to present a thematic literature analysis in order to establish the framework for the project titled «Insights from the CEFR: Multilingual Education and Assessment,» which received funding from the Volkswagen Foundation. The CEFR (Council of Europe 2001) and its Companion Volume (Council of Europe 2020) are cornerstones of this thematic literature analysis. This article aims to present our conceptual understanding of important terms, which will guide our future exploration. Additionally, it analyzes multilingualism in the Ukrainian context, taking into account its multilingual sociocultural realities and language education policy. The study examines the objectives of plurilingual education, with a specific focus on the Ukrainian context, and explores approaches that can be employed to incorporate plurilingual perspectives into language teaching. This progress report is intended to contribute to multilingual teacher education, making teachers aware of their learners' linguistic resources and the approaches that promote (multi)plurilingualism.

Keywords: CEFR/CV, multilingualism, plurilingualism, the Ukrainian context, linguistic resources, plurilingual approaches, thematic literature analysis.

Introduction

Multilingualism has become a distinguishing feature of modern society as the result of the shift in demographics towards multilingual communities (Chalhoub-Deville, 2019; Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Jessner, 2008). Nowadays using two or more languages is common and natural for many communities and individuals in most parts of the world, while being a monolingual speaker may be recognized as an isolated incident (Chalhoub-Deville, 2019; Skunabb-Kangass, 1989). In this light, the language has been seen as a source and a main building block to life-long education and social equity since 1995 when the European Society language policy objective was proclaimed (The Commission of the European Communities [CEC], 1995, p. 13). As shown in various documents, in the European Union, language policy aims to foster a multilingual identity, promote mutual understanding, and facilitate cultural enrichment by encouraging individuals to become proficient in two European languages besides their mother tongue. (CEC, 1995; Council of Europe 2001). Thus, all member states fo-

cus on the promotion of linguistic diversity and language learning.

The goal of this progress report is to describe the process of the literature analysis in order to define the framework within which the project 'Multilingual education and assessment: Insights from the CEFR' funded by the Volkswagen Foundation, was carried out. In pursuing this aim, in this article the authors will present their conceptual vision of the key terms such as multilingualism vs plurilingualism, plurilingual learners, learners' plurilingual repertoire, and plurilingual/ multilingual approaches that outline the direction of our further insights; analyse the goals of plurilingual education with the focus on the Ukrainian context and discuss approaches that can implement plurilingual turn to language teaching.

Methodology

In order to meet the goals of the paper, we used a thematic analysis of the selected sources, which is commonly employed to analyze the content of the articles and establish a thematic review of the literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This involved careful study and critical analysis

of the full articles and comparing/contrasting the findings and finally integrating them into the body of the paper (Slavin, 1986). An extensive literature search focusing on multilingualism/ plurilingualism in language education was undertaken in two phases. Phase 1 was carried out in two steps. In Step 1, we started with the analysis of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001), its Companion Volume (CV) (Council of Europe, 2020), and the CEFR-related literature (cf. Beacco et al., 2016; CEC, 1995; Piccardo et al., 2022). The CEFR and the CEFR/CV are the cornerstones of this project. Step 2 included reviewing the legal basis and state language policy to understand Ukrainian language education policy. In Phase 2, a more extensive search was carried out with a focus on cases of recent developments in multilingualism for language education through the overview of the approaches to multilingual/ plurilingual education. This search included academic peer-reviewed journals published in the English language, containing empirical or theoretical articles, from the period spanning 2007 to 2023.

Multilingualism vs Plurilingualism: Definitions and Conceptualisations

Defining multilingualism may become a challenge as the term covers a range of meanings, including bilingualism and plurilingualism. In some studies, the terms multilingualism and plurilingualism are used interchangeably while in other studies there is a clear distinction between the terms. Bilingualism may be treated as a variant of multilingualism as the research on L2 learning pertains to the findings on multilingualism and the understanding of the impact of bilingualism on the acquisition of a third language (L3) (Jessner, 2008).

An older conceptualization of bilingualism as a balanced or perfect proficiency in two languages that strives towards a close-to-native speaker's performance (Bloomfield, 1933 as cited in Baker, 2006) presents an outdated view. According to Baker (2006), deciding who is bilingual is difficult as a simple categorization of the term requires understanding what language competence or proficiency level is needed in order to be classified as bilingual. For example, some individuals understand a spoken language but do not speak that language themselves; others communicate orally successfully but do not write in that language.

Moreover, there is a question of whether a tourist who knows a few phrases in a second language can fall under the category of a bilingual. In this light, 'the native-like' proficiency of two or more languages may appear extreme (Baker, 2006). Baker (2006) concludes that trying to determine bilingualism from the proficiency perspective will always yield different results. However, if the number of languages is used as a criterion, then a bilingual is an individual who can operate two languages in everyday communicative situations.

