



Multilingual Education Experiments in Post-Soviet Space: The Case of Multilingual Education in Ukraine

Ligita Grigule

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

September 25, 2018

Multilingual education experiments in post-Soviet space: the case of multilingual education in Ukraine

Ligita GRIGULE¹

¹ Researcher., University of Latvia, Faculty of Education, Psychology and Art, Imantas 7. līnija 1, Rīga, LV-1083, Email: ligita.grigule@lu.lv

Abstract

The paper aims at providing information on today language policies in Ukraine. Until 2018 the school system in Ukraine has continued a tradition of running schools with minorities' languages as main languages of instruction. Since 2010, the Romanian non-governmental organization (NGO) The Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania (PATRIR) has engaged in an initiative to assess the context and later to pilot a multilingual education (MLE) project in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea first and, from 2014, in three Ukrainian regions: Odessa, Chernivtsi and Transcarpathia. Project was transferred to the Ministry, which is developing it further as a state-wide experiment "Building Multilingualism of Children and Students: Progressive European Ideas in the Ukrainian Context". The paper aims at analysing existing conditions, challenges, and needs for the effective implementation of MLE in Ukraine.

Keywords: language policy; multilingual education; teacher professional development

Introduction

The social political discourse in Ukraine is dominated by the tension between the aspiration to use education as an instrument to contribute to the "restoration or building" of Ukrainian identity on the one hand, and the tendency to use education as an instrument "to learn to live together" or "to learn to live like Europeans" on the other hand. The latter is more in line with the recommendations of international organizations such as UNESCO, EU, OSCE HCNM, the first option is a logical one in a phase of transition from a former Soviet republic to an independent nation-state. For the political authorities Ukrainian language status is a first priority. At the same time it should be noted that both public officials, public organization activists and community leaders are fully aware of the existence of this international legislation and recommendations as well as influence instruments.

Ukraine is a multilingual country, ethnic minorities constitute a significant proportion (22,2%, census 2001) of the country's total population. Language policy in Ukraine is based on its Constitution, international obligations, and from 2012 until February 2018 on the law "On the principles of the state language policy". Several articles of the Ukrainian Constitution contain guarantees related to the protection of languages and linguistic rights and freedoms in Ukraine and declares full respect to international agreements and obligations (Constitution of Ukraine Article 10, 11).

Until recently the school system in Ukraine continued the Soviet tradition of running "minority" schools with the respective mother tongues of minority groups as primary languages of instruction. According to MES information and statistical data regarding the implementation of language policy in education education in the languages of minorities is widely available in Ukraine at different levels of education. According to latest MESU data: 2693 pupils study in Moldovan language, 1785 pupils study in Polish language, 355 955 pupils study in Russian language, 16139 pupils study in Romanian language, 16020 pupils study in Hungarian language.

The diversity of large ethnic groups and languages can be highlighted as a typical feature of the education in Ukraine (including the linguistic diversity of teaching, until now), and, thus, also diversity of individual combinations of bilingualism, which, in turn, reinforces the need for one language of communication. The Russian language, which performed these functions, has a strong functional *lingua franca* substantiation, which conflicts with the political wish to decrease the importance of the Russian language, not to say – to eliminate quickly the use of the Russian language in the public space. The reinforcement of the state language – the Ukrainian language – does not proceed in accordance with the win-win principle but rather the win-lose principle, as if the exclusion of the Russian language usage would automatically reinforce the position/ quality of the Ukrainian language.

On 5 September 2017 the *Verhovna Rada* of Ukraine adopted The Law of Ukraine "On Education". The new Law "On Education" provides key competences, particularly, fluency in the state language; the ability to communicate with one's own (in case of difference from the state language) and foreign

