

8 (2023)

# Philologia Estonica

T A L L I N N E N S I S

## **KEEL JA KEELED. ÕPPIMINE JA ÕPETAMINE**

*Language and Languages.  
Learning and Teaching*

Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus  
Tallinn 2023

Philologia Estonica Tallinnensis 8 (2023)  
Keel ja keeled. Õppimine ja õpetamine  
Language and Languages. Learning and Teaching

Philologia Estonica Tallinnensis eelkäija on Tallinna Ülikooli Eesti Keele  
ja Kultuuri Instituudi toimetised (ilmus 2004–2015, ISSN 1736-8804)

Toimetuskolleegium / Advisory Board

Helle Metslang (Tartu, Tartu Ülikool), Margit Langemets (Tallinn, Eesti Keele  
Instituut), Meelis Mihkla (Tallinn, Eesti Keele Instituut), Renate Pajusalu (Tartu,  
Tartu Ülikool), Maria Voeikova (Viin/Sankt-Peterburg), Cornelius Hasselblatt  
(Zuidhorn / Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia), Epp Annus (Tallinna Ülikool / Ohio  
State University)

Peatoimetaja: Reili Argus

Toimetaja: Merilyn Meristo

Keeletoimetaja: Siiri Soidro

Inglise keele toimetaja: Ene Alas

Kaanefoto: Roman Nogin / Shutterstock

Autoriõigus: Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus ja autorid, 2023

ISSN 2504-6616 (trükis)

ISSN 2504-6624 (võrguväljaanne)

Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus

Narva mnt 25

10120 Tallinn

[www.tlupress.com](http://www.tlupress.com)

Trükk: Grano Digital

# SISUKORD

## **Merilyn Meristo, Reili Argus**

Sissejuhatus teemanumbrisse „Keel ja keeled.

Õppimine ja õpetamine“ . . . . . 5

*Introduction to the Thematic Issue “Language*

*and Languages. Learning and Teaching” . . . . . 10*

## **Anna Verschik**

Chackelis Lemchenas, a contrastive linguist before

contrastive linguistics . . . . . 17

*Chackelis Lemchenas, kontrastiivne lingvist*

*enne kontrastiivset lingvistikat . . . . . 34*

## **Miina Norvik, Renate Pajusalu**

Võõrkeele omandamise kogemused eestlaste

mälestustes ja arvamustes . . . . . 36

*Foreign language acquisition: opinions*

*and memories of Estonians . . . . . 69*

## **Birute Klaas-Lang, Kristiina Praakli, Diana Vender**

Üleminek eestikeelsele õppele. Vene dominantkeelega

Tartu lastevanemate hoiakute uurimisest. . . . . 71

*Transition to Estonian-medium education – a study*

*of the attitudes of Russian-dominant parents in Tartu . . . . . 93*

## **Tiina Rüütmaa, Merilyn Meristo,**

## **Reili Argus, Helin Puksand**

Õpetajate suhtumine mitmekeelses klassis õpetamisse

ja eestikeelsele õppele üleminekusse . . . . . 95

*Teachers’ attitudes to teaching in a multilingual classroom*

*and transition to Estonian-medium education . . . . . 127*

### **Ineta Dabašinskiene**

- Multilingual education for minority schools in Lithuania:  
in search of balance and compromise ..... 129  
*Mitmekeelne haridus vähemusrahvuste koolides Leedus:  
otsides tasakaalu ja kompromissi* ..... 152

### **Elena Samsonova, Aleksandra Ljalikova, Merilyn Meristo**

- Factors Facilitating and Hindering Deep-Level Collaboration  
Between Subject and Language Teachers in the Estonian  
CLIL Context ..... 154  
*Keele- ja aineõpetajate koostööd soodustavad  
ja takistavad faktorid Eesti LAK-õppe kontekstis* ..... 177

### **Kristiina Bernhardt, Merilyn Meristo**

- Eesti keele omandamist toetavad tunnitegevused  
I kooliastme mitmekeelses klassis ..... 178  
*Class Activities Supporting Estonian Language Acquisition  
at Primary School Level* ..... 199

