

Anna Mouti<sup>1</sup>

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

Hellenic Open University

Maligkoudi Christina<sup>2</sup>

Democritus University of Thrace

Hellenic Open University

## LITERACY PROFILES AND GREEK AS AN L2: ISSUES OF SLA AND THE CASE OF LOW-LITERATE ADULT REFUGEES AND MIGRANTS

Four main groups of migrant learners are proposed by the Council of Europe and the LIAM (Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants) project (<https://www.coe.int/en/web/lang-migrants/literacy-profiles>), namely A, B, C, D, with the aim of providing teachers' awareness on students' limited literacy issues but also guidelines and ideas for tailormade and learner-oriented courses. In this study we focus on Greek as L2 to non-literate and low-literate refugees and migrants in Greece. The paper draws on qualitative data provided by language teachers with some teaching experience to non-literate and/ or low-literate immigrant and refugee adults through an online survey, to study their profiles, their students' literacy profiles and related challenges in multilingual classrooms. Findings of this study reveal detailed students' profiles considering the four literacy groups. The need to teach literacy as a fundamental part of the integration pathway was also raised and interesting techniques and practices were presented by the teachers.

**Keywords:** literacy profiles, L2, non-literate or/and low-literate adults, refugees and migrants, language education. The findings

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Reports on refugees' language repertoires show that many adult refugees are strongly plurilingual. They come from multilingual societies, and they may possess richly varied experiences as language users and language learners –

---

<sup>1</sup> mouti@itl.auth.gr

<sup>2</sup> cmaligko@eled.duth.gr

an experience in which it is often very difficult to distinguish clearly between language learning and language use<sup>3</sup>.

Beacco, Krumm and Little (2017: 4) mention: "...there is no such thing as a typical migrant. Socially, culturally and linguistically migrant populations are infinitely diverse. [...]". Indeed, language classes organized for adult refugees and migrants are heterogeneous and students in these educational settings differ in various aspects. Migrants and refugees come from very different geographical areas and have left their home countries for different reasons. They have different home languages, different cultural, educational and professional experiences and some of them may have already joined communities in host countries, while others do not or are still living in refugee camps.

Adult migrants are a heterogeneous group in which different literacy profiles can be identified, taking account of migrants' educational background. The present study focuses on literacy (adopting Council of Europe's definition of literacy<sup>4</sup>) and it involves the four main groups of migrant learners proposed by the Council of Europe and the LIAM (Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants) project<sup>5</sup>, namely, A, B, C, D<sup>6</sup>. Our aim is to explore teachers' awareness of students' limited literacy issues but also guidelines and ideas for tailor-made and learner-oriented courses. The profiles describe typical educational backgrounds, skills and experiences that can affect learning. It is important to be aware that an individual is likely to be slightly different to any of the profiles and may present characteristics from across the four profiles. To some extent, refugees from groups A and B, and group C are learning to read and write for the first time while they are learning a new language at the same time. In particular, in Group A adults have not received an adequate education in their country of origin and their L1 is generally not written down or it is not the medium of instruction in their country of origin. In Group B adults have never learned to read or write in their L1 and they can be described as 'illiterate', especially if they had little or no formal education. In Group C adults had limited schooling in their L1 (in general, less than 5 years) and they can be described as 'semi-literate'. And, finally, Group D consists of literate migrants who also may differ in terms of their level of education, L1, age, motivation and other

<sup>3</sup> <https://rm.coe.int/tool-11-refugees-as-language-users-and-learners-language-support-for-a/1680717186>

<sup>4</sup> *"Terminology is delicate because terms such as "illiterate" and "limited language proficiency" are discriminating terms which neglect the fact that the people concerned are often fully able to participate in social life; they do not describe precisely which communicative competences people have although they are not able to reach a certain level in reading and writing. Therefore it is preferably to speak of "teaching literacy" instead of focusing on illiteracy".* Note by Council of Europe, found in <https://www.coe.int/en/web/lang-migrants/literacy>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.coe.int/en/web/lang-migrants/literacy-profiles>

<sup>6</sup> This study was conducted before the LASLLIAM official launch and therefore we have not used the levels as specified in the LASLLIAM Reference Guide.

personal and sociolinguistic factors. All the above categories (mainly A-B-C) could be categorized under the broader definition of LESLLA (Literacy Education and Second Language Learning for Adults) learners. According to LESLLA nonprofit organization<sup>7</sup>, *“A LESLLA learner is characterized as an adult (age 15+) who is learning an additional language against the backdrop of interrupted formal schooling experience. These learners are often, though not always, immigrant or refugee-background individuals developing print literacy skills for the first time as adults, usually in a new language”*.