languages. Regulations on the language of instruction for Ukraine's ethnic minorities have arisen serious discussions. The Article 7 of the Law of Ukraine on Education, which regulates the use of the state language and minority and other languages in education, is extensively analyzed both in international legislative level, as well as in academic and public discourse and the bilingual teaching method has gained topicality.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine requested the Venice Commission to prepare an opinion on Article 7 of the Law on Education and MESU has prepared a Position paper at their disposal. The paper describes the situation in minority schools where teaching is conducted exclusively in the language of the national minority and Ukrainian language is studied only as a separate educational subject. Due to the linguistic environment, where the state language is not a mean of communication, study of the Ukrainian language only as a subject does not ensure proficiency in the state language at a level sufficient for the realization of their constitutional rights and responsibilities throughout the whole territory of Ukraine. Schools with Russian as a language of instruction constitute an absolute majority among the schools with teaching in the languages of national minorities. The number of places in schools with Russian language of instruction does not correspond to the actual size of the Russian minority. This practice has developed since the Soviet Union, when the study of Russian have been forced. Thus, schools in the Russian language of instruction were not schools for the national minority, but remained an element of the continued russification of Ukraine. The authorities realised that the continuation of the previous language policy in education "not only does not contribute to national accord, but it is also a threat to national security, state sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine." Beside the purpose to consolidation of the political nation the strongest argument for the new regulation is the decrease of the level of the quality of education of children from national minorities. MESU in its communication for the public mentions that 36% of graduates in the Transcarpathia region passed the external independent testing with a result from 1 to 3 grade (according to 12-grade scale) 75% of graduates in Berehove district received from 1 to 3 grade (This is the worst result in the country), 61% of pupils who belong to the Hungarian or Romanian minorities and participated in external independent testing in math & history of Ukraine in one of their native languages, did not pass the pass/fail threshold in the Ukrainian language. MESU concludes that insufficient fluency in state language a person is not able to access the Ukrainian university, be eligible for public service and in the self-government bodies.

The ministry explains that consequently, three models of the use and study of languages could be proposed for the implementation: The first model envisages the possibility of teaching all subjects in the minority language from the first (1st) until the 11th (12th) grade along with the Ukrainian language. This model would work for vulnerable languages; those that do not have their own state for the development of linguistic terminology, as well as for those who do not live in their native language environment. The next model is proposed to the national minorities, whose language belongs to the European Union. Depending on the language group and the linguistic environment, this model may have two variants. The first option for the national minorities, whose languages belong to the Slavic language group, and who live in a predominantly Ukrainian-speaking environment. As stipulated by the Law, children whose mother tongue belongs to this group, will be able to fully study in their native language at kindergarten and elementary school, along with studying of Ukrainian as a subject. From the 5th grade, along with subjects taught in the native language, subjects taught in Ukrainian will be introduced. The share of subjects taught in Ukrainian will be increasing proportionally until the high school. The second option will take into account the peculiarities of studying the Ukrainian language by representatives of other language groups, who mostly live in the native language environment. In particular, it tackles the Romanian and Hungarian national minorities. For schools with these languages, the transition to studying subjects in Ukrainian will be even more gradual, and the percentage of subjects taught by the state will be smaller. This approach is justified by the fact that learning a language in another language group is much more difficult and requires more study time to reach a sufficient language level for the study of other subjects in Ukrainian.

The third model is proposed to the national minorities, whose mother tongue belongs to the same language family as the Ukrainian does, as well as to those, who prevalingly live in native language environment. In particular, this model is applied to the Russian language. Following this model, the children would proceed to study of the Ukrainian subjects immediately after the 5th grade. Children, whose mother tongue is Russian, easily learn Ukrainian. At the same time they mostly live in the 100% Russian-speaking environment – they communicate in Russian in families, on the streets, watch TV in Russian. Therefore, the only place where children from this national minority can freely use the state language is a school. While studying subjects in Ukrainian, and continuing to study Russian as a subject, children will be able to have a high level of proficiency both in Ukrainian and in Russian.

The main issues covered by the Venice Commission document are uncertainties of the Law on Education as Article 7 creates different regimes for different categories of minority: On the one hand, national minorities and indigenous people are treated differently: while for national minorities education in their language is only guaranteed at pre-school and primary level, for indigenous peoples education in their language is guaranteed at pre-school and general secondary school level. On the other hand, different treatment is applied to national minorities according to whether their language is also (or not) an official language of the EU.

The characterization by the ministry's middle-level officers is that the law in the form in which it is worded gives the opportunity for a broad explanation / interpretation and in general does not restrict the realization of the MLE, perhaps on the contrary, the bilingual methodology is publicly announced.