### **Mare Kitsnik**

- Kuidas õppida eesti keeles rääkima? Rääkimisoskust  
arendavad ülesanded eesti keele kui teise keele B1-taseme  
täiskasvanute õpikutes. .... 201  
*How to learn to speak Estonian? Speaking tasks in B1-level  
textbooks of Estonian as a second language for adults* ..... 224

### **Maris Saagpakk**

- Mitmekultuurilisuse pädevuse toetamine saksa keele tunnis  
virtuaalprojekti „Mets kui mälupaik Saksamaal, Eestis ja Sri  
Lankal“ näitel ..... 226  
*Fostering Multicultural Competence in German Language  
Classes in a Virtual Project “Memory Spaces in Germany,  
Estonia and Sri Lanka”* ..... 250

## SISSEJUHATUS TEEMANUMBRISSE „KEEL JA KEELED. ÕPPIMINE JA ÕPETAMINE“

Merilyn Meristo, Reili Argus

2023. aasta kevadel toimus Tallinna ülikoolis rahvusvaheline konverents „Keel ja keeled. Õppimine ja õpetamine“, millest inspireerituna sündis siinne artiklikogumik. Nii nagu konverentsil, on ka teemanumbri fookuses kaks tahku: keel ja keeled. „Keele“ all mõtleme eelkõige eesti keelt praeguses Eesti ühiskonnas, ajal, kui toimub üleminek eestikeelsele õppele. „Keelte“ all peame silmas keelte rikkust ja toimetulekut mitmekeelsusega.

Keel on ühiskondi siduvaks niidiks, see võimaldab suhtlemist ja kultuurilist eneseväljendust. Mitmekeelses maailmas toimetamiseks on oluline edendada tõelist mitmekeelsust, mitte ainult keelepaare, nagu eesti-inglise või eesti-vene. Lingvistidena mõistame, et kui toetame lapse esimese keele õppimist, aitame kaasa iga järgmise keele õppimisele, seega on igasugune keeleõpe kasulik. Siiski on ühiskonnas endiselt levinud ühe keele keskne suhtumine, mille muutmiseks tuleb ka keeleteadlastel tööd teha. On vaja mõelda sellele, kuidas toetada lastel eri emakeelte õppimist, et need aitaksid eesti keele õppimisel. Lingvistid ja poliitikakujundajad saavad siin koostööd teha ja õppida teiste riikide kogemustest, et luua tõeliselt mitmekeelne ühiskond, kus iga keel ja kultuur on väärtustatud.

Meie riigis on eesti keelel eriline tähtsus, keel säilitab meie rikast pärandit ja soodustab kogukonnatunnet. Poliitikakujundajate otsused muudavad meie haridusmaastikku. Lingvistid tagavad keeleõpetuse aluse süstemaatiliste keeleuuringute ja metoodiliste võtete arendamise kaudu. Praktikuteest keeleõpetajad täidavad keelepoliitika otsuseid ning kasutavad uuenduslikke ja tõendus põhiseid metoodikaid, mängides olulist rolli tulevaste põlvkondade identiteedi kujundamisel. Seetõttu on igal keele õpetamisega seotud teadusuuringul

praegu kulla kaal, et nii keelepoliitilised kui ka praktikute metoodilised otsused tugineksid tõendus põhisele informatsioonile.

Artiklikogumik algab pilguheiduga minevikku. **Anna Verschik** analüüsib artiklis „**Chackelis Lemchenas, kontrastiivne lingvist enne kontrastiivset lingvistikat**“ Leedu keeleteadlase Chackelis Lemchenase vaateid leedu keele õpetamisele vähemusrahvuste koolides. Lemchenas on rõhutanud, et keelekeskkond ei garanteeri keeleomandamist ja leedu keele õpetamine sarnaneb võõrkeele õpetamisega. Ta toetas eksplitsiitse grammatika õpetamist erinevate keelestruktuuride korral. Lemchenase mõtteid peetakse algeliseks kontrastiivseks lähenemiseks. Artiklis rõhutatakse, et Ida-Euroopa ja väikerahvaste sotsiolingvistiline olukord erineb läänemaailmast, kus on domineerinud ükskeelne ideoloogia. Ehkki leedu keele õpetamise kontekst on erinev teistest riikidest ja Lemchenase mõtted on seni jäänud laiemale uurijate ringile tundmata, on tema panus lingvistika ajaloo mõistmiseks väljaspool Lääne konteksti märkimisväärne.