Based on the above considerations, the need for a framework with descriptors below A1 for migrants with no or limited previous schooling, as well as for migrants with poor formal education and very basic literacy skills seems necessary. It was the LASLLIAM (Literacy and Second Language Learning for the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants) reference guide (Minuz et al. 2022) that basically came to fill this gap and complement previous efforts in the same line made in several European countries, that resulted in national and local second language literacy frameworks for adult learners. As an indicative example, the Italian framework/instrument was designed to support flexible and inclusive language education related to literacy profiles, which focuses on Italy as a context and Italian as a second language. It offered descriptors scaled below and up to A1 covering also oral second language acquisition up to A1 (see Borri et al. 2014; Rocca, Minuz & Borri 2017).

LASLLIAM *“is a European instrument to trace and foster the development of non-literate and low-literate migrants, as well as to design and improve learning environments offered to literacy and second language learners”* (Minuz et al. 2022: 15). Literacy is presupposed both by the CEFR and the CEFR Companion volume while the LASLLIAM Reference Guide complements the Common European Framework for Languages (CEFR) and the CEFR Companion volume below and up to the A1 level for adult migrants, with special attention to adult migrants literacy learners (LESLLA). As an indicative example, LASLLIAM 3 partially overlaps with CEFR Companion volume Pre A1 and LASLLIAM 4 partially overlaps with CEFR and CEFR Companion volume A1. In LASLLIAM *“the notion of literacy refers to the ability of individuals, as social agents, to identify, understand, interpret and produce written texts (which can be handwritten, printed, digital and multimodal) in accordance with social contexts”* (Minuz et al. 2022: 19).

ALTE LAMI SIG Group & Council of Europe (2022<sup>8</sup>) have already provided sample assessment tools based on LASLLIAM and a multilingual version in 12 languages (including L2 Greek<sup>9</sup>). Additionally, other tools found in the CoE-LIAM

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.leslla.org/languages-of-leslla-learners>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.alte.org/resources/Documents/LLAT%20-%20English%20version.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> The translation in Greek can be found here: <https://www.alte.org/resources/Documents/LLAT%20>

Toolkit seem to be useful for the support of LESLLA learners and teachers (Tools 11, 14, 15, 17).<sup>10</sup>

Drawing on educators' questionnaires, the aim of the present paper is to explore teachers' perceptions on language education for non-literate and low-literate adult refugees and migrants and to present learners' literacy profiles in the Greek context. Adult refugee language education has not been extensively explored in the Greek context, although existing studies have confirmed the diversity and heterogeneity of the specific working groups (e.g., Kantzou et al. 2017; Mouti, Maligkoudi & Gogonas 2021, 2022). There are no official data about the percentage of non-literate adult refugees and migrants in Greece. However, in research conducted in Thessaloniki in 2019 for the profile of refugees and asylum seekers, around 15% of the refugees had no attendance of any kind of formal education in their country of origin. Higher percentages of literacy were depicted among Afghans (82%) and Iraqi (80%) refugees, while lower percentages were found for Syrians (68%) and Pakistani (55%)<sup>11</sup>.

## 2. METHOD AND MATERIALS

The present paper is based on an exploratory primary small-scale study on literacy and second language learning for the linguistic integration of adult refugees and migrants. In particular, it aims to form the basis for further research in a field where little previous research has been conducted. It is the first study, to our knowledge, that literacy profiles of LESLLA learners are being examined in the Greek context and it is a complementary paper to Mouti and Maligkoudi (2024) on learning materials and teaching practices for LESLLA learners in the Greek context.

