

Greek Teaching Materials Abroad

Michael Damanakis

Introduction

Today's Greek emigration is characterized by a history of approximately 150 years. During the 19th century the destinations of the Greek emigrants were mainly the East-European countries and Egypt. In the current century, destinations have been especially the USA, Canada, Australia and -among other European countries- Germany.

At the present time, 10,00,000 Greeks live in Greece and some 4,00,000 live abroad in more than 100¹ countries. According to the records of the Greek Ministry of Education, Greek language courses (for emigrants and their children) have been organized in at least 40 countries.

The experience which has been obtained, as well as the research conducted on organizations and the historical evolution of Greek language education abroad is very rich. The analytical curricula and the teaching materials designed to help Greek students abroad learn Greek, and the scientific knowledge available about this matter, is very limited however.

The objective of the present article is to approach this topic by analyzing and comparing seven series of teaching materials which are in use in the USA, Australia and Europe.

First, we will briefly present the seven curricula (section 1), together with a first comparison of their basic characteristics.

Subsequently, the theoretical assumptions of sociocultural conditions and their influence on learning processes, and the resulting cultural orientation of each teaching series, are briefly analyzed.

We end with an analysis of the teaching of Greek both as a first and a second language, as well as the didactic and methodological consequences involved in the teaching of Greek language abroad.

1. Short presentation of the projects

1.1 Greek Curriculum Victoria, Australia (GCVA)

The GCVA was developed by a common project group associated with the Education Department of Victoria and the Education Department of South Australia, and was financed by two ministries and by the Joint Programme for Multicultural Education and Projects of National Significance of the Schools Commission.

The curriculum was first published in 1984 in Melbourne by the Victoria Education department (Materials Production, Curriculum Branch). It is intended for students of Greek and non-Greek speaking background, from kindergarten to year 8, who are enrolled in Australian state schools.

The subject is Greek as “mother tongue” and as a “second language²”. The aim of the material is communicative competence of the students in the Greek language.

The teaching series consists of a teacher's guide, nine unit books, story-books, supplementary materials (resource books), a cassette and a song-book.

1.2 ZEG-Project (Zuid Europese Gemeenschappen) Amsterdam

The material was developed by a project group within the framework of the ZEG-project and was financed by the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Netherlands.

The material was first published³ in 1987 (by the ABC-Amsterdam) and is intended for students of three levels:

- a) 4-7 years old
- b) 8-10 years old
- c) 11-12 years old.

The subjects are Greek as a mother tongue and Greek civilization. The aim of the material is to help students acquire knowledge about “social, cultural, historical, economic, geographic and national” matters, as well as communicative competence in Greek language (see Teaching Guide, p.4).

The teaching material consists of:

- a) Material for basic reading and writing
- b) Nine booklets, each containing an adventure involving Ulysses
- c) Slides depicting the adventures of Ulysses, posters, hand i craft booklets, painting activities and a cassette with songs.

1.3 Project of the National Assessment and Dissemination Centre (NADC) for Bilingual Education, Massachusetts (NADCM)

The teaching material was developed by a project group of the North-east Centre for Curriculum Development, New York. It was financed by the National Assessment and Discrimination Centre for Bilingual Education and was supported by the Office of Education of the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The material was published in Massachusetts in 1984 by the NADC and is designed for students from kindergarten to class A (1st grade). The subject of the material is Greek as a “mother tongue” and as a “second language”, as well as Greek civilization.

The general goal of the material is “to provide opportunities for the bilingual and bicultural education of all Greek- American children and of those who are interested in learning the Greek language and civilization” (unit 1.p.IV).

The teaching series consist of ten textbooks for the students and a teacher's book (kindergarten), two booklets for basic reading and writing (1st grade) and supplementary teaching material (story-books and books with proverbs, booklets for illustration and other activities, etc.).

1.4 Project of the Orthodox Archdiocese of America (POAA)

The development and publication of this teaching material was financed by the Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America and was materialized by its associates (collaborators) during the years 1974-1977.