Method

Since 2010, the Romanian non-governmental organization The Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania (PATRIR) has engaged on an initiative "Supporting multi-ethnic regions of Ukraine to improve the quality of education" to assess the context and later to pilot a multilingual education (MLE) initiative in Ukraine (PATRIR, Annual Report, 2015). Following several positive experiences in the former Soviet region, and an expression of interest on the side of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, PATRIR has engaged since 2014 on an initiative to assess the context and later to pilot a multilingual education project in three Ukrainian regions: Odessa, Chernivtsi and Transcarpathia. During the first year several consultations and capacity building events took place in all regions and regional coordination mechanisms were set up. Additionally the project included an improvement of the class environment in the selected schools, the monitoring of the changes that the MLE programme is enabling at school level and a video documentary on the experience of setting up a teaching learning models in a multicultural yet volatile environment in Ukraine. On 2016 the project was transferred to the Ministry, which is developing it further as a statewide experiment "Building Multilingualism of Children and Students: Progressive European Ideas in the Ukrainian Context".

Formative progress evaluation was chosen as the appropriate type of study to answer: Are the participants moving toward the anticipated goals of the project? Which of the activities and strategies are aiding the participants to move toward the goals?

The study involved the desk research - review of project related documents, non-structured participatory observation and discussions during the field visit, and qualitative methods – 25 interviews and discussions with relevant professionals of the MESU, scholars, regional experts, representatives of national and international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and pilot participants. The interviews initially were conducted during the initial consultations and field visit. Study included also expert interviews with international education officials and educators from Central-Asia. In addition, several skype interviews took place to clarify and fill in the missing data.

Findings

The authors and management of the project and also participants have a positive attitude towards the pilot, both as professionals and citizens, being aware of its social importance. The teachers are interested; however, the teachers are not paid sufficient attention to and they lack the possibility to cooperate among themselves and to learn. The current threats are linked to the fact that society is not informed about the course of the project. Future threat is the fact that schools lack capacity to reach the planned expected outcomes – development and analysis of models and drafting of the concept.

Overall, the project content is oriented to significant changes in forming minority school students' identity. It encourages developing community self-confidence and self-determination, as well as developing inter-community understanding, interaction and interdependence; improving social cohesion and reduce tensions.

The project is called a nation-wide experiment. The experiment is not just the name or the form of a document in which the experiment has traditionally been applied in Ukraine. Experiment Paradigm which has appropriate approach and data acquisition methods developed a baseline study, which requires a comparison of pilot school students with a control group. Moreover, the wording used (demands, forming a student's ability, requiring, to begin curriculum integration, cultivation of tolerance and empathy, their form creative teams, etc.) form the basis for a technical, experimental study based on the approach and concepts of the old education paradigm. Setting up experimental and control groups, which are suitable for natural sciences studies, raise both scientific-methodological and ethical questions and is

not recommended. If an institution of education itself, believing that MLE is education of the 21st century that is needed by children and society, wants to set up one MLE class/ group and deny the other one this possibility of high-quality education, it would be immoral to compare later how much the children in the control group lag behind in their knowledge. Whereas if the parents and pupils have deliberately chosen a monolingual learning environment, then the aspects of choice (attitudes and values) must be recorded and the monitoring of dynamics in these must be performed separately.

The Project document does not prove that the authors have awareness of the changes they aim to initiate. The project design is unbalanced. The methodological substantiation is eclectic, narrowly oriented towards linguistic aims. The project's title and goal are interpreted differently by informants of different categories. The research leader, which recognizes herself as the main author of the document, understands European ideas as the contemporary approaches to language teaching in Europe, which this researcher has studied and is bringing into Ukraine through this research. Her emphasis, which is defined in the goal of the research, is "curriculum integration of language subjects, within the context of one school". The experts believe that the project promotes the development of a new system of minority education.

In general, fragmentation in fundamental and recent studies and knowledge about language and multilingual education approach are typical in the country. Both scholars and community members' understanding of multilingual education is like studying many languages, not only the languages of those minorities that live in the region, but also foreign languages. To a large extent, multilingual education is prioritized as the study of language as a subject, and the availability of studying in the school of any language is also interpreted as a multilingual education. CLIL (content and language integrated learning) is understood and interpreted as a method, which is separated from the bilingual education (the mastery of which will guarantee success). Those participants of the project team, who are specialists of foreign languages, have benefited a lot in developing their awareness from the approach to language teaching and assessment and resources of the Council of Europe.