Ajaloolist tagasisaadet eestlaste mälestuste ja arvamuste kohta võõrkeele omandamisest pakuvad **Miina Norvik** ja **Renate Pajusalu** artiklis „**Võõrkeele omandamise kogemused eestlaste mälestustes ja arvamustes**“. Kuigi osalejate arvamused keeleõppe metoodika kohta olid erinevad, peeti traditsioonilisi meetodeid, nagu juttude rääkimist ja kirjalikke harjutusi, siiski kasulikeks. Õpetaja isiksuse ja rühmakaaslaste mõju osutus väga oluliseks, samuti rõhutati motivatsioonitegureid, näiteks huvi keele vastu kerkis esile seoses saksa, prantsuse ja hispaania keelega, kuid vajadust mainiti seoses inglise ja vene keelega, kus huvi jäi tagaplaanile. Uuringu tulemused näitavad inimeste arusaamu keelest ja keeleõppimisest, teisisõnu eestlaste keeleteadlikkust.

Edasi jõuame tänapäeva, kus **Birute Lang-Klaas**, **Kristiina Praakli** ja **Diana Vender** avavad oma artiklis „**Üleminek eestikeelsele õppele. Vene dominantkeelega Tartu lastevanemate hoiakute uurimisest**“ lastevanemate ootusi ja hirme seoses eestikeelse õppega. Autorid tõdevad, et kuivõrd informatsiooni saamine üleminekuprotsessi kohta on suuresti jäänud vanemate endi õlule, on see

süvendanud usaldamatust, hirme ja valesti mõistmist eesti keeles õppimise kohta. Vanemate mured ja tõstatatud küsimused on peamiselt seotud õpilaste akadeemilise edasijõudmisega, teises keeles õppimise keerukusega, õpilaste enesemääratlusega, päritolukeele ja -kultuuri küsimustega ning haridusasutuste ja vanemate vahelise asjaajamiskeelega. Autorid rõhutavad vajadust jätku-uuringuteks, et üksikasjalikumalt mõista üleminekuga seotud probleemvaldkondi.

Kui eelmises artiklis tutvustati lastevanemate hoiakuid, siis **Tiina Rüütmaa, Merilyn Meristo, Reili Arguse ja Helin Puksandi** artikkel „**Õpetajate suhtumine mitmekeelses klassis õpetamise ja eestikeelsele õppele üleminekusse**“ tutvustab õpetajate hoiakuid eestikeelsele haridusele ülemineku suhtes. Kaks kolmandikku uuringus osalenud õpetajatest õpetab õpilasi, kelle eesti keele oskus ei ole piisav eestikeelses õppes osalemiseks. Üldiselt pooldavad õpetajad üleminekut eesti õppekeelele. Siiski näitavad tulemused, et õpetajad, kellel on muukeelsete õpilaste õpetamise kogemus, on vähem positiivselt meelestatud kui kogemusetu õpetajad. Samuti on oluliselt vähem üksmeelt selles osas, kas muu emakeelega õpilaste kooli lõimimine loob ikka kõikidele õppimiseks soodsa keskkonna, ning selles, kas lubada muukeelsetel õpilastel kasutada koolis oma emakeelt. Uuringust selgus ka, et muukeelsete õpilaste õpetamise toetamiseks pakuvad koolid peamiselt abiõpetajat, õppematerjale, sealhulgas ligipääsu tasulistele materjalidele, ja koolitusvõimalusi.

Järgnevalt saame **Ineta Dabašinskienė** artikli „**Mitmekeelne haridus vähemusrahvuste koolides Leedus: otsides tasakaalu ja kompromissi**“ kaudu teada mitmekeelsuse olukorrast Leedus. Artikli keskmeks on vähemusrahvuste kirjaoskus ja leedu keele omandamine kui Leedu olulised haridusküsimused. Kuigi on tehtud edusamme, näitavad uuringud endiselt, et leedu keele oskuse puudumine võib mõjutada vähemusrahvuste akadeemilist edu ja karjäärivõimalusi. Uuring keskendub Leedu etniliste vähemuste hariduse õppekeelele ja keelepoliitikale üldisemalt ning analüüsib Leedu valitsusasutuste andmeid ja poliitikadokumente, rõhutades riigikeele õppimise tähtsust. Erinevalt naaberriikidest Lätist ja

Eestist liigub Leedu kakskeelse hariduse mudeli poole ning keskendub leedu keele positsiooni tugevdamisele. Inglise keelt peetakse samuti oluliseks. Muutused keeleküsimumustes võtavad aega ja nõuavad jõupingutusi riigilt, asutustelt ja ühiskonnalt.