It is to be used by students of elementary classes (1st-3rd/4th grades) whose “first language is English” or “who speak very little Greek”.

Therefore, as mentioned in the Teacher’s Guide, the subject is Greek as a foreign language or as a second language.

The aim is the systematic learning of modern Greek by students whose first language is English (Teacher’s Guide, p.5).

The material consists of:

- a) a textbook for oral practice
- b) three textbooks for basic reading and writing
- c) three textbooks for the further teaching of Greek, including teacher’s books.

This basic material is accompanied by supplementary material referring to the grammar of Greek language as well as to Greek history and civilization.

1.5 Project of the Institute of Education of Greece (PIEG)

The project of the Institute of Education, which has not been yet finished, is being developed by a project group at the Institute of Education and is being financed by the Greek Ministry of Education.

It is published by the OE B (state publisher) and is intended for Greek-speaking and English-speaking students of Greek origin, 6-14 years old (grades 1st-6th/7th).

According to statements made by the authors, the subject is Greek as a second language. The goal of the project (material) is the “development of the communicative ability (competence) of the students in Greek language” as well as “knowledge of basic elements of the Greek-orthodox tradition and Greek civilization”.

The material is organized in three stages (beginners, intermediate and advanced) and includes eight textbooks.

1.6 Project of the University of Ioannina (PUI)⁴

The PUI was developed by project groups that had worked in Greece and Germany during the years 1986-1993 under my scientific supervision. The project was financed by the Commission of the European Communities. The integrated teaching material is published by the OE B (state publisher) (First edition 1988).

The material is designed for Greek students, between 6-13 years of age, who attend regular German classes and simultaneously are taught the Greek language during regular school time or in afternoon classes.

The teaching material presupposes that students speak the Greek language to a certain degree so that they can -albeit with difficulties - communicate with their teacher in Greek. The material is not made for Greek as a foreign language.

The subject is Greek as a 'first' and 'second' language, with the aim to help students acquire:

- a) an identity relevant to the bicultural-bilingual conditions of their socialization and
- b) communicative competence in the Greek language.

The teaching material consists of one or two textbooks for each class (classes 1-6) and accompanying workbooks, special reading texts (anthology books), supplementary visual material (slides) and teacher's books.

1.7 Project for Florida University USA (PFU)

The PFU was developed by project groups under the scientific supervision of Byron Massialas, Professor at the State University of Florida. The project was financed by the US Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, as well as by the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The material was published by the Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centre, Massachusetts in 1981 and the Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centre, Dallas in 1983.

The materials are intended for Greek-speaking students in grades 1-8 in the USA. The subject is social studies as normally found in the US educational system, including teaching elements relating to Greek traditions, history and civilization. However, the goals of the materials are not clarified in detail by the authors.

The teaching series consists of four textbooks for grades 1-4. The contents deal primarily with the family, the neighborhood and the Greek heritage. They have been developed by the authors especially for Greek-speaking students. The textbooks for the following grades are translations of social studies books which are used in US Schools.

2. First comparative approach to the projects

Table 1 provides a first comparative overview of the projects presented above. The table demonstrates that only two of the seven projects have been exclusively or to a great extent created in Greece.

Only one of the projects is financed by the Greek government. This does not mean that the Greek state does not provide teaching material. However, the material provided is the same which is used in Greece and therefore seems not to be appropriate for Greek-language teaching abroad.

Concerning the levels of education dealt with, we can conclude that a very limited amount of teaching material has been produced up to now for pre-elementary and secondary education. The focus is on primary education. This is a problem in the sense that the students come to primary education linguistically unprepared, and they also don't have the proper teaching materials for learning Greek language in secondary education.

Concerning the prerequisites of Greek language education, and consequently the exact definition of the subject, there is a certain vagueness inherent in most of the projects. The authors either confine themselves to the general term "teaching the Greek language", or they use terms like "Greek as a second language" or "Greek as a foreign language", without defining such terminology. Moreover, in most cases these two terms are used as synonyms. We will come to this complex theoretical problem later (see section 6).