In teaching the Ukrainian language, the structural approach dominates, also when teaching it as a second language and in assessing the linguistic knowledge. It is a tradition in Ukraine to believe that there is a necessity to develop Ukrainian language teaching materials for each minority language based on L1 and L2's contrastive analysis theory. It might be supported by some of the authors who believe the fact that it is more of a tradition without scientific coverage and development. Second language acquisition has its regularities. To support my opinion, I conducted a short small-scale study of the Ukrainian language textbook for the 5th grade, where no reliance on L1 can be found. It would be desirable to challenge this deep-rooted tradition through the MLE and L2 methodological approach. The awareness of the particularities and specific circumstances of each minority seems to have already been exaggerated, it would be time to create a common value, a plurilingual approach, and this could be done through the intensification of interregional cooperation, the creation and use of common materials.

During the study, it was possible to conclude a different attitude towards the tradition of learning different languages and its current situation and status in Ukraine. The majority of the minority languages in the state belong to the group of Slavic languages. This belonging to the linguistic group is constantly used in the argumentation of linguistic education and, in a way, has formed the dominant linguodidactic approach – contrastive linguodidactics and separation of one linguistic community, juxtaposition, which leads from linguistic differences to broader sociocultural separation. This pronouncedly appears, for example, with respect to the Hungarian speaking community. Most of the informants, mentioning that the Hungarian language belongs to another group of languages, jump from their language education analysis and continue by characterising the special support Hungary grants to its diaspora and the tendencies towards separatism within this community. It confirms that Ukraine, like other European societies, has the linguistic identity as the strongest identity marker, and language skills and attitudes towards knowledge of the state language are an essential indicator of the cohesion of society.

Results and conclusions

It appears that Ukraine will continue to provide, as a minimum, a substantial part of pre-school and primary school education through the medium of the minority or indigenous language. At the secondary school level, Ukraine will continue at a minimum to provide for the teaching of all regional or minority languages as an integral part of the curriculum; also, since languages of EU member states may be used as the medium of instruction for one of more other subjects, it is possible that Ukraine will continue to make available a substantial part of secondary education in those languages.

On the political level, to this moment the MLE situation in Ukraine could be assessed as formally positive but unstable, unconvincing. On the one hand, on the highest governance level, a sound acceptance and support has been voiced for multilingual education. The informants reflect that from the initial avoidance of speaking about matters related to acquisition of minority languages and avoiding the mentioning of term multilingual education, speaking descriptively instead, now the official discourse is increasingly more frequently communicating ideas of Ukraine as a multilingual state, giving credit to learning both the official language and the native language as well as foreign languages in education. However, due to fear of opposition by the nationalistically minded groups against a balanced linguistic education and of radicalism, demanding “everyone to know the state language”, the politics may change. The attitude of the regional administrations could be assessed as sound awareness of the multilingualism of the region.

An important aspect in the overall situation aspect is kin-states. The initial consultations provided the data that the relationships between the ethno-linguistic communities and the home countries of the ethnicities the field of education were active (pupils and teachers participate in summer schools, teaching materials from the kin-states are used); i.e., it is a notable factor. As it was admitted during the group interview, minority communities (especially, Hungarian and Romanian) are strongly influenced by their kin-states. All informers expressed the opinion and referred to facts that in general each state, logically, was primarily interested in and was orienting itself towards reinforcing ethnic affiliation and good acquisition of the native language of the ethnic community (i.e., not decreasing it due to mastering of the state language). An additional fact must be taken into consideration, i.e., that, regretfully, the kin-states of the ethnic communities, the home country of the ethnicity, predominantly are such states, which in the studies of European multilingualism have been identified as monolingual, both as to their ethnic composition and the multilingualism practice, i.e., in these countries multilingualism and education in various languages there is not self-evident to be perceived with understanding and to be supported. Thus, awareness and support for the development of multilingual system of education in the project regions cannot be expected to be self-evident.