Edasi oleme tagasi Eestis ning **Elena Samsonova, Aleksandra Ljalikova** ja **Merilyn Meristo** analüüsivad artiklis „**Keele- ja aineõpetajate koostööd soodustavad ja takistavad faktorid Eesti LAK-õppe kontekstis**“ keele- ja aineõpetajate koostööd Eesti LAK-õppe kontekstis. Tulemustest saame teada, et koostööl põhinevast koolitusprogrammist-uuringust osavõtnud õpetajad hindasid tandemkoostööd õpilaste ja enda jaoks kasulikuks. Uuring tuvastas palju koostööd soodustavaid, aga ka takistavaid faktoreid, kuid domineerivaks jäid soodustavad asjaolud, välja arvatud organisatsioonilisel ehk koolijuhtimise tasandil. Kõige olulisemaks osutus LAK-õppe ja tandemi struktuur, kuid õpetajate ajapuudust peeti peamiseks koostöö takistuseks. Tulemused rõhutavad vajadust keskenduda organisatsiooniliste takistuste kõrvaldamisele koostöö edendamisel.

Õpetajate koostöö juurest siirdume tunnitegevuste juurde ning leiame **Kristiina Bernhardti** ja **Merilyn Meristo** artikli „**Eesti keele omandamist toetavad tunnitegevused I kooliastme mitmekeelses klassis**“. Eestikeelsele õppele üle minnes on oluline mõista, kuidas õpetatakse eesti keelt teise keelena ja teisi õppeaineid algkoolis. Uuringu fookuses olid tunnitegevused, mis toetavad eesti keele teise keelena õppimist. Lisaks uuriti tundide struktuuri ja õpilaste tegevusi. Tulemused näitavad, et õpetajad kasutavad eesti keele õpetamiseks mitmesuguseid meetodeid, kuid teatud aspekte suhtluskeele õpetamises pole piisavalt rakendatud, näiteks ei õpetata kuuldu mõistmist ja kirjutamist nii süstemaatiliselt kui sõnavara. Õpilastele ei anta piisavalt võimalusi rääkida või ennast väljendada, kuna õpetajad kasutavad rühma- või paaritööd vähem. Ainetundides keskendutakse sisule ja keeletugi koosneb sageli vaid sõnavara õppimisest. Teisalt kasutavad õpetajad mõningaid LAK-õppe tehnikaid. Uuringu tulemused annavad teavet selle kohta, kus vajavad õpetajad didaktilist tuge, et õpetada mitmekeelses keskkonnas.



Artiklikogumiku lõpupoole leiame **Mare Kitsniku** eesti keele kui teise keele õppematerjale analüüsiva artikli „**Kuidas õppida eesti keeles rääkima? Rääkimisoskust arendavad ülesanded eesti keele kui teise keele B1-taseme täiskasvanute õpikutes**“. Selleks et keeleõppijad saaksid rikkaliku, huvitava ja tõhusa keeleõppe, on vaja sobivaid suhtlemisoskust arendavaid ülesandeid. Võimalikult loomulikud suhtlusolukorrad arendavad efektiivselt suhtlemisjulgest ja keelelist sujuvust. Uuringus analüüsitakse kolme õppekomplekti kuulamistekste, mis pakuvad keelelist sisendit ja rääkimisoskust arendavaid õppetegevusi. Autor jõuab järeldusele, et kõik analüüsitud õppematerjalid sisaldavad ülesandeid, mis toetavad grammatikat, sõnavara ja suhtlusoskust, samuti jutustamisülesandeid. Mõningad neist ülesannetest on rikastatud aktiivõppe meetodite ja mänguliste elementidega. Uuring on esimene omataoline, mis vaatleb B1-taseme õppematerjalide rääkimisülesandeid.