Similarly, there is a plethora of definitions of multilingualism, a lot of which are contradictory. An older definition of multilingualism by Hufeisen (1998) highlights the number of languages, namely more than two that a person is learning. The most important European language policy document, the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001), and its updated policy document the CEFR/CV (Council of Europe, 2020) make a distinction between multilingualism and plurilingualism, stating that multilingualism is about the coexistence of different languages. US-based scholars Schissel et al. (2019) have a different reading of multilingualism as instances of a whole language repertoire. A similar view on multilingualism is also expressed by Chalhoub-Deville (2019) who highlights that multilingualism is seen as «flexible, dynamic, and complex systems that allow users to deploy resources as needed to take control of their language performance, enhance language learning, and access content» (p. 473). This reading of multilingualism is very similar to the definition of plurilingualism as defined by the language policy document the CEFR/ CV (Council of Europe, 2020). In its reading plurilingualism refers to the dynamic and evolving linguistic repertoire of an individual learner or user, who is seen as a social agent, using their language repertoire in order to accomplish a task. In the process of a task accomplishment a language user «does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact» (Council of Europe 2001, p. 4).

In this light, plurilingualism is an asset and it should be viewed so in schools and universities. According to Myklevold (2022), it is both

destructive and inefficient to disregard students' diverse linguistic repertoire, their prior linguistic knowledge or skills in language learning in a language classroom as multiple research proved that language learners rely on their previous language knowledge and skills while learning an additional language. The focus on plurilingualism makes the boundaries between the languages less distinct. From this standpoint, a plurilingual speaker demonstrates knowledge of and skills in more than one language with different levels of expertise depending on different purposes. Other definitions share a similar understanding of a plurilingual speaker. A plurilingual speaker is «a speaker of three or more languages with unique linguistic configurations, often depending on an individual history» (De Angelis & Selinker, 2001, p. 44). A linguistic repertoire of a person usually includes the mother tongue or L1 and other languages (called L2, L3 etc. depending on the order of their acquisition) or their varieties (Extra & Yağmur, 2012). According to the CEFR and the CEFR/ CV (Council of Europe 2001, 2020), plurilingualism entails communication not only across languages but also across cultures and contexts. As a result, a plurilingual speaker demonstrates the capacity to learn (under formal instruction and independently) and to use languages; manifests skills to utilize partial knowledge of various languages and cultures, and the attitude of tolerance towards diversity. Thus, multilingualism refers to the presence of diverse language communities coexisting within a specific geographic location, while plurilingualism attributes to a person's ability to use several languages.

The terminological difference between multilingualism and plurilingualism and their implementation in language education stresses the shift from linear additive language education towards interconnection between the languages (Piccardo et al, 2022, p. 4). In educational settings, the promotion of multilingualism is characterized by an independent language syllabus where languages are taught in isolation. Multilingualism can be achieved by diversifying the range of languages available in a specific school or educational system, promoting the learning of multiple foreign languages among students, or diminishing the dominant role of English in international communication (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). «The promotion of plurilin-

gualism implies a shift from seeing language as an entity, as a code, to seeing it as an activity, as a situated practice» (Piccardo et al, 2022, p. 8). Moreover, plurilingualism calls for establishing the connection between the languages by creating an educational environment that maintains a strong link between the languages taught and acknowledges complex communicative practices of individuals.

Implementing multilingualism/ plurilingualism in education

Due to the demographic shift towards a multilingual and diverse society, the European Commission set up the policy goal that all citizens of the EU speak at least two foreign languages in addition to their mother tongue (CEC, 1995). Diversifying the number of languages that students can learn at schools is one of the ways to achieve this objective (Council of Europe, 2001). In this regard, Beacco and Byram (2007, p. 36) pointed out, that though promoting language learning and diversifying the number of languages is a necessary and important step, it cannot be seen as a sufficient condition for acting on motivation to undertake plurilingual education.

Research findings repeatedly show that learners are best served when their diverse linguistic repertoire is valued and built upon (Escamilla et al, 2021). Some of the ways of enhancing plurilingualism in the language classroom are by introducing practices that enable students to draw on their multiple languages in a task completion such as comparing languages; introducing dual-language and multilingual books; encouraging translanguaging; allowing students' L1 in discussing complex concepts, promoting language awareness (Trinki & Krevelj, 2020). To a great degree, at the core of plurilingual education lies the notion that language skills can be transferred across different languages (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015), emphasizing the idea that languages are most effectively learned in relation to one another.

Plurilingual education can pursue different educational goals, ranging from catering for the needs of linguistic minority students, reinforcing the status of the state language in the national education system to fostering foreign language learning (cf. Cenoz & Gorter, 2015; Escamilla et al., 2021; Trinki & Krevelj, 2020; Zabolotna et al., 2019). For example, significant attention has

been given to the problem of minority languages in order to protect the linguistic rights of indigenous/ minority populations in many parts of the world (Chernychko, 2009; Escamilla et al., 2021; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1989; Yakovleva, 2015; Zabolotna et al., 2019). The authors of these studies promote the idea of plurilingualism with a focus on the needs of minority/indigenous language speakers by creating conditions conducive to sustaining linguistic and cultural diversity. In the Ukrainian context, a strong focus has been made on developing identification with Ukraine, while at the same time maintaining the right of minority language speakers for education in their language (Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020).

Consequently, to make the concept of plurilingualism feasible it is possible to categorize the goals of plurilingual education and examine plurilingualism from three different perspectives: Plurilingualism that aims at defining the status of the state language in a national educational system, plurilingualism that focuses on creating a conducive environment for sustaining minority languages and plurilingualism that pertains to teaching and learning of several foreign languages (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Objectives of Plurilingual Education

Analyzing the Ukrainian Context

The analysis of the language policy documents (cf the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) and the additional laws, such as About the principles of the state language policy(2012), About ethnic minorities in Ukraine, (1992), About Supporting the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language, (2019), European Charter for Regional Languages or Minority Languages, (1992), Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, (2019)), demonstrate that language policy in Ukraine is in line with the EU context where language is regarded as an instrument for personal, social, academic and professional growth (Nikolaenko, 2004). Moreover, language policy

in Ukraine aligns with the state social policy that has a strong focus on developing the identification with Ukraine, while at the same time maintaining the right of minority language speakers for education in their language (Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020).

An Experts' Report by the Council of Europe (CoELPD, 2008-2011) presented the investigation into how Ukraine was responding to modern approaches and challenges as outlined in the CEFR (2001). The findings revealed that Ukraine has attained quite a few achievements in terms of language education (CoELPD, 2008-2011, pp. 15-16). The experts registered that the state makes an effort to cater for the needs of national minorities and provides education in the learner's mother tongue. Consequently, a range of language institutions offers education both in Ukrainian and minority languages (Chernychko, 2009; Nikolska & Pershukova, 2020; Zabolotna et al., 2019). Moreover, Ukrainian has a high position as the language of schooling; and much has been done in order to change the status of the Ukrainian language in society, including among national minority communities. In addition, enhancing foreign language instruction stands as a crucial focus for education and state policies, playing a pivotal role in Ukraine's integration into European society. Nikolska and Pershukova (2020) in their analysis of multilingual education in Ukraine made a similar conclusion, highlighting that presently, Ukraine has implemented a comprehensive language education system, supported by the state's language policy. The primary objective of the language policy is to support mastery of every speaker's native language, mandatory proficiency in the Ukrainian language for all citizens (regardless of their nationality, religion, or occupational field), as well as the acquisition of foreign languages and the cultivation of language tolerance education (p. 5).

Although Ukrainian language policy has a strong focus on promoting plurilingualism, the authors realize the controversies between the state objectives and the real state-of-the-art situation in language education in Ukraine. On the one hand, there is an understanding that a language should not be taught in isolation from other languages and learners' linguistic repertoire needs to be valued and built upon while teaching an

additional language (Panasiuk, 2017). However, the language education system in Ukraine has a strong focus on teaching languages separately, with minimal or no collaboration among language teachers and an assessment system that evaluates students' proficiency only in the target language. Such an approach lacks integration and cooperation across languages. Therefore, it is really necessary to make knowledge on plurilingualism available to those who work with multicultural and heterogeneous classrooms on a daily basis (teachers and policy-makers) and to empower teachers with practical skills in order to bring a change in classroom attitudes and practices (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020).

Analyzing plurilingual approaches for FLL

Research on (multi)plurilingualism in education reveals that while there is a solid theoretical foundation for the concept, its practical integration into teaching has not made significant progress, therefore, many language teachers rely on a monolingual approach in their classroom practices (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018). Consequently, the question of how effectively incorporate plurilingual approaches in foreign language teaching and learning is frequently raised.

Candelier et al. (2010) use the term 'pluralistic approaches' and define them as the didactic approaches which involve several (i.e. more than one) varieties of languages or cultures in teaching/ learning activities (p. 5). These approaches are opposed to monolingual ('singular') approaches which consider only one language or culture, taken in isolation (Candelier et al., 2010). Recognizing language diversity, Duarte & Kirsch (2020, p. 4) define approaches as multilingual when they are applied in a multilingual and multicultural surrounding specifying that multilingual approaches imply that students and teachers have various linguistic resources that can be acknowledged and used for learning.

Following the framework presented in our article and regarding plurilingualism as a natural condition of learners' development in a modern world (Piccardo et al., 2022), we keep to the term plurilingual approaches. The use of plurilingual approaches in the classroom implies developing pluricultural and plurilingual competencies in the space that acknowledges a variety of languages (Candelier et al., 2010) with the focus on enhanc-

ing language use for communicative purposes rather than on the isolated development of language competencies (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020). Moreover, plurilingual approaches aim to bring together learners' previous linguistic experience of both their home language(s) (an immigrant language, minority language, national language) and the first foreign language (a national language or a second native if a learner is bilingual). As can be seen from this brief analysis, in order to embrace the multi-layered concept of plurilingualism, plurilingual approaches can be used for different teaching purposes in the classroom (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020). In our understanding, plurilingual approaches in the classroom may serve two main goals:

- to foster plurilingualism by means of creating plurilingual materials, transforming tasks, providing plurilingual assessment, etc.
- to use the learners' plurilingual repertoire to enhance language learning.

Numerous studies are dedicated to how learners' plurilingual repertoire can be effectively used as a resource in enhancing language learning (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018; Duarte & Kirsch, 2020). Making use of learners' repertoire can pursue different aims, namely, to develop a positive attitude to home languages and to linguistic diversity, as well as to utilize learners' plurilingual repertoire to foster language learning through raising language awareness.

One of the first analyses of plurilingual approaches was carried out in the FREPA/CAR-AP Framework of Reference for Pluralistic Approaches to Languages and Cultures (Candelier et al., 2010). The study aimed at creating the framework of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that can be developed by plurilingual approaches, among which such approaches as intercultural, language awareness/ awakening to languages, intercomprehension of related languages, and integrated didactic are suggested (Candelier et al., 2010). These approaches have been further researched and widely discussed in other studies (Celentin, 2020; Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Meißner, 2011). Later CLIL, immersion, and language comparison have been added to the list of plurilingual approaches (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018). The volume *Multilingual Approaches for Teaching and Learning* in Duarte & Kirsch's

edition (2020) presents studies on approaches that enhanced the structural inclusion of multiple languages in mainstream educational settings. The volume mainly elaborated on existing approaches, such as translanguaging, intercomprehension, and language comparison.

Different perspectives were used in order to implement plurilingual approaches into practice. In some studies, plurilingual approaches were implemented and researched separately from one another (Celentin, 2020; Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Meißner, 2011). These studies collected findings about the application of a certain approach in specific educational settings, which enabled the researchers to observe and analyse its advantages, drawbacks, and implementation details. Other studies were targeted at acknowledging the advantage of the application of the synergy of approaches (Candelier et al., 2010) coined as a holistic approach (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018; Duarte & Kirsch, 2020). A holistic approach is developed and analysed in a number of articles dedicated to the Netherlands' project *Holi-Frysk* that illustrated the implementation of the model based on the combination of the following approaches: language awareness, language comparison, receptive multilingualism, CLIL, and immersion (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020).

Numerous studies present successful implementation of definite plurilingual approaches at different education levels, i.e. in primary school (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Cutrim-Schmid, 2021), secondary school (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018; Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Cutrim-Schmid, 2021), tertiary education (Hurajová, 2015; Schmidt-Unterberger, 2018). In addition, plurilingual approaches can be applied for various studying purposes not necessarily related to multilingual/plurilingual education. For example, intercomprehension has been investigated as a way to teach foreign languages to students with special language needs (Celentin, 2020) and as a means to develop learners' autonomy (Meißner, 2011).

Mapping plurilingual approaches for the Ukrainian context

Such plurilingual approaches as language awareness, intercomprehension, immersion, and CLIL and their possible implementation in the Ukrainian context have been analyzed.

Language awareness can be approached from two perspectives. Firstly, language awareness is a cognitive function that develops through paying deliberate attention to the target language, enabling language learners to gradually realize how language works. Secondly, it can be viewed as a pedagogical approach applied to help learners gain insights into and about the language. The approach means that learners discover their own language (Bolitho et al., 2003). In this perspective, the approach helps to acquire knowledge about languages and their variety but not proficiency in the language (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020, p. 7).

Language awareness aims at fostering learners' understanding of four aspects of the language: socio-effective, linguistic and communicative, strategical, and interactional (as cited in Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018). Focusing on a language from a socio-effective perspective, learners develop the ability to reflect upon their own attitudes towards languages and motivation to learn languages. Managing linguistic and communicative repertoires results in the learners' capacity to manage their linguistic and communicative experience in new interaction situations. Understanding strategies that are useful in learning languages helps learners manage the process of language acquisition. Thus, through the analysis of the interactive processes, learners reflect upon and explore language contact situations (Duarte & Günther-van der Meij, 2018).

The advantages of the language awareness approach include fostering a positive attitude towards languages and language learning through language discovery and reflection on the language and the development of learners' metalinguistic knowledge. Moreover, in the most general sense language awareness advances self-directed learning by involving learners in making self-discovery and independent inferences about the language depending on their existing linguistic repertoire. Another significant advantage of language awareness is that unlike some other approaches (e.g. intercomprehension), it is applicable for teaching/learning of both typologically close and distant languages.

A language awareness approach can be applied with the aim to reinforce the status of the state language when Ukrainian is taught to minority language speakers. In addition, this

approach is suitable for promoting multiple foreign language learning. Language awareness is based on the learner's prior language knowledge and skills as well as on cognitive skills, such as generalization and hypothesizing, and learning strategies, such as compensation and substitution. Applying the language awareness approach, learners can become more aware of linguistic diversity and develop a motivation to explore and discover additional languages.

Intercomprehension is a plurilingual approach to teaching related languages where each participant understands the language of other participants. The approach offers communication modes when people communicate with each other using their own languages, thus establishing equality in the dialogue. Applying intercomprehension leads to participants' receptive competencies development (Celentin, 2020). The aim of the intercomprehension approach is to develop learners' ability to deduce the meaning of the words in related languages, using vocabulary they already know and following the rules of transition (Celentin, 2020).

The characteristic of intercomprehension to deal with two languages simultaneously brings a number of benefits to language learning and promotes multilingualism in the classroom. The strengths of applying intercomprehension in foreign language teaching as illustrated in the studies by Celentin (2020) and Meißner (2011) are: fostering autonomy and motivation, developing meta-strategic competence, and using compensation strategies. In light of this, intercomprehension in many ways aligns with other plurilingual approaches (cf. language awareness, immersion). However, the salient features of intercomprehension are the development of phonological awareness, dictionary and grammar competencies, and managing language anxiety due to the presence of L1 in learning an additional language.

Intercomprehension can serve as an effective approach for instructing Ukrainian to individuals whose native language differs from the national language but shares linguistic similarities with Ukrainian (such as Russian, Belarussian, Polish, etc.). Currently, there is a prevailing social and political inclination to encourage the active learning and use of Ukrainian among Russian-speaking citizens in Ukraine. Similarly, intercomprehension

is applicable for sustaining minority languages when the learners are allowed to use their mother tongue together with the national language in the classroom.

Immersion is an approach that boosts learners' foreign language knowledge and skills in bi(-multi)lingual language education (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Tedick et al., 2011). According to the US experience, immersion can take two forms. Firstly, in the case of a predominantly linguistically homogeneous population, an additional target language (such as English or German) can be introduced alongside the existing language. Conversely, in a linguistically diverse population, where multiple languages are already present in an immersion program, efforts are directed at the acceptance and utilization of the first languages of all children through the introduction of innovative curricula and teaching methods. These purposes determined three types of programs: 1) one-way (foreign language) immersion programs; 2) two-way (bilingual) immersion programs; 3) indigenous language immersion programs (Tedick et al., 2011).

Recognizing differences in applying immersion, the approach still has core features regardless of the programs, country, and aims. The application of immersion means using the target language to teach school subjects based on the curriculum identical to the local first language curriculum. Moreover, immersion is supposed to support development in all the learner's languages, therefore additive bilingualism occurs. Furthermore, the classroom culture needs to recognize the cultures of the diverse language communities to which the learners belong, including immigrant communities. Additionally, exposure to the immersion language is largely confined to the classroom where students have similar (limited or nonexistent) levels of proficiency in the immersion language (Bratož et al, n.d.).

Related literature analysis (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020; Tedick et al., 2011) shows that immersion as a multilingual approach carries a number of benefits. It initially aims at developing multilingualism and intercultural understanding whatever form it takes, it boosts language knowledge and skills through regular language practice. Besides, it can be applied to preserve endangered languages. On the other hand, it receives critics as it leads to 'language separation pedagogies'

(Duarte & Kirsch, 2020) which is in contrast with the research that repeatedly demonstrates the importance of using all language resources of plurilingual learners in optimizing learning (Duarte & Kirsch, 2020).

Immersion is recognized as an effective approach for supporting minority languages in various educational settings, such as schools where the minority language is used as the language of instruction. Additionally, immersion can play a crucial role in preserving endangered languages, making it a recommended strategy in the Ukrainian language education context as well.

CLIL is an umbrella term referring to various activities (as cited in Coyle, 2007, p. 545). CLIL fosters an environment that encourages multilingualism / plurilingualism, as students are taught content subjects using two or more languages, aiming to advance in both subject knowledge and proficiency in a foreign language or languages (Hurajová, 2015).

The approach has been studied in numerous theoretical articles (Coyle, 2007; De Zarobe, 2013; Hurajová, 2015;) and has a variety of implementation forms: at secondary school (Moore & Lorenzo, 2015), and at tertiary education (Hurajová, 2015; Schmidt-Unterberger, 2018). CLIL has become a research focus of many projects and studying platforms: Integrating of Content and Language in Higher Education Association (ICLHE) founded in 2010, LANQUA project 2007 – 2010 – Language Network for Quality Assurance funded by the Lifelong Learning Erasmus Network of the European Union motivated cooperation between 60 partner institutions (Hurajová, 2015).

According to Coyle (2007) and De Zarobe, (2013), CLIL proves to have a number of benefits. Since students are supposed to practice the language they are learning in communication from the very beginning, the motivation is developed. Consequently, constant practice leads to raising learners' linguistic competence and confidence. Providing students with topics close to their school life enhances problem-solving skills and encourages spontaneous communication in discussions the content-relevant ideas. CLIL tends to enable students to learn 'through the language rather than in the language' (Coyle, 2007), promoting the shift to a student-centered study environment.

Obviously, the analysis of CLIL and immersion as pluralistic approaches (Bratož et al, n.d.) revealed that they share common characteristics. The most visible common feature of both approaches is a more prominent focus on content transmitted through the language than on the language forms and structures. In contrast to immersion, CLIL is extensively used at 'regular' state schools. Also, within CLIL the time spent on learning a target language is typically more restricted than in an immersion class. CLIL traditionally refers to teaching non-language subjects whereas immersion initially targets at fostering languages. However, a CLIL lesson offers class time to specifically work on language learning. CLIL programmes may also present target language classes as a separate subject while immersion uses language for subject learning without any additional focus on vocabulary or grammar.

The CLIL methodology has already been incorporated into the Ukrainian education system with the aim to promote foreign language learning. Its extensive use can enhance language learning through content, fostering language learning strategies, enhancing receptive and productive skills in foreign languages, and increasing students' motivation and autonomy.

Conclusion

The key purpose of this study was to analyze multilingualism/ plurilingualism in society and educational settings in Ukraine. The research focused on the differentiation of the terms multilingualism and plurilingualism relying on the CEFR view. According to the Council of Europe (2001), multilingualism is understood as the presence of diverse languages within a specific society or geographic region, representing its linguistic diversity. On the other hand, plurilingualism as 'the repertoire of varieties of language' (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 8) is seen from the perspective of an individual (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 8). Consequently, speaking about education and foreign language teaching in particular, the promotion of plurilingualism can be seen as a response from a diverse society. Plurilingualism in the educational setting emphasizes the importance of establishing the connections between languages by creating an educational environment that recognizes the interplay between the languages and acknowledges the diverse communicative

practices. Promoting plurilingualism involves a change in perspective, shifting from viewing language as a static code to perceiving it as an active practice.

The analysis of plurilingual approaches in the Ukrainian context considers their characteristics and implementation details which has led the authors to the conclusion that plurilingual approaches can bring about changes in multilingual education in Ukraine. Aligning them with three perspectives of plurilingualism (reinforcing the status of the state language, sustaining minority languages, and promoting foreign language learning), has revealed that intercomprehension and language awareness can integrate minority language speakers into the national educational system, while immersion supports minority language sustainability. CLIL and intercomprehension can also contribute to sustaining minority languages. Additionally, CLIL and immersion play a significant role in developing plurilingualism in foreign language teaching and learning.

Examining various interpretations of multilingualism and plurilingualism and the language policy documents and researching methods to enhance learners' plurilingual abilities can potentially enhance the training of multilingual teachers. This process will help teachers recognize the linguistic assets of their students and familiarize themselves with strategies that foster the development of (multi)plurilingualism.

References

- About Ethnic Minorities in Ukraine. No. 2494-XII. (1992, June 25). <https://cis-legislation.com/document.fwx?rgn=16949>
- About the Principles of State Language Policy. No. 5029-VI. (2012, July 3). <https://cis-legislation.com/document.fwx?rgn=53865http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/5029-17>.
- About Supporting the Functioning of the Ukrainian Language as the State Language. No. 2704-VIII. (2019, April 25). On Supporting the Funct... | on April 25, 2019 № 2704-VIII (rada.gov.ua)
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Beacco, J.-C., & Byram, M. (2007). Data and methods for the development of language education policies. *Part 2 of the guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division.
- Beacon, J.-C., Byram, M., Cavalli, M., Coste, D., Cuenat, M. E., Goullier, F. & Panthier, J. (2016). *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*. Council of Europe.
- Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanič, R., Masuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Ten questions about language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 251-259. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.3.251>
- Bratož, S., Cagol, M., Consalvo, G., Dozza, L., Hutz, M., Kallas, K., Kocbek, A., Mastellotto L., Pirih, A., Säälük, U., Zanin, R., & Zefran, M. (n.d.). Language immersion and CLIL. *Multilingual Education*. <https://sisu.ut.ee/multilingual/book/1-multilingual-education>
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2), 77–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Candelier, M., Camilleri-Grima, A., Castellotti, V., de Pietro, J.-F., Lorincz, I., Meissner, F.-J., Schroder-Sura, A., & Noguerol, A. (2010). *FRE-PA/CARAP: Framework of reference for pluralistic approaches to languages and cultures*. Council of Europe
- Celentin, P. (2020). An intercomprehension-based approach and teaching method accessible to students with SLN (specific language needs): A first exploration of the points of convergence. *Italiano LinguaDue*, 12(2), 443-457. <https://doi.org/10.13130/2037-3597/15090>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Multilingual education. Between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chalhoub-Deville, M. B. (2019). Multilingual testing constructs: Theoretical foundations. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 16(4/5), 472–480.
- Chernychko, S. (2009). Napryamky movnoyi osvity Ukrayiny i uhorskomovna osvita na Zakarpatti [Language education in Ukraine and Hungarian-language education in Transcarpathia]. *Acta Beregsasiensis*, 2, 97-106.
- Commission of the European Communities [CEC]. (1995). *White Paper on education and*

training, teaching and learning: Towards the learning society. CEC. In Ukr.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR)*. Council of Europe.

Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages (CEFR): Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe. www.coe.int/lang-cefr.

Council of Europe Language Policy Division [CoELPD]. (2008-2011). *Language education policy profile. Ukraine*. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/language-education-policy-profile-ukraine/16807b3c3a>.

Coyle, D. (2007). Content and language integrated learning: Towards a connected research agenda for CLIL pedagogies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 543-562. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb459.0>

Cutrim-Schmid, E. (2021). 'I think it's boring if you now only speak English': Enhancing learner investment in EFL learning through the use of plurilingual tasks. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(1), 67-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1868476>

De Angelis, G. & Selinker, L. (2001). Interlanguage transfer and competing linguistic systems. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 42-58). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-004>

De Zarobe, Y. R. (2013). CLIL implementation: From policy-makers to individual initiatives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(3), 231-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777383>

Duarte, J. & Günther-van der Meij, M. (2018). A holistic model for multilingualism in education. *EuroAmerican Journal of Applied Linguistics and Languages*, 5(2), 24-43. <https://doi.org/10.21283/2376905X.9.153>

Duarte, J. & Kirsch, C. (Eds.). (2020). *Multilingual approaches for teaching and learning. From acknowledging to capitalising on multilingualism in European mainstream education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429059674>

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., & Slavick, J. (2021). Teaching (bi)multilingual learners: Con-

necting languages. *The Reading Teacher*, 75(3), 363-371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2044>

European Charter for Regional languages or minority languages. (1992). <https://bit.ly/3XwZf43>

Extra, G. & Yağmur, K. (Eds.). (2012). *Language rich Europe: Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe*. Cambridge University Press on behalf of the British Council.

Hufeisen, B. (1998). L3-Stand der Forschung-Was bleibt zu tun? In B. Hufeisen, & B. Lindemann (Eds.), *Tertiärsprachen. Theorien, Modelle, Methoden* (pp. 169-183). Stauffenberg.

Hurajová, L. (2015). Tertiary CLIL. In S. Pokrivčáková (Ed.), *CLIL in foreign language education: E-textbook for foreign language teachers* (pp. 85-98). Constantine the Philosopher University. <https://doi.org/10.17846/CLIL.2015.85>

Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 15-56. Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004739>

Meißner, F.-J. (2011). Teaching and learning intercomprehension: A way to plurilingualism and learner autonomy. In I. de Florio-Hansen (Ed.), *Towards multilingualism and the inclusion of cultural diversity* (pp. 37-58). Kassel University Press.

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. (2019). *Kontseptualni zasady derzhavnoyi polityky shchodo rozvytku anhliys'koyi movy u sferi vyshchoyi osvity* [Policy on English for Universities]. (in Ukr.). <https://bit.ly/3NlfQ0j>

Moore, P., & Lorenzo, F. (2015). Task-based learning and content and language integrated learning materials design: process and product. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(3), 334-357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1053282>

Myklevold, G-A. (2022). *Multilingualism in mainstream language education in Norway: Perceptions and operationalizations*. [Doctoral dissertations at the University of South-Eastern Norway no. 146, Norway].

Nikolaenko, S.M. (2004). *Education and science: Legislative and methodological foundations*. Kyiv Politekhnik.

Nikolska, N. & Pershukova, O. (2020). Development of multilingual education in Ukraine. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 75. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20207501004>.

Panasiuk, Y.V. (2017). Multilingualism v ukrainskomu suspilstvi [Multilingualism in the

Ukrainian society]. *Research Journal of Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University. Series «Philology» (Linguistics)*, 2(8), 37-40. In Ukr.

Piccardo, E., Germain-Rutherford, A., & Lawrence, G. (2022). An introduction to plurilingualism and this handbook. In E. Piccardo, A. Germain-Rutherford & G. Lawrence [Eds.] *The Routledge handbook of plurilingual language education* (pp. 1-14). Routledge. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9781351002783-1>

Schissel, L. J., Leung, C. & Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2019). The construct of multilingualism in language testing. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 16(4/5), 373-378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1680679>

Schmidt-Unterberger, B. (2018). The English-medium paradigm: A conceptualisation of English-medium teaching in higher education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(5), 527-539. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491949>

Slavin, R. E. (1986). Best-Evidence Synthesis: An Alternative to Meta-Analytic and Traditional Reviews. *Educational Researcher*, 15(9), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015009005>

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1989). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. *Estudios Fronterizos*, 8(18-19), 36-67.

Tedick, D.J., Christian, D., & Fortune T.W. (Eds.). (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2012.704481>

The Constitution of Ukraine. (1996). <https://web.archive.org/web/20110521190059/http://www.rada.gov.ua/const/conengl.htm>

Trinki, M. & Krevelj, S.L. (2020). Multilingualism in English language classrooms: Can we think outside the box? In R. Geld & S.L. Krevelj (Eds.) *Conference UZRT: Empirical Studies in Applied Linguistics, 2018*, 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.17234/UZRT.2018.7>

Yakovleva, O.V. (2015). *Bahatomovnist ukrayinskoho suspilstva yak rehulyatyvnyy faktor osvity i vykhovannya v systemi vyshchyykh navchalnykh zakladiv u konteksti svitovoho dosvidu. [Multilingualism of Ukrainian society as a regulatory factor of education and upbringing in higher educational institutions in the context of world experience]* [Doctoral Dissertation. National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Kyiv, Ukraine]. In Ukr.

Zabolotna, O., Shchudlo, S., Medina, T., Panchenko, E., & Kozlov, D. (2019). Teaching Ukrainian as a non-native language to national minorities in Ukraine: Challenges for evidence-based educational policies. *Advanced Education, Special Issue 11*, 60-67. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.164167>.

БАГАТОМОВНІСТЬ У СУСПІЛЬСТВІ ТА ОСВІТНЬОМУ ПРОСТОРИ УКРАЇНИ

Мар'яна Нацюк (Україна-Німеччина),
Вікторія Осідак (Україна-Німеччина)

Анотація

Постановка проблеми. Багатомовність стала реальністю у багатьох частинах світу в результаті глобалізаційних та демографічних зсувів у бік багатомовних спільнот. Враховуючи необхідність реагувати на соціальні зміни в освітньому просторі, цілі мовної політики Ради Європи орієнтовані на багатомовні та багатокультурні групи студентів (Council of Europe, 2020). Мова розглядається як інструмент безперервної освіти та є однією середовищем досягнення соціальної справедливості (Commission of the European Communities [CEC], 1995, с. 13). Відповідно, одним із головних завдань мовної політики Європейського Союзу є оволодіння двома європейськими мовами на додаток до рідної з метою просування багатомовної ідентичності та сприяння взаєморозумінню між представниками різних мов та культур (CEC, 1995). Таким чином, усі держави-члени європейської спільноти зосереджуються на дослідженні мовного розмаїття та вивченні кількох мов.

Мета статті. У цій статті автори пропонують тематичний аналіз літератури з проблеми багатомовності у навчанні з метою визначення концептуальних основ дослідження в рамках проекту «Багатомовна освіта – погляд з позиції Загальноєвропейських рекомендацій з мовної освіти та оцінювання», який отримав фінансування від Фондації Фольксваген (Хейдельберг, 2022).

Методологія дослідження. Для досягнення поставленої мети автори використали метод тематичного аналізу вибраних джерел, який зазвичай застосовується для критичного вивчення змісту наукових досліджень та здійснення тематичного огляду літератури (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Такий підхід передбачає критичне читання статей, порівняння та зіставлення результатів та оцінювання висновків і, нарешті, інтегрування узагальнень в практичні рекомендації (Slavin, 1986). Загальноєвропейські рекомендації з мовної освіти та оцінювання (Council of Europe, 2001) і Доповнення до Рекомендацій (Council of Europe, 2020) стали наріжними каменями під час тематичного аналізу літератури з теми дослідження.

Результати дослідження та їх обговорення. У цій статті автори визначили ключові терміни дослідження, на які буде використано впродовж усієї пошукової роботи у рамках проекту. Крім того, проаналізовано засади багатомовності в українському контексті, враховуючи соціокультурні реалії та мовну освітню політику. Визначено цілі багатомовної освіти, зокрема в українському навчальному просторі та підходи, які можна застосувати для включення багатомовної перспективи у викладання мов, визначено теоретичні засади дослідження мультлінгвізму та плюрилінгвізму. Аналіз літератури з багатомовності має практичне втілення в організації професійного вдосконалення вчителів, які можуть ознайомитися з підходами, які сприяють формуванню багатомовності студентів.

Ключові слова: Загальноєвропейські рекомендації з мовної освіти та оцінювання, багатомовність, плюрилінгвізм, український контекст, підходи до навчання багатомовності, тематичний аналіз літератури.

BIOS:

Maryana Natsiuk, a PhD holder in Education, lecturer at Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Department of English Philology and Methods of Teaching, UALTA member. Currently, she is a research fellow at Heidelberg University of Education, Germany. Her scientific interests include teaching EFL, innovative methods of teaching foreign languages, teaching culture, multilingualism.

Email: nymaryana@gmail.com

Viktoriya Osidak, a PhD holder in Education, is an Associate Professor at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine, UALTA member. Currently, she is a research fellow at Heidelberg University of Education, Germany. She has authored numerous publications, with an emphasis on alternative assessment strategies to enhance L2 learning and teaching. Her research interests lie within TEFL and Language Testing and Assessment, Plurilingual teaching and assessment.

Email: viktoriya_osidak@ukr.net