Undoubtedly, the law (Art 7), as it is formulated, reduces the space for instruction in minority languages in primary and secondary education establishments, i.e., reduces the time of minority language acquisition and affects its quality (pupils are not acquiring academic language in elementary grades 1-4). Law restricts the choice only to persons who have identified themselves as belonging to a minority, which is not democratic in general and can create unnecessary strain of choice in ethnically mixed families. By this condition the law directs the formation of asymmetric social bilingualism does not providing the possibility for Ukrainian parents to send their child to minority school and develop his bilingualism. In the context of general recognition of inclusive education and intercultural dialogue, law encourages the creation of a separate learning environments in schools based on language choices, thus typical rivalry between parallel classes potentially can turn into competition with ethno-linguistic tag. As could have been anticipated the newly adopted law have created tension in the public discourse of minority communities and may reinforce linguistic divisions and cause inter-ethnic tensions. The Law has not been communicated and explained to professionals in a timely manner, as a result, teachers cannot serve as mediators of state policy for parents and the community, they are just as confused and ignorant as the minority communities. At the same time to be noted that the Law forces and provides positive impetus for the introduction of bilingual teaching-learning methodology. The law and the subsequent explanatory (Position Paper) and implementation documents (Roadmap) invoke the teaching in the second language as a term in Ukrainian legislation:

“Teaching subjects in Ukrainian along with subjects taught in the native language will be introduced” (Position Paper).

Concerns are caused by data that ministry officials’ limiting bilingual education only to lesson plan level and MLE is still considered as an experiment that applies only to minority education. Latvian experience shows that when implementing bilingual education models most schools exclusively considered lesson division only by class and year rather than looking at which model corresponds to which bilingual education type and which predicted result. Latvia's experience makes it also possible to disagree with the Vienna Recommendation to preserve “century-old” (Recommendations 100.) minority schools, given that they are considered to be part of the historic heritage of Ukraine. Quite unnecessary also seems the suggestion not to apply Art. 7 to private education institution language choice. Twenty years of bilingual education in Latvia in its separate education program form have not succeeded to overcome the isolation / separation of minority schools; a unified school system just with diverse offerings of modern programs remains a topicality in politics in Latvia.

Recommendations

The international education practice has defined the basic aspects in the introduction of bilingual/multilingual education (Baker, 2002, Grigule, Odina, 2016, Guiding Principles, 2018). The proposed capacity development plan includes recommendations on strengthening the project management, expanding the group of pilot project institutions, creating a common understanding and appropriate quality assessment tools, reinforcing the research component of the project, creating and supporting inter-regional level cooperation of teachers and managers, thinking/ caring about the prestige and sustainability of the project, promotion of project publicity, provision and creation of study resources and professional development.

Strengthening the project management by establishing a consultative/advisory council, restoring the scientific representation, involving researchers, who are currently interested and engaged in the active work on topics related to the project, as well as the stakeholders' representatives (public organisations, international organisations) and international experts; **strengthen the management of MLA implementation at regional level**. Regional management unit (academic advisor and advisor) must be given a chance to study the international bilingual education experience. They need to rise capacity to fulfill their school advisers' role; they can best identify the teachers needs and order adequate trainings, organize the MLE school network and collaboration, the dissemination of information to parents, involve community. Collaboration with project management should be two-way - regions should receive feedback on the collected information for the baseline study and other requested and submitted materials.

Restoring and expending the group of pilot project institutions. The pilot project schools and pre-schools group, were established based on voluntariness and the criteria of community's interest. Referring to the regional coordinator's interview to this moment some of them due to staff turnover have low capacity to implement MLE in practice. It would be advisable to restore the pilot group in a reasonable (from the perspective of management's possibilities), methodologically wise (possibilities of cooperation between pre-school and a school, a school and an institution of higher education, regional peculiarities) and politically targeted way.

Principles of representation (a stratified sample), including II, which conform with several criteria:

- Language (involving as diverse schools as possible – for example, a Hungarian school; focusing in a politically targeted way on increasing the awareness and acceptance within the community; against resistance);
- Cooperation possibilities (PII and a school, a school and an institution of higher education, a school and continuous education, a school as a methods centre);
- Teachers' qualification;
- Reasonably manageable from the perspective of the managements' possibilities.