In particular, the main purpose of this study is to investigate L2 teachers' perceptions regarding language education of non-literate and low-literate adult refugees and migrants and, at the same time, to present the literacy profiles of LESLLA learners in the Greek context according to focal educators' reports. As far as the research design is concerned, an on-line questionnaire was used, which was composed of twenty questions (mostly open-ended questions). Twenty six

---

-%20Greek%20version.pdf

<sup>10</sup><https://rm.coe.int/tool-17-challenges-in-learning-to-read-and-write-in-a-new-language-lan/168071719c>

<https://rm.coe.int/tool-14-diversity-in-working-groups-language-support-for-adult-refugee/1680717199>

<https://rm.coe.int/tool-15-supporting-refugees-with-low-literacy-language-support-for-adu/168071719a>

<https://rm.coe.int/tool-11-refugees-as-language-users-and-learners-language-support-for-a/1680717186>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.jips.org/uploads/2020/01/Greece-Thessaloniki-profiling-report-Dec2019-GREEK.pdf>

L2 teachers, who had previous experience with LESLLA learners, participated in the study. The questionnaire was delivered and completed digitally by the teachers. The open-ended questions explored their profiles as well as their students' profiles. More specifically, the questions aimed at highlighting learners' literacy profiles and teachers' perceptions and challenges regarding the language education of this special group of non-literate or low-literate adult refugees and migrants.

The data were analyzed using a qualitative content analysis, and the categories identified and explored were the following:

1. Educators' Profiles (gender, degree, teaching experience etc.)
2. LESLLA Learners' Profiles
3. LESLLA Learners' Literacy Profiles
4. Learners' and Educators' Challenges

Two tools from the CoE Toolkit were also used for this questionnaire, in order for the educators to express their involvement, awareness and sensitivity regarding LESLLA learners. In particular, the following tools were used: (1) Tool 15 - Supporting refugees with low literacy: to raise participants' awareness of different levels of literacy which are typically found among refugees and also to be used as a model to guide educators into providing an indicative portrait and adequate category for one of their LESLLA learners and (2) Tool 17 - Challenges in learning to read and write in a new language: to raise participants' awareness of the difficulties faced by refugees when trying to read or write in a new script.

Of the twenty six (26) teachers who answered the questionnaire, most were women (74%) and their age was mainly among 20-40 years old (61%). They all had some teaching experience with LESLLA learners ranging mainly from 1 to 6 years (83%) and 88% of them had a post-graduate degree. Their bachelor's degrees were mainly those of Language and Literature Studies, and Primary Education departments, although there was also one educator who had graduated from the Department of Social Anthropology and another one from the Department of Sociology. Moreover, all participants held a postgraduate diploma or they were pursuing Post-graduate studies from Greek or Cypriot Universities in the fields of Language Education for Refugees and Migrants, Greek as an L2, Special Education, Educational Management and Teaching Methodology. They were all plurilingual with Greek as their L1 and English as an L2. Other reported L2 languages were French (9), German (9), Italian (9), Spanish (8), Swedish (2), Portuguese, Dutch, Catalan but also Arabic (4), Farsi and Romani (students' L1s).

### 3. FINDINGS

#### 3.1. STUDENTS' PROFILES AND EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

As reported by the focal educators, their LESLLA students spoke a variety of languages: Arabic, Farsi, Urdu, Bangla, Punjabi, Pasto, Balochi, Lingala, Persian, Dari, some African dialects but also English, French, and Greek. The countries of origin that were reported were Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Guinea, Gambia, Egypt, Syria, Somalia, Kuwait, Iran, and Balochistan. Their period of residence in Greece ranged from some months to 4 years but there were also cases of migrants with 10-25 years in Greece. Learners' previous jobs in their countries of origin had mainly to do with manual labor and, thus, the majority of them were farmers, workers, stock-breeders, salesmen, shoemakers, seamstresses, and electricians. In Greece, men migrants are mainly unemployed or workers and women are mainly housewives/dealing with housekeeping. However, there were also school-aged cases/adolescents with low literacy skills.