Three of the seven series of teaching materials may be characterized as examples of an open curriculum whereas the other four ones represent more of a closed curriculum.

With the exception of the University of Florida Project, which doesn't have the Greek language itself as a subject the rest of the projects focus more or less on literacy in the Greek language⁵.

As far as we know, there have not been any significant contacts and collaboration among the producers of the various teaching materials.

With respect to the University of Ioannina project, there was a close collaboration between the project groups involved in this project and the project groups of the Landesinstitut für Schule und Weiterbildung in Soest Nordrhein-Westfalen during the whole time (for 7 years), as well as with the Hessisches Kultusministerium. For a short time we collaborated with the ZEG- project.

Furthermore, there was also a short (one year) collaboration between the Greek Institute of Education and the Orthodox Archdiocese of America (see projects 1.4 and 1.5).

3. Functioning conditions of the teaching material

One of the basic factors that has to be taken into account when producing teaching materials, is the institutional and organizational framework in which the materials will be used. However, as the analysis above reveals these conditions are not clarified in any of the six⁶ series of teaching materials. The relevant references - if there are any - are mostly vague. As a result, the reader is not able to understand if the teaching materials are designed:

- for Classes involving Mother Tongue Teaching
- for Reception Classes
- for Bilingual Classes.

Furthermore it is difficult to estimate the teaching time which the materials require, since in some cases this point is not clarified.

PROGRAMME CATEGORY	GCVA	ZEGA	NADOCM	POAA	PIEG	PUI	PFU	TOTAL
1. AREA OF PRODUCTION								
— Greece					+	+		2
— Abroad	+	+	+	+		+	+	5
2. SPONSOR								
— Greece					+			1
— Host Country	+	+	+				+	4
— Greek Organisation in the Host Country				+				1
— Other						EC		1
3. LEVELS OF EDUCATION								
— Kindergarten	+	+	+					3
— Primary Education (grades 1-6)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	7
— Secondary Education	+						+	2
4. SUBJECT								
— Greek as MT	+	+	+			+		4
— Greek as SL	+	+(?)	+	+	+(?)	+		5
— Greek as FL				+				1
— Greek Civilisation		+	+			+	+	4
5. OPEN CURRICULUM								
— Yes	+	+	+					3
— No				+	+	+	+	4
6. BASIC TEACHING AND WRITING								
— Yes	+(?)	+	+	+	+	+		6
— No							+	1

Table 1: Characteristics of the teaching material projects, according to information given by the authors. H=Host Country, MT=Mother Tongue, SL=Second Language, FL=Foreign Language

The producers of the various materials do provide the following information:

In the *Dutch project* (ZEG-project), for example, information about the institutional and organizational framework are confined to the statement that the “Language and Civilization Lesson... is attended by students of several Dutch schools..., once a week and five hours only” (ZEG, Teaching Guide, II 7).

In the *Archdiocese project* it is mentioned that the series Γράφω και Διαβάζω “can be used as basic or supplementary teaching material within the framework of the language curriculum of the school, depending on its form - morning or evening courses -on the frequency of lessons during the week, the pace of progress of the students, and other factors” (Teaching Guide, p.4).

The units of the series “μιλώ, γράφω και διαβάζω” “can also be divided “into more lessons, depending on the special functioning conditions of the school” (Teaching Guide, p.5).

From the description given above one could conclude that the authors consider the material “appropriate” for all forms of schools, although it is intended for students whose “first language is English” or “for those who speak very little Greek”.

In the *project of the Institute of Education of Greece*, the only reference made

to the functioning conditions of the classes, where the teaching material will be used, is the following: “The new series of textbooks is designed for children of Greek-speaking background, 6-14 years old, who go to Greek schools of America: morning, evening as well as those which are open every Saturday” (see Introduction, p.1).

In this case also, the authors assume that the teaching material can be used under any organizational circumstances.

Finally, in the teaching materials created by Florida State University, there is no mention of the forms of education this material has been produced for.