Creating a common understanding and appropriate quality assessment tools. To promote understanding, teaching and assessment of Ukrainian as a second language. Introduce the CEFR methodology (Language skills descriptors, Language portfolio) for language skills evaluation and self-assessment in MLE. Introduce the formative MLE assessment in teaching and monitoring. An agreement should be reached on the highest level on what is understood as quality, which aspects to choose to validly conclude that the experiment has been successful. Are these quantitative indicators – institutions of education do not drop out, stay in the group, the group grows; or quality indicators – is MLE developing, is growth observed? What has increased, what has decreased? The teachers should be encouraged to reflect, to improve their skills in assessing study process, linking it with the project goals. For example, if the teachers attend and organise "open classes": these have been prepared, it is a performance of a kind, but it would be important to agree on and follow certain aspects, which are observed and analysed. And the teacher, who has "created" this class, should be ready for a professional conversation on what she/he wanted to show, the way my pupils learn, what my pupils are able to do.

Reinforcing the research component of the project. The scientific component of the project is very weak. Bilingual / multilingual education does not imply (not only) the integration of the first, second and foreign language content. The sequence of languages is logical and now set by the law. The essence of bilingual education is the integration of content and language or the acquisition of language through content. Involvement of the researchers of the Academy of Sciences should be activated. **It is recommended to provide schools with internationally recognized theoretical background on bilingual /multilingual education**. Teachers should receive MLE Guidelines, examples of planning, organizing and assessment, recommendations for co-operation and reflection.

Creating and supporting inter-regional level cooperation of teachers and managers. One of the problems in the project but at the same time also – its room for improvement, is the approach to minority educations as such, where issues until now have been treated separately. An individual approach should be respected, the needs of a particular ethnic community are acknowledged; however, to reach the State's integration goals, it is equally important to create and to maintain a common space, at least professionally, being aware of raising young people for living in the same country. The planned cooperation between regions should be developed. The elements of cooperation should be planned and shared responsibility should be structured; so that the exchange of experience materials would become a real manifestation of the new Ukrainian school approach (not to have the character of personal contacts, or - I want to share, I do; Don't – will leave school and project with all the received and developed materials).

Thinking/ caring about the prestige and sustainability of the project. Experiments, and projects likewise, have a beginning and an end. It would be advisable to find a broader context of Ukrainian education, where multilingual education could fit in. One of the recommended activities is expanding the group of institutions of education, by involving also schools with Ukrainian as the language of instruction, which have chosen one of the EU languages for bilingual studies, thus turning the bilingual methodology into an innovation for the state-wide education. The new Education Law by including the reference to the MLE has basically created a legislative framework for the MLE with the following interest from different stakeholders. The Venice Commission has serious doubts as to whether the Ukrainian authorities will be able to adopt implementing legislation and to solve, in such a short time, the important problem of the lack of qualified teachers in the Ukrainian language, which will become even more acute under the new framework. It is recommended rise the teacher professional development institutions involvement in designing and implementing the project activities (teacher training program development and leading jointly with the international consultants).

Promotion of project publicity. It is recommended to separate general information about the project, the goal of which is to raise society awareness, from the site with the limited access in which the participants could gain information about what their colleagues are doing and share their experience and materials.

Provision and creation of study resources. The teaching-learning resources play an enormous role in MLE implementation. The hypertrophic role of textbooks in post-Soviet countries is ambivalent: lack of textbooks is a significant impediment to the introduction of bilingual education, but the high dependence on the textbook is also a potentially powerful tool for implementing the reform. The textbooks can visualize and shape the new learning approach. A textbook can become a powerful teacher training tool.

Teachers who were enthusiastic about bilingual education search themselves for solutions themselves. So, each country has got their own teacher made terminology vocabularies. These vocabularies are usually just nouns with translations (most popular semantic meaning). These vocabularies are usually developed by practitioners and are often criticised by scholars, particularly linguists. Practice proves that such dictionaries are not used extensively. Modern day CLIL methodology focuses particularly on functional approach in general and subject-specific language demands, that goes over a simple list of unknown words, including academic terminology, chunks and language of learning activities and instructions.