Various educational settings and LESLLA groups were depicted and some general descriptions were provided regarding LESLLA learners' groups. For instance, there were cases of unaccompanied minors<sup>12</sup> in a Red Cross Centre, refugee camps, or formal education classrooms, who may be adolescents with no or limited prior schooling. Other cases reported in our study were HELIOS Program classes (Greek language lessons provided by IOM in cooperation with some NGOs), addressing mostly Afghan LESLLA learners (more women than men), being in Greece for 1-2 years, whose first languages were Farsi, Dari and Pasto. A variety of non-formal educational settings, organized by NGOs, were also reported including low-literates from Asia and Africa and less than 2 years in Greece or residing longer in Greece but not knowing Greek or how to read and write in their L1s. Finally, a Sunday School for migrants in Athens was recorded, with men from Pakistan, speaking mainly Urdu, dealing mainly with manual work, who had stayed in Greece for around 3-8 years.

#### 3.2. LESLLA LEARNERS' LITERACY PROFILES

After providing information regarding their educational settings and LESLLA multilingual classrooms, the educators, on a second phase, were asked to report on the literacy profiles of their students individually according to the four literacy profiles of the CoE and following the example provided by the Tool 15 of the CoE Toolkit (<https://rm.coe.int/-15-/168075b907>). In what follows, we have categorized the portraits/profiles provided according to the four Literacy Levels based on the educators' assessments, confirmed by the authors in all of the cases. In the following example, there is one of the sample portraits, provided in Tool 15.

<sup>12</sup> In Greece, unaccompanied minors are placed in formal education (Mammou, Maligkoudi & Gogonas, 2023) according to their age and, hence, adolescents may be found in High-schools classrooms without knowing how to read or write even in their L1.

| Portrait  | Description  |
|---|--|
| Abdi is a 45 year-old Bantu man from Somalia. His mother tongue, a Cushitic language, is a spoken language only. His level of oral ability in the target language is beginner; he has no contact with the host community, except through mediators. | <b>Group A:</b><br>Adults like Abdi did not have access to formal education in their country of origin, and their mother tongue is not written down or is not the medium of instruction. Sometimes they have difficulties in understanding how a written text, or a written word, conveys meaning. You can guide these adults in discovering written language: begin by pointing out the meanings and functions of the words in their everyday environment, such as in shops and on street signs, notices etc. |

Twenty six (26) literacy profiles were provided by the participants, however, fourteen (12) are presented here, as indicative examples for each literacy profile (A, B, C, and D literacy profile) in the Greek context.

**3.2.1. Indicative Literacy Profiles-A Group**

- Naim<sup>13</sup> is a 54-year-old man from Egypt. He has never had any formal education in his country and has never learned to read or write in his mother tongue. His speaking skills in Greek are at an advanced level as he has been in Greece for 25 years. He wants to sit the Naturalization exams and has attended some classes in non-formal educational settings but he hasn’t learned to write in Greek.
- Asma is a 42-year old woman from Iraq. She did not receive an adequate education in her country of origin, and her mother tongue is Kurmanji, having developed only oral and not written skills. She is one year in Greece, dealing with housekeeping.
- Ali is a 17-year-old man from Kuwait. Ali is a Bedoon (stateless person found in several Middle Eastern countries<sup>14</sup>), meaning that he is not recognized as a Kuwaiti citizen, and does not have the right to attend public schools or receive medical care. His mother tongue is Arabic but he cannot write or read in Arabic as he did not have the opportunity and right to receive formal education as a Bedoon. He learns Greek and English as L2s.

**3.2.2. Indicative Literacy Profiles-B Group**

- Afizullah is a 35-year-old man from Afghanistan. His mother tongue is Farsi but he did not have access to formal education and thus he did not learn to read and write in his L1. He also speaks other languages and also some Greek as initially he had contact with the host community

<sup>13</sup> Aliases were used in all the cases presented.

<sup>14</sup> <https://minorityrights.org/minorities/bidoon/>

through mediators. Along the way, however, he left the camp, stayed in an apartment with his family, his older children went to school and he started attending Greek lessons, organized by various NGOs. He showed great perseverance and managed to cover a large part of A1 at his own pace and to develop some literacy skills in Greek.

- Ahmad is a 40-year-old man from Afghanistan. He speaks Farsi, it is difficult for him even to hold a pencil and he cannot read in his mother-tongue. His language skills in Greek are at a beginner's level because, although he has been in Greece for many years, his contacts are only with members of the Farsi-speaking community. In his country, he was a farmer and a stock-breeder. He had limited schooling in his mother tongue, just for 3 years and he doesn't speak any other languages.
- Sumar, 42 is a woman from Iraq, and Arabic is her L1. With a few years of schooling in her home country, she is at an initial stage in oral and written part in Greek.

### **3.2.3. Indicative Literacy Profiles-C Group**

- Mahmoud is a 30-year-old man from Afghanistan and his L1 is Farsi. It seems that he had some limited schooling in his mother tongue (less than 5 years). It is very difficult for him to read and write even small words in Greek.
- Kasim is a 30-year-old man from Pakistan. He does not make it clear whether his L1 is Urdu or Panjabi. He had limited schooling in his L1 in Pakistan for 2-3 years and he just writes some basic words: his name or words from the Koran. After one year in Greece, he can recognize some words as images. He communicates with the host community through mediators.
- Ali is a 40-45 year-old man from Somalia. Although he declared himself illiterate, he has some basic literacy skills in English. In addition, he sent to his Greek teacher words in his L1, which he rendered into Latin characters. He can read syllables and simple words in Greek.

### **3.2.4. Indicative Literacy Profiles-D Group**

- Mahmoud is a 20-year-old man from Afghanistan. His L1 is Farsi and he has some literacy skills, as he had received adequate schooling in his country of origin. He had completed secondary education. He speaks English and Greek (A1-A2) since he has been in Greece for 1,5 years.
- Iman is a 37-year-old woman from Palestine. She has completed secondary education in her country of origin and she was working at a shopping center. She learned some basic English in Chios. She can understand



simple expressions in Greek but she has not developed written skills in Greek.

- Mohammed is a 38-year-old refugee from Palestine. His spoken Greek is quite developed and he is classified at an advanced intermediate level B1, but he can be an independent user only in matters of absolute communicative necessity. His written speech presents severe problems, as he is unable to systematize the rules of traditional spelling and his written speech suggests a novice user of Greek.

### **3.3. Participants' awareness on low literacy challenges**

As already mentioned, Tool 17 - Challenges in learning to read and write in a new language (from the CoE Toolkit), was also used to raise participants' awareness of the difficulties faced by refugees when trying to read or write in a new script. This process is very important as there are cases where challenges of this kind may be raised: a. in cases of adults of a low level of literacy due to limited education opportunities and b. in cases of differences between the scripts of refugees and migrants' languages of origin and the script of the target language. This may have an important impact on their second language acquisition or learning, and it may be an important factor even for literate learners of Group D. There are three activities in this Tool and participants were encouraged and engaged in these activities so that they could better understand the challenges for adults who try to read and write in a new or unfamiliar script (<https://rm.coe.int/tool-17-challenges-in-learning-to-read-and-write-in-a-new-language-lan/168071719c>). More specifically, these activities, are inviting participants and educators to read the text or try to copy the text or fill in the form from right to left and reflect on this experience.

These processes and the rest activities found in Toolkit 17, make the educators aware of the challenges some students may face when they have not developed a sense of the script of the target language or even the direction of reading and writing. As Toolkit 17 mentions *"The Latin alphabet is read and written from left to right while Arabic is right to left, and Japanese is often vertical. The Roman alphabet uses both capital and lower-case letters whereas other languages such as Arabic do not. New readers will need to be made aware of these basic differences as they begin to develop their reading skills. In addition, due to lack of opportunities for education, some refugees may not be able to read and write well in their own language. Learning to read and write in a new language with a different script will be especially challenging for them"*.

We thought that this tool would be an essential way for the participants to reflect on this experience and discuss these challenges through their own involvement. According to our participants' responses, this activity engaged

them in unfolding thoughts, feelings and attitudes regarding the challenges and difficulties of their LESLLA learners. First of all, the concept of empathy emerged:

*It is very important to recognize and empathize with the position your student is in. There is a strong sense of the limitations of your possibilities you are faced with something completely foreign and unknown to your previous knowledge and experiences.*

*The whole process can prove to be particularly stressful and exhausting. This requires a very slow pace, constant repetition, endless patience, constant encouragement, frequent breaks and use of humor.*

In many cases it seems that these challenges are immediately transformed into educators' challenges, as they are trying to suggest ways to overcome these challenges for the facilitation of the teaching process:

*I felt very vulnerable.*

*Having a text in front of me that I couldn't read and therefore understand made me feel inadequate, especially if the information it contains is important. This experience helped me put myself in another person's shoes and helped me realize how important it is to have a careful planning and introduction to the L2 (writing direction, letters) but also not to have high expectations from the beginning.*

*Mainly what I get from the material is the need to manage the fear and the immediate desire to quit and this might arise in a student of this profile.*

Some of the participants decided to share some personal experiences from their teaching experience. There was a participant who was found in a similar position at a young age due to his/her family migration path and recognized these challenges and difficulties but also the feeling of "wanting to hide". Hence, this activity acted as a reflection process for some of the focal educators and it increased their awareness towards the challenges L2 low literate or non-literate learners may face in the teaching process. The educators' realization of their students' challenges and difficulties enabled them to comprehend their learners' difficult paths of language learning and literacy development. Practical issues (e.g., how to write on a line, how to hold a pencil, how to write from the right to the left) were issues of the literacy process and also the main reasons for learners' loss of motivation, interrupted education and drop-out.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have presented exploratory primary small-scale research on Literacy and Second Language Learning for the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants. To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine this field of low-literate adult refugees and migrants in the Greek context and it was the LASLLIAM Project (Council of Europe) that became the initial point of our study. Certainly, there are limitations such as the small number of participants, but it was the rather focused population and sample that required an existing experience with low-literate refugees and migrants.

The findings of this study reveal interesting and detailed students' profiles considering the CoE four literacy groups but also detailed information about their multilingual repertoires and their plurilingual profiles. It was a procedure that helped the researchers as well as the participants to visualize the students, their literacy profiles, and needs. The needs refer to their specific educational and literacy needs apart from their communicative language needs. Moreover, it was reported by the focal educators that it is important to teach literacy as a fundamental part of the integration pathway.

A rather original part of this study has to do with the CoE Toolkit implementation in the Greek context, as Tools 15 and 17 have been essential tools and materials during the research procedure. CoE Toolkit has not been extensively used and to our knowledge the only relevant study published in the Greek context is the work of Mouti, Maligkoudi, and Gogonas (2021, 2022), focusing on the Needs Analysis Tools.

The use of Tool 15, provided us with interesting LESLLA learners portraits and profiles according to the four CoE Literacy Profiles. These LESLLA learners and their stories became visible, as in the majority of the cases the learners are "lost" inside the diversity of the working groups, especially in cases where the classrooms-groups are heterogeneous in terms of literacy. It was this first attempt of providing some grouping according to their literacy profile, something that is not predefined in some syllabus or curriculum in Greece like in the Italian case (see Borri et al. 2014). This categorization that emerged through the findings of our study, confirms the need for the LASLLIAM Reference Guide implementation also in the Greek context and the -hidden- existence of the LASLLIAM Levels below the CEFR A1.

The use of Tool 17, was a hands-on activity, raising educators' awareness and made them reflect on their experience, their students and their choices as well as their teaching practices. It included a text in a script they could not read and could not understand, without knowing where to start reading and which direction to read in. These challenges of the LESLLA learners enabled the participants-educators of our study to reflect on the challenges of the learners and to reconsider their teaching practices and approaches.

Our small-scale research basically depicts this under-examined area related to the LESLLA learners in the Greek context before the LASLLIAM launch and reveals existing challenges that LASLLIAM Reference guide aspires to fill in a non-language specific approach and in a common European reference framework. Further research would be interesting in examining the LASLLIAM implementation and Literacy and Second Language Learning for the Linguistic Integration of Adult Refugees and Migrants in the Greek context through the voices of the learners themselves. Mouti and Maligkoudi (2022) provide work on the Piloting of LASLLIAM in Greek through the design of sample materials and tools based on its philosophy, scales, and descriptors and LASLLIAM Reference Guide has already started its journey in Greece.

## References

- Beacco, Krumm & Little 2017: J.C. Beacco, H.J Krumm, Little Introduction. In J.C. Beacco, H.J Krumm, D. Little & P. Thalgott (Eds.), *The linguistic integration of adult migrants. Some lessons from research* (pp. 1–5). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bigelow & Schwarz 2010: M., Bigelow, R., Schwarz, *Adult English language learners with limited literacy*. Washington DC: National Institute for Literacy.
- Borri et al 2014: A. Borri, F. Minuz, L. Rocca, C. Sola, *Italiano L2 in contesti migratori. Sillabo e descrittori dall'alfabetizzazione all'A1*, Loescher, Torino.
- Kantzou, Manoli, Mouti & Papadopoulou 2017: V. Kantzou, P. Manoli, A. Mouti, M. Papadopoulou, Γλωσσική εκπαίδευση προσφύγων και μεταναστών/ριών: Πολλαπλές μελέτες περίπτωσης στον Ελλαδικό χώρο. *Διάλογοι! Θεωρία και πράξη στις επιστήμες αγωγής και εκπαίδευσης*, 3, 18–34
- Council of Europe and ALTE 2023. *LAMI-LASLLIAM Assessment Tools (LLAT)* ©, [Online], [<https://www.alte.org/resources/Documents/LLAT%20-%20English%20version.pdf>].
- Mammou, Maligkoudi & Gogonas 2023: P. Mammou, C. Maligkoudi, N. Gogonas, Enhancing L2 learning in a class of unaccompanied minor refugee students through translanguaging pedagogy. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 17 (2), 139–156, [Online], [<http://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2022.2151762>].
- Minuz et al. 2022: F. Minuz, J. Kurvers, K. Schramm, L. Rocca, R. Naeb, *Literacy and Second Language Learning for the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Mouti, Maligkoudi and Gogonas 2021: A. Mouti, Maligkoudi, C. & N. Gogonas, Assessing language needs of adult refugees and migrants in the Greek context. In *Collated Papers for the ALTE 7th International Conference. Madrid* (pp. 229-232).
- Mouti, Maligkoudi and Gogonas 2022: A. Mouti, C. Maligkoudi, N. Gogonas, Language needs analysis of adult refugees and migrants through the CoE-LIAM Toolkit: The context of language use in tailor-made L2 material design. *Selected papers on theoretical and applied linguistics*, 24, 600–617.
- Mouti & Maligkoudi 2022: A. Mouti, C. Maligkoudi, Sample LASLLIAM tools and reflections on piloting in Greek. Presentation in the Conference *Launching the Council of Europe Reference Guide: “Literacy and Second Language Learning for the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants”*. Strasbourg.
- Mouti, A., & Maligkoudi, C. 2024., Literacy and Language Education of Adult Refugees and Migrants: Learning Materials and Teaching Practices for LESLLA Learners in the Greek Context. *LESLLA Symposium Proceedings*, 18(1), 71–83, [Online], [<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10486284>].
- Rocca et al. 2017: L. Rocca, F. Minuz, A. Borri, Syllabus and descriptors for illiterate, semi-literate and literate users. From illiteracy to A1 level. In *Alfabetización y aprendizaje de idiomas por adultos: investigación, política educativa y práctica docente* (pp. 207–218). Granada: University of Granada.

**Άννα Μουτή**  
**Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης**  
**Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο**

**Χριστίνα Μαλιγκούδη**  
**Δημοκρίτειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θράκης**  
**Ελληνικό Ανοικτό Πανεπιστήμιο**

**ΠΡΟΦΙΛ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ ΩΣ Γ2: ΖΗΤΗΜΑΤΑ ΑΠΟΚΤΗΣΗΣ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΗ  
ΓΛΩΣΣΑΣ ΚΑΙ Η ΠΕΡΙΠΤΩΣΗ ΤΩΝ ΕΝΗΛΙΚΩΝ ΜΕΤΑΝΑΣΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣΦΥΓΩΝ ