IAIMTE Educational Linguistics SIG meeting

Literacy and Teaching Writing in a Multilingual Environment

April, 25-26, 2014
IAIMTE Educational Linguistics SIG meeting
LITERACY AND TEACHING WRITING IN A MULTILINGUAL ENVIRONMENT
April, 25-26, 2014

joined with

The 13th International Spring Conference of the Estonian Association of Applied Linguistics
LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION IN THE MOBILE WORLD
April, 24-25, 2014
IAIMTE EL-SIG PROGRAMME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-conference EAAL events</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, April 24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(within EAAL spring conference)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16:45–17:40</strong> Plenary session: prof. Gert Rijlaarsdam (Amsterdam/Antwerpen), Teaching Writing in L1 secondary education: Learning to write, and writing to learn</td>
<td>Institute of the Estonian Language, Roosikrantsi 6 (2nd=3rd floor Hall)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IAIMTE SIG-meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAIMTE SIG-meeting</th>
<th>Tallinn University, Astra Building, Narva Rd 29</th>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>15:30–16:00 Coffee break</td>
<td>Astra Building, Atrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16:00–16:55</strong> Plenary session: prof. Marilyn Martin-Jones (Birmingham), Ethnography of literacy as a lens on language policy and practice in multilingual settings</td>
<td>Astra Building, European Hall A222 (0=1st floor), Narva Rd 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–18:15 <strong>POSTER SESSION 2</strong> with discussion (see abstract-book)</td>
<td>Astra Building, room A447 (3rd=4th floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 IAIMTE conference dinner (information on tickets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Saturday, April 26

| 10:15 **Round table**: practical issues of teaching languages and language planning in multilingual environment | Silva Building, room S240 (1st=2nd fl), Narva Rd 29 |
| 12–13 **Closing. Final reception** | Silva Building, room S240 |

---

1 The 13th EAAL spring conference program can be found at http://www.rakenduslingvistika.ee/v02/index.php?view=content&id=2 (see links right)
2 All plenary sessions (events marked with gray background) are open for everybody.
3 In Estonia, floors are marked as 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. without 0-floor, i.e. in all elevators, you should choose the last number mentioned.
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Plenary sessions

**EAAL. April, 24 at 16:45–17:40 (IEL hall, 2nd fl, Roosikrantsi 6)**

Professor Gert Rijlaarsdam (Universiteit van Amsterdam/Universiteit Antwerpen), *Teaching Writing in L1 secondary education: Learning to write, and writing to learn*

In this presentation I will share some lessons we learnt from research in the Netherlands in secondary education. One lesson we learnt is that students sometimes learn more from observation than from exercises: observing how other students write their text has more effect than writing the text themselves. Another lesson is that observing the effect of a text on the reader has a large effect on student’s genre knowledge and writing performance. We also learnt that the effect of instruction is different for students with different writing styles: some students prefer to make a scheme for writing; other students need to write for a certain period of time to explore what they think: they need the act of writing for thinking.

The last element I like to share what the act of writing contributes to learning in project work: what helps understanding the topic better, and preparing an oral presentation or writing a text?

**IAIMTE/EEAL. April, 25 at 11:05–12 (TlnU Astra Building, European Hall, A222, Narva Rd 29)**

Professor Jan H. Hulstijn (University of Amsterdam), *The basic language cognition – higher language cognition (BLC-HLC) theory of language proficiency in native and non-native speakers*

In this talk I will present an updated version of the BLC-HLC theory of language proficiency (Hulstijn 2011). The theory makes a distinction between Basic Language Cognition and Higher Language Cognition. BLC is restricted to language knowledge in the oral domain that is shared by all adult native speakers not affected by language-related disorders. HLC is the complement of BLC, including the use of oral and written language (literacy), exhibiting large individual differences. The theory offers an instrument for the understanding of individual differences in attained levels of L1 and L2 proficiency and various types of bilingualism.


**IAIMTE/EEAL. April, 25 at 16–16:55 (TlnU Astra Building, European Hall, A222, Narva Rd 29)**

Professor Marilyn Martin-Jones (MOSAIC Centre for Research on Multilingualism, School of Education, University of Birmingham), *Ethnography of literacy as a lens on language policy and practice in multilingual settings*

The talk will be illustrated with reference to research carried out in Wales; it will emphasise that the research approach can also be applied to research in multilingual settings and to linguistic diversity in the wider context of globalization.4

**IAIMTE. April, 26 at 10:15-13 (Silva Building room S240, Narva Rd 29)**

Round table: *Literacy and teaching first, second, or foreign language writing in multilingual environment*

Closing. Reception

---

4 See the abstract on p. 6.
# Opening & poster sessions. April, the 25th. TlnU Astra Building (Narva Rd 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-10:30</td>
<td>A447</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Krista Kerge, Tallinn University (Estonia)</td>
<td>Literacy and responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10.30 Coffee break; 11.05 PLENARY session: 12-13.45 LUNCHTIME** (see pp 2-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>A447</td>
<td>Poster session 1: TOWARDS LITERACY</td>
<td>Jenni Alisaari &amp; Elina Kouki, University of Turku (Finland)</td>
<td>Letters to my teacher: Approving academic writing skills of multilingual teachers in Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elżbieta Awramiuk, University of Białystok (Poland)</td>
<td>Invented Spelling: A window on early literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Krista Uibu &amp; Maile Timm, University of Tartu (Estonia)</td>
<td>Word semantics and text comprehension at basic school: Results of a longitudinal study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kadri Sõrmus, Maigi Vija &amp; Kersti Lepajõe, University of Tartu (Estonia)</td>
<td>Estonian student text corpus EMMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brigitte Marin, University East Creteil Paris (France)</td>
<td>Literacy development in two different linguistic situations: How do French students learn how to write in their mother tongue and in a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Krista Kerge, Hille Pajupuu, Pilvi Alp &amp; Halliki Põlda, Tallinn University &amp; Institute of the Estonian Language (Estonia)</td>
<td>What is different in acquisition of the written Estonian as L1 and L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-15:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on language and literacy objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**15.30 Coffee break; 16.00 PLENARY session** (see pp 2-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>A447</td>
<td>Poster session 2: Methods towards diverse and multilingual education</td>
<td>Katri Karasma, University of Helsinki (Finland)</td>
<td>The sentences pupils write when using action grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helin Puksand, Tallinn University (Estonia)</td>
<td>Good reader in Estonian adolescents' estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katri Karasma, University of Helsinki (Finland) &amp; Mare Müürsepp, Tallinn University (Estonia)</td>
<td>Reception of fantasy in multicultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulo Feytor Pinto, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal (Portugal)</td>
<td>Chinese culture promoting writing in a multilingual Portuguese L1 class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-18:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on diverse literacy resources and multilingual classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20:00 Conference dinner

**DISCUSSION DAY** April, 26 at 10.00 – Silva Building (Narva Rd 29), room S240, 1st floor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Round table: Literacy and teaching first, second, or foreign language writing in multilingual environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Closing. Final reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACTS

Marilyn Martin-Jones

Ethnography of literacy as a lens on language policy and practice in multilingual settings: insights from a research project in Wales

Much has been written, of late, about the multi-layered and processual nature of language policy-making (e.g. Hornberger and Johnson, 2007; McCarty, 2011; Johnson, 2009 and 2013). Hornberger and Johnson (2007) demonstrated, with compelling attention to detail, why the study of language policy ‘on paper’ (i.e. discourse analysis of policy documents) needs to be combined with ethnography so as to provide a fuller picture of the complex and situated ways in which language policy-making unfolds. As they put it:

An ethnography of language policy can include textual and historical analyses of policy texts but must be based on an ethnographic understanding of some local context. The texts are nothing without the human agents who act as interpretive conduits between the language policy levels (Hornberger and Johnson, 2007: 528).

In this presentation, I will give an account of an ethnographic research project, focusing on literacy, which was carried out in one particular language policy context - that of the development of bilingual education, in Welsh and English, for students in the post-16 sector in Wales – and I will describe some of the ways in which we designed the research project so as to gain insights into different dimensions of the language policy processes at work in this particular context.