Another practice - using an already existing text-books in post-Soviet space is first and foremost dictated by the available financial and human resources. When starting to use it, teachers must conclude that books that are made for native speakers are not appropriate for the same form of the bilingual program pupils because the language is too complex. In the long run, this should signal the authors to re-evaluate in general the text book content that is full of unnecessarily complex texts and rather focus on diverse forms of information perception and processing. Using lower class text books of the same kind is not recommended because language limitation do not reflect academic limitation. Minority school pupils are more than capable to learn and should be taught general education content.

There is also a controversially valuated experience of using the same content text-books in two languages. In Moldova, when beginning the MLE experiment, the ministry provided schools the same content text-book in two languages as the main form of support. A working solution is one of the limited financial and human resource exit plans - using a textbook in the main language of instruction (native language) and a workbook in the target (second) language or vice versa.

An important aspect as well as a strong safeguard of bilingual education is new Ukrainian as second language textbooks; the development of which should attract the very best forces, materials, and

resources, by introducing a functional approach and content that matches the interests and needs of pupils. Researchers draw attention (Silova, 2006) that, with a simplified understanding of integration mechanisms, post-Soviet textbooks addressed to minorities are intensively teaching about the country's history, geography, cultural values and customs of the titular nation, resulting in the creation of an environment in which the student does not see himself. For years, culture teaching typically looked like a monologue from a representative of one majority culture about particularity their own culture. The old approaches to the culture teaching were no longer adequate to society in which learners should not treat as travelers, visitors but as equal citizens in the society. A positive attitude towards the state will develop day by day through a textbook that makes learning Ukrainian a pleasure.

It is strongly recommended to rethink, to re-evaluate the existing practice that Ukrainian as second-language textbooks is created for each minority language separately. In addition to economic exhaustion, the content does not use the opportunity to represent the multinational society in one training device. UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision also warns that the production of single textbooks for different linguistic communities as well as simple translation can also present difficulties by inaccuracies in the translated versions and cultural bias in some of the illustrations and content matter.

According to the bilingual method, one must rely on the development of the student's active teaching, the use of interactive methods, cooperation. This implies the need for entirely new materials, the awareness of which needs to develop in the multilingual education implementation process. It is recommended to create visual aids with comments in several languages- it is economical, increases the prestige of the target language and will accompany the positive attitude towards multilingualism. **If the project expects teachers to develop teaching materials, then they should be taught.** It is recommended to get acquainted with samples of multilingual teaching/learning resources developed in neighbouring countries, it is suggested to organize training sessions for teaching/learning materials developers and encourage joint language and subject teachers teamwork and cooperation between schools in the field of joint development and exchange of training materials. It would be necessary to develop informative materials for parents (questions and answers, opinions of people who are popular in the local community about bilingual education, positive examples of multilingualism. Attention should be paid to the education of authors, the involvement of teachers - practitioners, and school cooperation in order to create additional learning resources, especially focusing on information technologies. Teachers i.e. practitioners, are usually very involved in teaching materials and teaching – learning syllabus development but there could be more cooperation with schools when it comes to teaching material development and exchange. Work books and extra materials could be developed for electronic use; thus they can be adapted to individual or class needs.

The translation and making accessible to an extensive circle of professionals the fundamental works of theoreticians of bilingual education regarding introduction of bilingual education in post-soviet states is a commendable experience. Translations facilitate the development of national terminology and thus, more common /shared understanding of terms and their internalization. It would be advisable to support accessibility of theoretical literature, by translating some of the founders and authorities of bilingual education I would propose a book by Ophelia García or, in the best-case scenario, a collection of articles.

Professional development. The project management indicates master classes as the preferred form of in-service training. Also the teachers, when responding during interviews about the in-service training needs, place the emphasis on active and practical training. One can presume that the traditional in-service training courses had been provided in a form of lectures; the teachers are tired of this, they want to learn in a way that is appropriate for that way of organising the learning process that the New Ukrainian School expects from them. Those teachers, who in practice work bilingually, want to acquire at the courses/ master classes skills and, predominantly, materials that they could use in their lessons. It could also be concluded that the practice that has been just launched is not sufficient to make teachers reflect and conceptualise, for them to need continuous training events, where they could share their professional findings, beliefs. A time will come, when at the courses, where teachers are flooded with successive activities that are interesting as such, they will not feel happy at all. They will be more interested in the larger picture, in ways for coordinating their work with that of their colleagues. Therefore a balance between theory and practice should be maintained in the content of the courses, and also, basically, the inductive path should be chosen, the path from an example, from practice to generalisation and conceptualisation.