4. The sociocultural and learning assumptions of the students and the teaching material

The sociocultural and the linguistic situation of the students, for whom the teaching materials are designed, are more important factors than the organizational assumptions. In the projects examined, the learners are often not defined at all, or they are defined inadequately. In the *Florida State University Project* for example, reference is made to “Greek-speaking students” in general (see Teacher’s books, Introduction).

The producers of the teaching materials, created by *the Institute of Education of Greece*, aim at using their material after some “proper adjustments” for children of Greek-speaking background living in other countries (i.e. outside of the United States, MD), but also for all children who are taught Greek as a second language (see Introduction, p.1).

The producers of the “*Analytical Project of Bilingual Education*” (NADCM) have similar aspirations. They write that “the teaching material of the Analytical Project aims at the bilingual and bicultural education of all Greek-American children and of those who are interested in Greek language and civilization” (see Unit 1, p.IV).

Insufficiently defined are also the receivers of *the material of the Archdiocese* because on the one hand they refer to students whose first language is English and on the other hand to students who attend various forms of Greek-language education (see Introduction of Teacher’s Guides).

The *Dutch project* (ZEG) refers to Greek students in general and lastly *the Victoria (Australia) project* is intended for students of Greek-speaking, as well as non-Greek-speaking background

On the whole, we can support the fact that the producers have aimed their teaching materials not at the monolingual student whose mother tongue is Greek or for whom at least the dominant language is Greek, but at students who have been socialized under bicultural-bilingual conditions.

However, the authors’ references do not make clear what form of bilingualism they had in mind. In this sense, the learners are only negatively defined. In short, from the theoretical analyses of the material producers one might conclude more what the learners are not rather than what they are.

5. Cultural orientation

An insufficient sociocultural orientation and a mainly linguistic definition of the learners is accompanied, for the most part, by a vague definition of the primary goals of the material. This theoretical deficit, found in some of the projects, is also reflected in the content of the teaching materials. Without going into a detailed analysis, we shall outline the cultural orientation of the materials with reference to the theoretical information supplied by the producers and focus less on the materials themselves.

The fact that the teaching materials do not totally neglect the student’s biculturalism and bilingualism is a common feature of these materials.

On the other hand, however, none of the teaching materials is based on a clearly formulated bicultural-bilingual theoretical view. In this sense, the authors' references to the student's biculturalism and bilingualism often have a verbose character.

Comparing the projects with each other, *the Project of Modern Greek from Victoria (Australia)* appears to be the most biculturally and intercultural oriented. One of its main goals is the understanding of Greek civilization, the civilization of the Greeks in Australia as well as the civilization of "other nations". Nevertheless, we should emphasize that this project can be characterized more as an analytical curriculum. The production of teaching materials based on this analytical curriculum still remains unaccomplished.

Diametrically opposed to the previous project is perhaps *the Project of the Institute of Education of Greece*. The producers' focus on the Greek-orthodox tradition" and "the contribution" of Greek civilization to "the formation of the Western civilization and especially its influence on the American nation"⁷ leads to Greek - centred and ethnocentric teaching contents, which we believe students of Greek origin who attend US schools are unfamiliar with.

In textbook 3, Part "B" of this project (Experimental application), 10 of 17 units contain texts that refer directly to modern Greece⁸. In addition, there are texts which refer to modern Greece indirectly, as well as to Greek history and mythology.

Reading the texts which refer directly to Greece, one gets the impression that the producers of the material - who are mostly the writers of the texts - aim at making the students feel nostalgic about Greece.

It is our view that such an aim does not provide much help in the bicultural socialization of Greek children abroad. Furthermore, it's doubtful whether through such texts someone can make second and third generation individuals feel nostalgic about Greece. In our estimation, children are not really familiar with these types of contents. As a result, it is not unlikely that students will be driven away from their mother tongue courses instead of attracted to them.

The teaching material produced in *Amsterdam (The Netherlands)* has a similar cultural orientation to that of the Institute of Education project. The authors intend to lead students, through the adventures of Ulysses, to subjects which relate to their direct sociocultural environment. As long as the teaching material is confined to the adventures of Ulysses, however, the transition to matters that relate to the bilingual socialization of children depends upon the goodwill and the capacity of the individual teacher.

The cultural orientation of *the Archdiocese project* is contradictory. One part of the material is beyond the children's experiences and another part refers directly to the student's sociocultural (bicultural-multicultural) conditions.

The Project NADCM, compared with the former projects, can be characterized as biculturally oriented, but is not completely free from anachronistic (old-fashioned) ethnocentric texts.

The Florida State University Project, diverges considerably from the rest for two reasons:

- a) Its teaching objective is neither Greek language nor Greek civilization exclusively
- b) The greatest part of the material is composed of translations of American schools manuals.

An analysis of the first series of materials for grades 1-4, which have been especially made for Greek-speaking students, leads to some more specific conclusions.

The first three volumes have a multicultural orientation. Issue "The Family", for example, refers to Greek, Chinese, Mexican and Jewish families. In issue "The neighborhood" neighbors from various nationalities appear to coexist peacefully. Also, the issue "Various Communities" deals with traditional communities like those of the Eskimos in Greenland, of Navjos or Navojow in the southwestern USA and the

traditional Greek community.

On the other hand, however, we see an orientation towards tradition in the teaching materials. The Greek family celebrates Easter with magiritsa (Easter soup), lamb on a spit and tsourekia (round sweet cakes) (see student's book, p.100). Food in the Chinese family is Chinese food made by the grandmother (lbd, p. 105). In the Greek grandmother's narrative, children are introduced to the traditional Greek community characteristic of the beginning of our century and not to the modern community.

The orientation towards the past is distinct in the issue "Greek heritage". The ten topics of the issue are mostly examined in their historical evolution. This leads, on the one hand, to an ethnocentric presentation of the contents and, on the other hand, to contents which are not suitable for students of 6-10 years old (grades 1-4).

Needless to say, the authors quote excerpts from the Odyssey, from other classical texts, from the Gospel, etc. in order to show the continuity of the Greek language. The authors also emphasize that the ancient Greek people offered many ideas that became the basis of today's civilization.

In sum, an analysis of the Florida State University project points to a double result: The producers of the material recognize the multiculturalism and multilingualism of society and the biculturalism and bilingualism of Greek children abroad, on the one hand. On the other hand, however, they insist on teaching traditional and Greek-centred educational contents, which do not advance the idea of a bicultural and intercultural education. Apparently, the implicit theory that the teaching material is based on is that of the parallel existence, but not coexistence, of ethnic and cultural minorities (see Smolicz, 1987, p. 166).

In our opinion this contradiction characterizes the views and the efforts of those who deal with the education of Greek children abroad, (with the exception of those who consciously espouse ethnocentric patterns of education).

Everyone takes into consideration successful cases of bicultural socialization, where individuals managed to combine elements of the two civilizations into a whole and to acquire a bicultural identity. Nobody, however, knows exactly which particular processes take place within the individual. Furthermore nobody has stated a well-tested valid proposition of bicultural-bilingual education for Greek children abroad.

Finally, as yet nobody has defined the place and the role of Greek civilization within the framework of a bicultural- intercultural education for Greek children abroad. This is a difficult problem and until we solve it, we will continue to offer Greek children abroad the same educational contents we offer Greek students in Greece.

6. Teaching Greek as a first and a second language

The theoretical deficit we discovered is also reflected in the terminology relating to Greek language teaching.

Before continuing, we need to clarify that the term "Greek as a mother tongue" is not used very often. The general term 'Greek language teaching' appears more frequently.

The absence of the term "Greek as a mother tongue" is obviously due to the decline in the number of children of Greek origin whose dominant language is Greek.

The terms used in the relevant bibliographies are: "Greek as a second language" and "Greek as a foreign language". However, these terms are not defined semantically and in many cases they are used as if they were synonyms.