Järgneb **Maris Saagpaku** didaktilise alatooniga artikkel „**Mitmekultuurilisuse pädevuse toetamine saksa keele tunnis virtuaalprojekti „Mets kui mälupaik Saksamaal, Eestis ja Sri Lankal“ näitel**“, milles räägitakse virtuaalsest mälupaikade projektist ning analüüsitakse kollektiivse kultuurimälu subjektiivseid ja suhtelisi aspekte. Kahe riigi üliõpilaste osalusel toimunud projekt aitas mõista, kuidas tekib kultuuriline tähendus, samuti märgata teiste kultuuride vaatlemise kaudu uusi aspekte enda kultuuris ja tõlgendada neid laiemas kontekstis. On oluline teadlikult tutvustada õppijatele kultuurimüütide rolli tänapäeva kultuurilise identiteedi kujundamisel. Niisugused projektid on hea näide, kuidas tõhusalt arendada õppijate kultuuridevahelist suhtlus- ja vahendamispädevust ning kasutada keeletunde kultuuriõppeks.

Selles teemanumbris leidub lai lugemisvalik kõigile, kes huvituvad mitmekeelsusest ja teise keele õppega seonduvast. Artiklid vaatavad Eesti kontekstist kaugemale ning käsitletud on õpetamist ja õppimist nii laiemalt kui ka kitsamalt, nii õppija kui ka õpetaja perspektiivist.

Head lugemist!

# INTRODUCTION TO THE THEMATIC ISSUE “LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES. LEARNING AND TEACHING”

Merilyn Meristo, Reili Argus

In the spring of 2023, an international conference titled “Language and Languages. Learning and Teaching” took place at Tallinn University. Inspired by this event, the current collection of articles was born. Just as the conference, this thematic issue focuses on two aspects: language and languages. When we refer to “language,” we primarily mean the Estonian language in the contemporary Estonian society during the transition to Estonian-medium education. Under “languages,” we refer to the richness and variety of languages and the ability to navigate multilingualism.

Language serves as a binding thread for societies, enabling communication and cultural self-expression. In a multilingual world, it is crucial to promote genuine multilingualism, not just language pairs like Estonian-English or Estonian-Russian. As linguists, we understand that by supporting the acquisition of a child’s first language, we contribute to the learning of any subsequent languages. Thus, language learning of any kind is beneficial. However, a monolingual attitude is still prevalent in society, and linguists need to work on changing it. We must consider how to support children learning different native languages, which can aid in the learning of the Estonian language. Linguists and policymakers can collaborate and learn from other countries’ experiences to create a truly multilingual society where every language and culture is valued.

In this country, the Estonian language is of special importance, as it preserves our rich heritage and fosters a sense of community. Policymakers shape our educational landscape. Linguists strengthen the foundation of language education through systematic linguistic

research and methodological approaches. Language teachers, as practitioners, implement language policy decisions and use innovative, evidence-based methods, playing a significant role in shaping the identity of future generations. Therefore, research related to language education is currently invaluable to ensure that both language policy and practical decisions are based on evidence.

The collection of articles begins with a historical overview. **Anna Verschik**, in the article “**Chackelis Lemchenas, a contrastive linguist before contrastive linguistics**”, analyses the views of Lithuanian linguist Chackelis Lemchenas on the teaching of the Lithuanian language in schools for ethnic minorities. Lemchenas emphasized that the language environment does not guarantee language acquisition, and teaching the Lithuanian language is akin to teaching a foreign language. He supported explicit grammar teaching for different language structures. Lemchenas’s ideas are considered a primitive contrastive approach. The article emphasizes that the sociolinguistic situation of Eastern Europe and small nations differs from the Western world, where a monolingual ideology has prevailed. While the context of teaching the Lithuanian language is different from other countries, and Lemchenas’s ideas have remained largely unknown to a broader circle of researchers, his contribution to understanding the history of linguistics outside the Western context is significant.

Moving on to the present, **Miina Norvik** and **Renate Pajusalu** offer insights into the experiences and opinions of Estonians regarding foreign language acquisition in their article “**Foreign language acquisition: opinions and memories of Estonians**”. While participants’ opinions on language teaching methodology varied, traditional methods such as storytelling and written exercises were generally considered useful. The influence of the teacher’s personality and classmates was found to be very important, and motivation factors were emphasized: interest in the language was prominent with German, French, and Spanish, but necessity was mentioned with English and Russian, where interest was of less importance. The

results reflect people's perceptions of language and language learning, in other words, Estonians' language awareness.