The implementation of MLE is about the change of the education paradigm in correlation with socio-political processes and concerning stakeholders at all levels. At international level it relates to the Western approach to minority education. At national, state and regional level, it relates to the gap between MLE management and methodological support in the context of the Ukrainian regional reform. At the level of community and parents, there are the decisions on the choice of the learning language. Currently the parents ground their choice of language for learning on the argument “whether they will be able to help their children with homework”. If at MICRO – classroom level the teaching is to be changed, it should guide the decision-making process of the formulation and awareness of multilingual education goal oriented towards a sustainable education and sharing individual and social objectives. Answering the question of how the effectiveness of the programme will be measured, such factors as the career, higher education, the opportunity to study at the universities of the ethnic homeland, the popularity of school, language prestige (the language which is taught at school), strengthening the national language are mentioned. Attention should be paid to the social markers – the change of social practice in the community. It is recommended to think and formulate the aims and expected outcomes at different levels of social participation – individual, community, state; at different time scales: long, medium, short-term: both future career, as well as here and now (an interesting lesson) and opportunities at attitude level.

References

- Eriksen, T. H. (2002). *Ethnicity and nationalism: Anthropological perspectives*. Pluto Press.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2001). *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Pluto Press.
- Essential Actions: A Handbook for Implementing WIDA's Framework.
<https://www.wida.us/get.aspx?id=712>
- European Commission for Democracy Through Law (Venice Commission). Ukraine. Opinion on the provisions of the Law on Education of 5 september 2017 which concern the use of the state language and minority and other languages in education. Adopted by the Venice Commission at its 113th Plenary Session (8-9 December 2017)
[http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDLAD\(2017\)030-e](http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDLAD(2017)030-e)
- Grigule, L. Odina, I. Transforming the Latvian Multilingual and Intercultural Education Experience into Flourishing Europe. *International Journal of Multilingual Education*. 2016 vol.7 (E ISSN 1512-3146)
- Hrynevych, L. Languages of minorities and the future of children: criticism by Romania and Hungary. The Double Standard Surrounding Ukraine's Education Law.30.11.2017.
<https://guests.blogactiv.eu/.../the-double-standard-surrounding-ukraines...>
- Implementation of Language Policy in Education. *Crimea Policy Dialogue 2010*. Кримський політичний діалог 2010. – К.: К.І.С., 2012. – 230 с. АНГЛ. МОВОЮ.
- Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, “Position on the Article 7 of the Law of Ukraine “On Education”, 27 October 2017. CDL-REF(2017)051,
[http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL-REF\(2017\)051-e](http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CDL-REF(2017)051-e)
- Marsh, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D., Jesis, M., Frigols, M. *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education*, 2011.
- Teaching Knowledge Test. Content and Language Integrated Learning. UCLES, 2009
- Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, T., McCarty, T. L. Key Concepts in Bilingual Education: Ideological, Historical, Epistemological, and Empirical Foundations. In Volume 5, *Bilingual Education*, eds Jim Cummins & Nancy Hornberger. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd edition. New York: Springer, 2008, 3-17.
- Tyshchenko, Y., Kurkchi, Y. (2015). Multilingual education in multi-ethnic regions: needs, expectations. <http://patrir.ro/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Annual-Report-2015-v2.pdf>
- The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation. Division of Research and Learning in Formal and Informal Settings. National Science Foundation.
<https://www.purdue.edu/research/docs/pdf/2010NSFuserfriendlyhandbookforprojectevaluation.pdf>
- Wesolowsky, T. Ukrainian Language Bill Facing Barrage Of Criticism From Minorities, Foreign Capitals. <https://www.rferl.org/a/ukraine-language-legislation-minority-languages-russia-hungary-romania/28753925.html>
- Zwiers, J. (2008). *Building academic language: Essential practices for content classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.