In *the Victoria, Australia (GCVA) project* for example, the term Greek as a "second language" is constantly used. In fact, the material is designed for teaching Greek as a "foreign language" to elementary school level children of non-Greek origin, who have had no previous contact with Greek language and civilization. In the particular project the term "Greek as a second language" can be used as long as reference is made to students of Greek origin. The producers of the material, however, use the same term (Greek as a second language) for both groups of students (of

Greek and non-Greek origin) and offer the same material to both groups of students.

The same applies to *the Archdiocese Project*. According to the author of the materials, the teaching object is Greek “as a second language” and users of the materials are students in grades 1-3/4 whose ‘first language is English’ or “who speak very little Greek”.

The confusion contained in the teaching materials from *the Greek Institute of Education* is particularly strong, since it aims at the teaching of Greek as a “second language” to different groups of students, different countries and also “to every child we want to teach Greek as a second language”.

This lack of clarity regarding concepts seems only natural if one considers the fact that there is no theory to account for rather complex linguistic situations.

We, therefore, will attempt to formulate some thoughts which could function as the stimuli for the creation of a theoretical framework.

Before doing this we need to emphasize that Greek language teaching to Greek children abroad has to be considered in the framework of their linguistic situation as a whole.

It is a paradox that the children of emigrants are offered both the language of “their” country (the country their parents come from) and the language of the host country as a “second language”. The obvious question is: don’t these children have a first language?

We will try to answer this question by taking as an example the Greek language teaching provided to about 50,000 Greek pupils at all levels in Germany.

Table 2 shows that every language can be considered from many vantage points and can be evaluated as either a first or second language.

If we compare the German and the Greek languages with respect to their *international prestige* and slams, Greek language obviously occupies a second place (see table 2, aspect 4). The same holds true in relation to the *social prestige* and status in the society of the host country. The role the Greek language plays in the German society is significant to marginal (see table 2, aspect 3).

Whether Greek will be the dominant language *in family communication* will depend on several factors, such as: the ethnic origin of the spouses, whether the family belongs to the first, second or third generation, whether the family is

Aspect	Language			
	Greek as first	Greek as second	German as first	German as second
1. <i>Individual aspect</i>				
1.1 cognitive aspect	e.g degree of mastery of each language			
1.2 emotional aspect	e.g attitude towards the two languages			
2. <i>family aspect and minority aspect</i>	dominant language in family communication and in the minority			
3. <i>social aspect</i>				
3.1 sociocultural, political and institutional aspect	e.g status and prestige of each language in the society of the host country			
3.2 socioeconomic aspect	e.g use and usefulness of each language for social advancement in the host society			
4. <i>international aspect</i>	international prestige and status of the languages			

Table 2: Aspects from which a language can be considered and evaluated as a first or second language.

incorporated into the ethnic community or not. It is our assumption that the use of Greek language in *intraethnic communication* depends on the degree of organization characteristic of the minority community.

Research (see Gotovos, 1988; Damanakis, 1988; Tamis, 1986/87), as well as our everyday experience, indicates that communication among members of Greek families abroad is to a great extent bilingual, i.e. bilingualism characterizes their internal linguistic situation (see table 2, aspect 2).

The same - and to a greater extent - applies with respect to the individual. On an *individual level* a language can be evaluated as first or second depending on the individual's degree of mastery of the language (objective evaluation) or depending on the individual's self-esteem and his/her attitude towards the language (subjective evaluation) (see table 2, aspect 1).

On the other hand, it needs to be emphasized that in the process of an individual's development each of the two languages can turn from second into first and vice versa. Usually, before the child reaches the elementary level, the first language tends to be the family language. A few years later this changes into the language of the host country.

From the analysis given above, it is evident how difficult it is to evaluate two languages and place them on a scale as either first or second, when these constitute the components of a *dynamic ongoing process of bilingual socialization*.

Moreover, it becomes clear that a given language can be considered the first language from one viewpoint and the second language from another viewpoint. The status of a language can remain stable or change over time. It is particularly during a young individual's development that the gradual change of the language from second to first and vice versa is possible.

Summing up, we can draw the following conclusions:

In a dynamic bicultural-bilingual process of socialization each of the two languages: a) can be the first language from one viewpoint and the second language from another viewpoint and; b) can maintain or change its position on the hierarchical scale.

By "*dynamic process of socialization*" we mean that both languages are alive and constitute components of the individual's socialization, which directly affect one's development. This means that we have to exclude from our consideration languages which are not part of a child's socialization. We cannot talk about Greek language teaching as teaching "a second language" when this is not the language of the child's socialization outside of the classroom too. In such cases Greek is foreign language.

In a dynamic process of bilingual socialization each of the two languages can function as one's first or second language and can maintain or surrender this position (in the process of the individual's development) to the other language.

In this sense, it is meaningless to classify languages as a first or a second one, as long as they are both languages of individual socialization.

The views presented above imply a methodological way of dealing with the bilingual education of children, provided that we treat both their languages as well as their bicultural capital on the basis of a comprehensive conceptual framework.

6.1 Consequences for teaching

The starting point of the University of Ioannina Project is the dynamic bicultural-bilingual socialization of the individual and the underlying theory is based on bicultural and inter-cultural education.

The fundamental teaching principle of the teaching materials is the following: *We should accept and treat the bicultural- bilingual capital of students in a positive way*⁹.

From this general teaching principle, the following teaching methodological sub- principles can be derived:

- First, treating the bicultural-bilingual capital of students in the most positive way presupposes its activation, which in turn presupposes *the selection of educational contents that will correspond to the student's experiences.*
- Children's experiences tend to have a bicultural character, for children receive cultural and linguistic stimuli not only from their family and their ethnic community but also from the dominant language and the culture of the host society. Because of the fact that host societies -in which various minority groups live- are usually multicultural, *thematic material characterized by multiculturalism is necessary* within "Mother Tongue Teaching" too. In other words the "*interculturalisation*¹⁰" of the curriculum as a whole is also relevant to "Mother Tongue Teaching".
- Acceptance of the bicultural-bilingual capital of students also implies *acceptance of a "mixed" linguistic code* which is often used by the students.
- The mixed linguistic code ought to become the basis *for the future linguistic development of the child in a conscious and equivalent (additive) bilingualism.*
- Moreover, a language has to be treated in a positive way *for the sake of learning the other language, and children have to be encouraged to adopt a positive attitude towards both languages.*
- On the other hand, we should take efforts *to prevent or to cure possible errors* relating to different types of interference with in the framework of a bilingual education.
- Finally, it's advisable *to emphasize the common features of the civilizations* which are represented in a multicultural society, so as to make things easy for children *in the process of acquisition of a bicultural identity.*

Address for correspondence: University of Crete, Department of Education, Perivolia 74100, Rethymnon, Greece.

References

- Apeltauer, Ernst (ed.) 1987:** *Gesteuerter Zweitspracherwerb. Voraussetzungen und Konzepte für den Ün-terricht.* Hueber: München.
- Gotovos, Athanassios:** The evolution of Greek language of second generation emigrants. Existing forms of oral and written language as prerequisites for the teaching of the mother tongue. In: *Scientific Year-book of the Department of Education of Ioannina.* Ioannina 1988 (p.273-480, Greek).
- Damanakis, Michael:** Research on the conditions under which mother tongue education conducted for Greek children in the FRG.
- Sociocultural and learning conditions of students and their attitude towards mother tongue courses.** In: *Scientific Year-book of the Department of Education of Ioannina University.* Ioannina 1988 (p. 11-272, Greek).
- Damanakis, Michael:** *Introduction to the theoretical framework of the project of production of language learning material for Greek children in Germany.* Ioannina University: Ioannina 1991 (Greek).
- Fthenakis, Wassilios (a.o.):** *Bilingual-bikulturelle Entwicklung des Kindes.* Hueber: München 1985.