Continuing into the present, **Birute Lang-Klaas**, **Kristiina Praakli**, and **Diana Vender** explore the expectations and fears of parents concerning the transition to Estonian-medium education in their article "**Transition to Estonian-medium education – a study of the attitudes of Russian-dominant parents in Tartu**". The authors note that since parents are largely responsible for obtaining information about the transition process, this has increased distrust, fears, and misunderstandings about learning in Estonian. Parents' concerns and questions mainly revolve around students' academic progress, the complexity of learning in a second language, students' self-identity, questions related to their native language and culture, and the language used in communication between educational institutions and parents. The authors emphasize the need for further research to gain a more detailed understanding of the problem areas related to the transition process.

Having discussed parents' attitudes, the next article by **Tiina Rüütmaa**, **Merilyn Meristo**, **Reili Argus**, and **Helin Puksand** presents teachers' attitudes to the transition to Estonian-medium education in their article "**Teachers' attitudes to teaching in a multilingual classroom and transition to Estonian-medium education**". Two-thirds of the teachers participating in the study teach students whose proficiency in the Estonian language is insufficient for participating in Estonian-medium education. Overall, teachers favor the transition to Estonian as the language of instruction. However, the results show that teachers with experience in teaching students with a different native language are less positively inclined compared to inexperienced teachers. There is also significantly less consensus regarding whether integrating students with a different native language into schools creates a favorable learning environment for everyone and whether it is acceptable for students with a different native language to use their language in school. The study also revealed that schools primarily provide support for teaching

students with a different native language through teaching assistants, teaching materials, including access to paid materials, and training opportunities.

Next, we turn to Lithuania with **Ineta Dabašinskienė’s** article “**Multilingual education for minority schools in Lithuania: In search of balance and compromise,**” which provides insights into the situation of multilingualism in Lithuania. The article focuses on the literacy of ethnic minority groups and the acquisition of the Lithuanian language, addressing important educational issues in Lithuania. While progress has been made, studies still indicate that a lack of proficiency in the Lithuanian language can impact the academic success and career opportunities of ethnic minorities. The study concentrates on the language of instruction and language policy of ethnic minorities in Lithuania, analyzing data from Lithuanian government institutions and policy documents, emphasizing the importance of learning the state language. Unlike its neighboring countries Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania is moving toward a bilingual education model, with an emphasis on strengthening the position of the Lithuanian language. English is also considered important. Changes in language issues take time and require effort from the state, its institutions, and society.

Returning to Estonia, **Elena Samsonova, Aleksandra Ljalikova, and Merilyn Meristo** analyze the collaboration between language and subject teachers in the Estonian Language and Literature (ELL) program in Estonia in their article “**Factors facilitating and hindering deep-level collaboration between subject and language teachers in the Estonian CLIL context**”. The results reveal that teachers who participated in the study of collaboration-based training programs considered tandem collaboration useful for students and themselves. The study identified numerous facilitating and hindering factors for collaboration, with facilitating conditions prevailing, except at the organizational or school management level. The most crucial aspect turned out to be the structure of the ELL program and tandem collaboration, but teachers cited a lack of time

as the main obstacle to collaboration. The results emphasize the need to focus on eliminating organizational obstacles to promote collaboration.

Moving away from teachers' collaboration, we delve into classroom activities in the article "**Class activities supporting Estonian language acquisition at primary school level**" by **Kristiina Bernhardt** and **Merilyn Meristo**. During the transition to Estonian-medium education, it is essential to understand how Estonian as a second language and other subjects are taught in primary school. The study focuses on classroom activities that support the learning of Estonian as a second language. It also examines the structure of lessons and students' activities. The results show that teachers use various methods to teach the Estonian language, but certain aspects of language instruction, such as listening comprehension and writing, are not implemented systematically, particularly in terms of vocabulary teaching. Students are not given enough opportunities to speak or express themselves, as teachers use group or pair work less frequently. In subject lessons, the focus is on content, and language support often consists primarily of vocabulary learning. However, teachers do use some Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) techniques. The results provide information on areas where teachers need didactic support to teach effectively in a multilingual environment.

Towards the end of this collection of articles, we find **Mare Kitsnik's** article which analyzes instructional materials for Estonian as a second language. The article is titled "**How to learn to speak Estonian? Speaking tasks in B1-level textbooks of Estonian as a second language for adults**". In order to provide language learners with a rich and engaging language learning experience, it is essential to incorporate appropriate exercises that enhance communicative proficiency. Encouraging natural communicative situations effectively cultivates confidence to speak and linguistic fluency. The study involves an analysis of listening texts from three instructional sets, which offer linguistic input and activities designed to promote

speaking skills. The author concludes that all the analyzed instructional materials contain tasks that support grammar, vocabulary, and communication skills, including narrative tasks. Some of these tasks are enriched with active learning methods and playful elements. This study is the first of its kind to examine communicative tasks in B1-level instructional materials.

Following the above, **Maris Saagpakk** presents an article with a didactic focus titled “**Fostering multicultural competence in German language classes in a virtual project on ‘Memory spaces in Germany, Estonia, and Sri Lanka’**”. The article discusses a virtual memory space project and scrutinizes subjective and relative aspects of collective cultural memory. This project, which involved students from two countries, facilitated an understanding of how cultural significance is constructed and enabled the recognition of new aspects of one’s culture through the observation of other cultures, interpreting them in a broader context. It is imperative to consciously introduce learners to the role of cultural myths in shaping contemporary cultural identity. Such projects serve as an excellent example of how to effectively develop learners’ intercultural communication and mediation competence while utilizing language classes for cultural studies.

This thematic issue provides a diverse selection of readings for individuals interested in multilingualism and second language education. The articles extend beyond the Estonian context and address teaching and learning from both broader and more specific perspectives, considering the viewpoints of both learners and educators.

Happy reading!





# CHACKELIS LEMCHENAS, A CONTRASTIVE LINGUIST BEFORE CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS

Anna Verschik

**Abstract.** The article explores the views of Chackelis Lemchenas (1904–2001) on teaching Lithuanian to speakers of other languages. As a prominent linguist, experienced practitioner, and a multilingual person, he proposed ideas that are compatible with the principles of contrastive linguistics already in the 1920s. He favoured explicit grammar explanations in the subsystems that differ in Lithuanian and the students' L1 and explained that what he called “formal logic” was necessary in order to teach the students how the grammar of Lithuanian works in comparison with their L1. The article demonstrates that exploration of language teaching approaches in non-Western contexts and from historical perspectives provides a better understanding of the history of ideas.

**Keywords:** Lithuanian, language teaching, language learning, Chackelis Lemchenas, historical sociolinguistics

## 1. Introduction

The objective of this article is to describe and analyse the views of Chackelis Lemchenas (1904–2001) concerning the teaching of Lithuanian as L2 to ethnolinguistic minorities in interwar Lithuania (1918–1940). More specifically, the ideas expressed in the mid-1920s–1930s are to be discussed from today's perspective, given what we know now about language acquisition and language teaching. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) as a scholarly discipline started developing after WWII, at the same time with related fields such as L1 acquisition, contact linguistics and bi- and multilingualism

research. The understanding that what language learners produce is not chaotic but actually has connection to features of their L1 is reflected by Uriel Weinreich (1953), Robert Lado (1957) and later works by Pit Corder (1967) and Larry Selinker (1972). The underlying idea of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, expressed by Lado (1957), suggests that for a learner it is easier to acquire features that are similar in L1 and L2 and more difficult to acquire grammatical features that differ across these languages.

However, empirical evidence (especially from the point of view of the neighbouring discipline of contact linguistics) demonstrates that Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis has a limited predictive power and not all speakers of L1 transfer features of that language onto target language (L2). Moreover, the learners' version may become a new norm under certain sociolinguistic circumstances (for instance, in Latvian, the fixed stress on the first syllable is a "mistake" characteristic of speakers of Finnic languages that have the feature; eventually, their variety of a Baltic language became the mainstream). Still, the idea of a contrastive approach and comparison of L1 and L2 (L3, Lx) structures was innovative and fundamental for the formation of SLA (see more on the history of the field in Ellis 2020).

What is less known is how understanding of L2 learning and teaching developed in the non-Western context. Additionally, there is a diachronic dimension here, and research on language teaching and learning discourse in a historical perspective can be qualified as a historical sociolinguistic inquiry (see the programmatic article by Nevalainen 2015).<sup>1</sup> It may be argued that in macro-perspective, Lithuania and other countries of Eastern Europe are culturally a part of the West, but at a closer look, one discovers remarkable differences compared to the prototypical West. Teaching of such languages as Lithuanian or other languages of the so-called peoples

---

<sup>1</sup> The homepage of Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics mentions language ideologies among the topics; a historic (reconstructionist) approach to discourse on language teaching, views on language learners and teachers profiles etc. can be considered as a subtopic: <https://www.degruyter.com/journal/key/jhsl/html>

with late modernization occurred in a strikingly different sociolinguistic situation than teaching of English, French, German, Russian and other “big” languages with long-established standards and traditions. Unlike the West, the Baltic states that emerged in 1919, after the collapse of the Russian Empire, acknowledged ethnic minorities and, with a different degree of success, guaranteed primary and secondary education through the medium of minority languages. In the Baltic states, the general understanding was that everyone should study foreign languages, minorities and majorities alike (the usual practice was to teach two foreign languages and, in the minority school, the official language as well). Thus, an analysis of considerations of how Lithuanian as L2 should be taught and by whom would provide a better understanding of SLA/L2 teaching history. Another point is the availability of the relevant writings and a potential researcher’s ability to read Lithuanian or any other lesser used language. It will be demonstrated that Chackelis Lemchenas, a renowned teacher of Lithuanian, translator, editor and lexicographer, expressed ideas that remained unknown to the larger scholarly community.

The paper is organised as follows. First, the sociolinguistic context of interwar Lithuania and the linguistic situation will be discussed. Then the papers where Lemchenas expressed his views (Lemchenas 1924a, 1924b, 1928) will be analysed. This will be followed by discussion and conclusions.

## **2. The sociolinguistic situation and teaching of Lithuanian from 1918 to 1940**

Lithuanian has a long literary tradition, yet due to socio-political circumstances, such as the Polonization of the elites since the emergence of Polish–Lithuanian commonwealth and then the subjugated position of Lithuanians and Russification policies under the Russian imperial rule, a gradual emergence of modern standard Lithuanian took place as late as the middle of the 19th century. The inhabitants of

larger cities and towns spoke mostly the languages of the elites, that is, Russian, Polish and, to some extent, German, while Lithuanian-speakers dwelled mostly in the countryside (this started gradually changing during the national awakening in the second part of the 19th century). The proficiency in Lithuanian was not required from the ruling imperial elites, and as for ethnolinguistic minorities, such as the Poles, Jews, Tatars, Karaims, Belarusians, their command of Lithuanian varied depending on their place of residence, occupation and the need to interact with their Lithuanian neighbours.

After the establishment of the independent Republic of Lithuania in 1918, the sociopolitical situation changed radically: now Lithuanian was the official language that functioned in all public domains, and a mere working knowledge of the language and/or its regional variety was not sufficient anymore. Ethnolinguistic minorities had to be taught modern standard Lithuanian in schools and vocational training institutions.

Compared to other Baltic countries, Lithuania had a larger share of minorities. According to the 1924 census, the share of other ethnic groups was as follows: Russians constituted 2.7 %, Germans 1.4 %, Poles 3.2 % and Jews 7.6 % of the population (Kasekamp 2010: 117). Like in Latvia and Estonia, linguistic minorities had a right for secondary education in their languages, so Lithuania had a developed system of minority schools. In all three Baltic countries, the policy was that minorities should attend either their own schools or majority schools and not the schools of other minorities, especially the German and Russian ones, as the former elite languages still held some prestige.

According to Kaubrys (1991: 25), who retrieved data from the Ministry of Education, the State Archive of Lithuania (*Lietuvos valstybinis archyvas*) and from various official reports (written records of the parliament meetings, the government news publication *Vyriausybės žinios*) there were Jewish, Polish, German, Latvian, Russian, Belarusian and mixed schools (the latter had several languages of instruction). The number of Jewish schools (here Yiddish