The last decade or so has seen significant shifts in language policy in Wales, in the wake of political devolution. The Welsh Government had made considerable commitments ‘on paper’ to the expansion of bilingual vocational education for young adults, as a route into bilingual workplaces. Yet, the processes of policy implementation in different educational sites have been uneven in nature and educational practitioners and their students still face considerable difficulties as they attempt to create “implementational spaces” (Hornberger and Johnson, 2007) for bilingual and Welsh-medium education. We wanted to gain insights into the specific nature of these difficulties, into the constraints on policy implementation and into the ways in which the constraints were being navigated locally.

Our research project was based in one Further Education college in North Wales where bilingual vocational education was being developed in curriculum areas such as Agriculture and Early Years Child Care. The main research participants were two college tutors and the students enrolled in their classes: 28 students in all. The ethnographic work had three main dimensions:

1. Research into the wider policy context and into the ways in which the policy was being implemented within the college. This involved the gathering of policy documents, internet-based research and interviews with key local social actors, such as the Director of the college, and others with a key role in interpreting and appropriating the terms of the bilingual education policy within the college.

2. Research with the two college tutors, focusing on the ways in which they interpreted and appropriated the policy within their area of the curriculum, on the textual resources available to them, on the specific pedagogic strategies they employed for putting bilingual vocational

This project was entitled: “Bilingual literacies for learning in Further Education” (Dwyeithrywydd a llythrenned mewn Addysg Bellach). It was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (2005-7) under its Teaching and Learning Research Programme. The members of the research team were: Marilyn Martin-Jones (Principal investigator), Roz Ivanič, Daniel Chandler, Buddug Hughes, Beryl Davies, Margaret Lewis and Anwen Williams.
education into classroom practice and on the nature of the literacy practices, in Welsh and English, that recurred within the weekly routines of classroom life. The teachers kept a log of the bilingual materials they used in class and we conducted consecutive interviews with them (about these materials and about the wider policy issues). We also conducted classroom observations.

(3.) Multi-site research with the students, moving from their college classes to their different worlds of literacy (at home and at work) and documenting the range of literacy practices they engaged in and the types of texts they used and produced (on paper and on screen). The students kept literacy diaries and we carried out diary-based interviews with all of them. We then asked a smaller group of students to take photographs of particular literacy events in their lives and conducted photo-based interviews with these students. We also carried out observations in some of their workplaces.

The specific methodological challenges we faced in this research included: (1.) Designing and carrying out a research project using two languages (Welsh and English). (2.) Developing dialogic approaches to the gathering of data with a view to gleaning ethnographic insights into the emic perspectives of participants. (3.) Defining the scope of the multi-site ethnography. These challenges will be illustrated with reference to different stages of the research.

References


During the last decade, the amount of immigrant children has increased at Finnish schools. National Finnish teacher education is in front of new demands, because there is a need for multilingual teachers. According to the Ministry of Education and Culture, professional teachers who come from other countries and have another mother tongue than Finnish must apply for a special teacher education at the university in Finland and also reach a certain level of Finnish language before they can work as teachers. In this paper we describe observations about a pedagogical approach carried out at the University of Turku on a unique course constructed for multilingual teacher students. It is an experiment to find concrete pedagogical tools for the development of multilingual teacher students’ academic writing skills. The method of teaching in this experimental project is journal writing. According to former research, journal writing could develop writing skills holistically, because the student writes about his/her personal life or the topics of personal interest. The aim of this research is to find out by content analysis of the written journals, if the personal feedback and individual scaffolding supports students’ development of academic language proficiency and give them tools to face academic tasks. Furthermore, it is possible to monitor, if the contribution of the unique writing course develops multilingual student teachers’ academic communication skills in Finnish better than the former methods of teaching academic writing. Preliminary results indicate that the writing skills of the students increase remarkably during the experiment. Teacher students experience that the journal writing helps them to improve their academic writing skills because they are allowed to write about their personal life and hence discuss also their identity. The relationship between the teacher students and the supervisors seems to change during the writing process from traditional teacher–student composition to collegial and professional discussion about teacher’s work and pedagogical questions. The results of this study suggest that journal writing as a method enhances student’s individual language repertoires, language awareness and holistic linguistic identity.
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Elżbieta Awramiuk

INVENTED SPELLING – A WINDOW ON EARLY LITERACY

Invented spelling means the writing produced by young children (aged 3–7) before they are formally taught reading and writing or are at the beginning of the learning process. Their writing is more spontaneous than learnt. Children’s early writing provides a window on their conceptualization of the written language, illustrating the process of developing language awareness and spelling skills. Invented spelling, together with phonological abilities and letter knowledge is considered to be a strong predictor for later literacy skills. The studies analysed linguistic conditioning for early literacy, showing how the way children are introduced to the world of sounds and letters influences their thinking about written language and their ability to write (Martins, 2007; Pasa and Morin, 2007; Senechal, Ouellette, Pagan and Lever, 2012).

This study presents some results of research on Polish invented spelling, describes an investigation of the development of early literacy and one of the factors influencing it – teaching method. The purpose is to describe the types of errors made by young Polish-speaking children (247 Polish children, at the beginning of formal reading instruction, aged 6-7). The task involved writing 12 words, which were characterized by a simple structure and a consistent relation between a grapheme and phoneme. The words were grouped in four series, which tested the manner of writing four sounds in different phonological environments.

The results indicate that the most common errors involves letter omissions and are caused by problems with phonological segmentation, especially the sequence Cy. A comparison of two characteristic misspellings: Polish children (RBA ‘ryba’ – fish) and English children (HLP ‘help’) show that the ways of access to literacy (teaching the name of letters vs. phonological training) have a fundamental significance to preschoolers’ conception of the grapheme-phoneme correspondences.

Keywords: applied linguistics, early spelling development, errors analysis, invented spelling

References


Word semantics and text comprehension at basic school: Results of a longitudinal study

Word semantics is strongly related to the text comprehension (Häkkinen, 2007). The international comprehensive research PISA and official national academic placement tests assure that students have problems in word recognition as well as in text comprehension (Henno et al., 2007, OECD, 2013, Puksand et al., 2010). The aim of the present study was to find out the extent in student word recognition and text comprehension in the first and second stage of basic school. The longitudinal study was conducted in three consecutive years from Grades 3 to 5. Students’ competences were measured in the lower-level and higher-level text comprehension tasks as well as in the vocabulary task. The students, who had better word recognition skills, had also better text comprehension skills. In addition, girls outperformed boys in three consecutive years in word recognition and in the higher-level text comprehension task. The girls’ knowledge was also better in previously learned words. To support students’ word semantics and text comprehension skills at first and second stages of basic school, it is necessary to take into consideration their gender and developmental peculiarities.

Keywords: word semantics, text comprehension, gender differences, longitudinal study
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Kadri Sõrmus, Maigi Vija & Kersti Lepajõe

Estonian student text corpus EMMA

The presentation provides an overview of what makes EMMA, a corpus of Estonian native-speaking high school students’ texts, different from other language corpora. We also present the principles of collecting the corpus, its objectives, possible areas of application, and development plans.

The first stage of the Estonian native-speaking students’ language corpus consists of national essays written from 1998-2014. The sample includes essays from six years, i.e. 3,000 texts (500 per year). The main focus of the present stage of collecting the corpus is entering the national essays into the corpus, creating access to it, and developing a functional user interface. The development plan includes adding to the corpus also other texts whose aim, conditions, time or genre of writing are different (e.g., research papers, responses to questions, competition papers, essays written by the same students at the end of primary school).
school, etc.). The development of the corpus is based on the principles of D. Biber, S. Hunston, U. Römer, R. Reppen, etc.

The objective of gathering texts of Estonian native-speaking students is to improve the possibilities of researching change in language use and the special characteristics of texts written by students. The presentation includes an analysis of possible effects and benefits of corpora-based approach to student texts in context of general writing skills.

References

Brigitte Marin

Literacy development in two different linguistic situations: How do French students learn how to write in their mother tongue and in a foreign language

This preliminary study led in France, in the Parisian suburb, is based on a comparison between the different ways teachers teach literacy in France. It concerns the teaching of written language such as it is proposed to students aged 11-13 in two contexts, in mother tongue and in foreign language – English (Wyse, Jones, Bradford, and Wolpert, 2013). This study lays on answers to questionnaires performed by twenty novice teachers. We have asked these teachers to specify what they are expecting from the passage to written language and the way they assess it, as well as the criteria which they establish to evaluate students’ writings.

The first results show that the requirements are more often linguistic while teaching a foreign language, whereas in situation of apprenticeship of the writing in mother tongue, they highlight the relation with the construction of the literacy skills. It permits to describe what learners need to know to be effective language users and the role of vocabulary (Nation, 2001). The process of writing is supposed to develop thought and cognitive-linguistic capacities (Olson, 1998) which increase through the “putting in words”.

Keywords: Literacy, written language, vocabulary
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Krista Kerge, Hille Pajupuu, Pilvi Alp & Halliki Põlda

**What is different in acquisition of the written Estonian as L1 and L2**

Lexical proficiency is an important factor of mastering writing on the level that makes it possible to freely manage with different types of content and text. This is a skill usually characteristic of a highly educated user of the language. Let us call it a benchmark to be striven for. Our interest is how can this benchmark be attained in the official national language if the society is multicultural, i.e. for many people, the official language is a second language.

Thus we investigated how this benchmark of educated Estonian writing is approached by students of grades 5, 7, 9, and 11, whose mother tongue (L1) is Estonian as the official national language, and by Russians with a certificated Estonian (L2) proficiency of CEFR levels A2, B1, B2, or C1. The research material consisted of creative writings on themes customized to age and CEFR level: 159 by L1-Estonian students; 64 by L2-Estonian speakers on a certain certificated level, see Table 1.

The analysis was focused on four lexical aspects: vocabulary range (the percentage of words in a text belonging to different frequency levels (Laufer and Nation, 1995)), general lexical diversity (G=types /\(\sqrt{\text{tokens}}\) (e.g., Verspoor, Schmid & Xu, 2012)), diversity of rare words (AG=advanced types /\(\sqrt{\text{tokens}}\), (Daller, Van Hout & Treffers-Daller, 2003, cf. Tidball & Treffers-Daller, 2007)), lexical sophistication (LS=advanced tokens *100 / total number of tokens (Laufer & Nation, 1995)). The reference values have been obtained from social essays written by non-philologist employees (L1 Estonian) working in positions requiring higher education (Pajupuu, Kerge, Meister, Asu & Alp, 2010).

Table 1. Tokens (N) and types (V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Estonian as L1 (by grade)</th>
<th>Estonian as L2 (by proficiency level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N V</td>
<td>N V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>272 164</td>
<td>85 50 149 93 301 135 378 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>162 103</td>
<td>50 36 130 76 276 118 336 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>147 93 131 90 227 157 253 189</td>
<td>41 29 122 71 221 101 270 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>137 74 120 74 143 106 228 169</td>
<td>36 25 102 59 191 94 259 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>79 49 104 61 81 67 154 121</td>
<td>31 23 81 48 160 84 236 110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results demonstrated a gradual approach to the benchmark in the lexical skills of both L1 and L2 test groups (cf. Alp, Kerge, & Pajupuu, 2013, Kerge, Uusen, & Põlda, 2014). There were no significant differences between the groups in general diversity, but sophisticated vocabulary revealed a significant difference between upper secondary students (L1, grade 11) and proficient L2 users (C1): for the L2 group both indices AG and LS appeared far lower than the benchmark, being lower than those of the L1 speakers attending grade 9. cf. Figures 1-3.

Consequently, a year before graduating from upper secondary school, the vocabulary of L1-Estonian speakers is sufficiently close to educated language use, enabling them to go to work or further their education. As for L2-Estonian speakers, however, their lack of sophisticated vocabulary may prevent them not only from competing for positions requiring higher education on an equal footing, but from being an active citizen and fulfilling their cultural needs.
Figure 1. General diversity by grade (L1) and by proficiency level (L2)

Figure 2. Diversity of sophisticated words by grade (L1) and by proficiency level (L2)

Figure 3. Lexical sophistication by grade (L1) and by proficiency level (L2)
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Poster session 2:

METHODS TOWARDS DIVERSE AND MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

Katri Karasma

The sentences pupils write when using action grammar

We have used action grammar in Finland since year 2008 when we got positive results from it and invited what it is. We organized an experimental research using in two classes the traditional grammar. We could call it Setälä's grammar after the most famous linguist in Finland Emil Nestor Setälä. One class had no grammar during the first semester. The experimental classes (two classes in grade 7) had new grammar. They used drama methods. The classes had pre- and post-tests. Their attitudes and learning was measured. The results were encouraging. In the experimental group the grammar became interesting and nice. In the traditional classes the grammar was boring. (Sarmavuori 2009-10, Sarmavuori & Maunu 2011, Maunu 2010-13.)

I was as a substitute teacher in a class where the teacher uses action grammar. I had to teach the predicate complement. The class was grade 8 in a comprehensive school in Espoo (Finland). There were 19 pupils. We made as an exercise The Youth Coffeehouse. We took three pupils into the front of the class. They were the young, the father and the teacher. They had to discuss the young person's difficulties. Before that every pupil wrote a sentence using a predicate complement. The sentences were on the table and everybody (the young, father and teacher) took one piece of paper and read it.

It was funny to hear the sentences. The sentences were their own and not loose sentences from the text book.

The problems: What kind of sentences do pupils write? How many of them are right? Are there wrong sentences and how are they like?

In the grade 7 the pupils have learnt parts of speech. The action grammar was very suitable for them. Also in grade 8 when they learn syntax, the action grammar is very useful. The pupils learn grammar, they learn to write grammatical sentences, they learn to improvise and they learn to be in a group.
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Good reader in Estonian adolescents' estimation

Different authors describe ‘good reader’ as ‘advanced reader’ (Puig, Froelich, 2011) or as reader who is in the highest proficiency level (Alvermann et al., 2010; Johnson, 2005; OECD, 2010). In literacy we can see that good readers go beyond the text being read to form their own interpretations and apply understandings in the other areas, they know how to direct their attention depending on the kind of text being read, and they sustain interest and understanding over long text (Puig, Froelich, 2011). Proficient readers use also a variety of strategies while reading. These strategies include inference, making connections, visualizing, determining importance, synthesizing, questioning, and using text structures (Johnson, 2005; OECD, 2010). But how do adolescents describe ‘good readers’? This paper will focus on what Estonians adolescents think about who is a good reader and what kind readers they are, how much and what kind of texts they read.
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Reception of fantasy in multicultural education

Classical works of fantasy genre may serve as a valuable educational material for teaching in multicultural society, while the books, comics, cartoons and other media forms are internationally widely known. Children in different countries identify themselves with the fictional characters and go through the same experiences depicted in the stories. Our comparison was carried out concentrating on novel by Tove Jansson, to see the differences and similarities in the reception of the novel by the children in different countries.

We wanted to see what events children choose, when they have a possibility to illustrate what they have read and how they verbalize their pictures. The pictures and the texts tell us what was impressive, what they have learned.

Children from grade 4, age 9—10, were asked to make a picture and to tell what is in it. They read an extract from Tove Jansson’s book Finn Family Moomintroll (Trollkarlens hatt 1948). In this research there are 17 Finnish children and 14 Estonian children. All these children made a picture and told something about it. Research questions are: 1) What do the children draw about the moomins? 2) How do they verbalize their drawings? 3) Are there some differences between Finnish and Estonian children? 4) What kind of humour is there in the children’s pictures?

Some results: In the Finnish pictures the children used most to draw the magician (7 pictures), the table (5 pictures) and moomin house (5 pictures). In one picture there was the event when Moomintroll changed into a very strange animal and in one picture a bonfire. The longest description was 35 words and the shortest 7 words. In some pictures there was effect from cartoons. The humour was often combined with magic: the flying table, the flying magician or the happiness of Moominvalley, especially a happy end and that the magician got the ruby.
Comparative analysis of the pictures and writings by Finnish and Estonian pupils was carried out. Conclusions will be done about the use of the pictures to develop children's meta-cognitive abilities in multicultural classrooms.
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Chinese culture promoting writing in a multilingual Portuguese L1 class

This poster describes a sequence of activities implemented in one class of Portuguese L1 (PL1), in grades 7 and 8. The trigger for this non-continuous 14-month long sequence was the fact that the class had a student of Chinese origin, besides three Brazilians, and that the textbook included a short story staged in Ancient China by the renowned writer Marguerite Yourcenar. The eight activities comprehend all language skills: oracy, reading, writing and language awareness but the poster enhances only those three concerned with writing – summary, translation and poem – and the two about language awareness – scripts and alphabets.

The sequence is not continuous so it could fit the school project – parents’ participation in translating and reading the summary of the short story – and different parts of the curriculum – scripts and alphabets, short story, summary, oral reading, oral presentation and poetry – avoiding a detached intercultural intervention – the aim was not only for the pupils to learn about China but especially to learn PL1 curricular contents through China. This long-haul intervention also made it possible for students to change the course of events – the Chinese student decided to recite a Chinese poem in her oral presentation assignment. Without it, there wouldn’t have been the last activity: the writing of a class version in Portuguese of the Chinese poem. During this sequence, there was collective, pair and individual work.
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6 In some sources, the heading is given as Through the Yangzi Gorges (see Jean Elizabeth Ward, Li Bai: an Homage to. Lulu, 2007, p. 101; see also http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/through-the-yangzi-gorges-2/comments.asp)
Participants of the IAIMTE Educational Linguistics SIG meeting 2014

Jenni Alisaari – University of Turku (Finland) jenni.alisaari@utu.fi
Elżbieta Awramiuk – University of Białystok (Poland) eawramiuk@poczta.onet.pl
Martin Ehala – University of Tartu (Estonia) ehalam@ut.ee
Jan Hulstijn – University of Amsterdam (Holland) j.h.hulstijn@uva.nl
Katri Karasma – Helsinki University (Finland) k.karasma@gmail.com
Krista Kerge – Tallinn University (Estonia) krista.kerge@gmail.com
Elina Kouki – University of Turku (Finland) elina.kouki@utu.fi
Kersti Lepajõe – University of Tartu (Estonia) kersti.lepajoe@ut.ee
Brigitte Marin – University Paris East Creteil (France) brigitte.marin@u-pec.fr
Marilyn Martin-Jones – Birmingham University (UK) m.martinjones@bham.ac.uk
Karin Muller – Tallinn English College Karin.Muller@tik.edu.ee
Mare Müürsepp – Tallinn University (Estonia) marem@tlu.ee
Hille Pajupuu – Institute of the Estonian Language (Estonia) Hille.Pajupuu@eki.ee
Anu Petermann – Association of the Estonian Language Teachers (board) info@eeselts.edu.ee
Paulo Feytor Pinto – Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal (Portugal) paulofeytorpinto@gmail.com
Helin Puksand – Tallinn University (Estonia) helin.puksand@tlu.ee
Halliki Põlda – Tallinn University (Estonia) halliki.polda@tlu.ee
Kadri Sõrmus – University of Tartu (Estonia) kadri.sormus@ut.ee
Maile Timm – University of Tartu (Estonia) timmmaile@gmail.com
Krista Uibu – University of Tartu (Estonia) krista.uibu@ut.ee
Maigi Vija – University of Tartu (Estonia) maigi.vija@ut.ee

Scientific board

Paulo Feytor Pinto – Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal (Portugal) paulofeytorpinto@gmail.com
Marilyn Martin-Jones – Birmingham University (UK) m.martinjones@bham.ac.uk
Eija Aalto – University of Jyväskylä (Finland) eija.aalto@jyu.fi
Caroline Doktar – Åbo Akademi University (Finland) caroline.doktar@abo.fi
Maigi Vija (organizer) – University of Tartu (Estonia) maigi.vija@ut.ee

IAIMTE/EAAL conference assistant

Kristiina Ranne – Tallinn University (Estonia) Silva 545 (4th=5th floor)