Hohmann, Manfred - Reich, Hans H. (ed.): *Ein Europa für Mehrheiten und Minderheiten, Diskussion um interkulturelle Erziehung.* Waxmann Wissenschaft: Münster/New York 1989.

Reid, Euan & Reich, Hans: *Breaking the Boundaries. Migrant Workers' Children in the EC,* Multilingual Mailers LTD: Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide 1992.

Reich, Hans H: Europäische Modelversuche mit Migrantenkindern - Ergebnisse einer vergleichenden Evaluation. In: *Deutsch lernen* 1/90 (S. 3-24).

Smolicz, Jerzy: Multiculturalism and an overarching framework of values: some educational responses for ethnically plural societies. In: Borrelli Michele, Hoff Gerd (ed.): *Interkulturelle Pädagogik im internationalen Vergleich.* Pädagogischer Verlag Burgbucherei Schneider GmbH: Baltmannsweiler 1987.

Tamis, Anastasios: The changing structure of Modern Greek: The formation of an Ethnolect. In: *Glossologia* 5-6, 1986-87 (p. 123- 138).

Tocatlidou, Vasso: Designing Materials for Mother Tongue Teaching. In: Reid Euan & Reich Hans: *Breaking the Boundaries Migrant Workers' Children in the EC.* Multilingual Matters LTD: Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide 1992 (p. 179-212).

Addresses for Materials

1. Greek Curriculum

Materials Production, Curriculum Branch, Education Department of Victoria, Melbourne 1984.

2 ZEG — project, Greeks

ABC Amsterdam 1987 (Baarsjesweg 224, 1058 Amsterdam).

3. Greek bilingual Curriculum Kindergarten —First Grade

NADC, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1979. (National Dissemination Centre, 417 Rock Street, Fall River, MA02720).

4. Μαθαίνω να μιλώ ελληνικά, Γράφω και διαβάζω, Μιλώ, γράφω και διαβάζω.

Orthodox Archdiocese of America, New York 1974.

5. Μαθαίνω Ελληνικά

Institute of Education of Greece, ΟΕΔΒ, Athens 1989. (Ministry of Education, ΟΕΔΒ, 26-28 Mitropoleos Street, Athens).

6. Ελληνική Γλώσσα

Ioannina University GR, Ioannina 1988.

(Ioannina University, Department of Education, 30 Doboili Str., Ioannina GR).

7. Greek Bilingual Social Studies Series

Evaluation Dissemination and Assessment Centre. Massachusetts 1981, Dallas 1983. (National Dissemination Centre, 417 Rock Street, Fall River, MA02720).

NOTES

¹ The main host countries of Greek emigrants are: USA. (about 2,000,000 Greek Americans), Australia (400,000-500,000), Canada (300,000-350,000), Germany (350,000) and Great Britain (200,000, mainly Cypriots).

² In fact the curriculum deals much more with Greek as a “foreign language” than as a second language, since it is designed to be used also by children of non-Greek origin, who tend not to have any contact with the Greek language until they reach elementary school level.

³ During the period in which the present paper was written, the production of the material had not yet been finished.

⁴ English-speaking readers can find information about the project in an article by V. Tocatlidou (1992, 197ff). The description of the project as a whole can be found on pages 45-49 of the same book.

⁵ However, in our estimation they don't provide satisfactory solutions to this major problem. Due to space constraints we will not discuss this issue in detail.

⁶ In the following analysis our project is left out. However, we need to emphasize that the analyses of the other teaching materials and our criticism of them are based on the philosophy of our material, series of teaching materials.

⁷ Is there an American Nation? If so, composed of whom?

⁸ We quote some titles of these texts: “Letter from Chios”, “John from Carpathos”, “Steve's letter”. “The spring” (in Greece), “Swallows go on vacation” (in Greece), “Blessed moment” (Journey in Greece).

⁹ Due to lack of space we will confine ourselves to an epigrammatic reference of the teaching-methodological principles which the production of the teaching material was based on. The analytical presentation of the project might be made within the framework of another article.

¹⁰ Regarding this term, see Hohmann, 1982, 175.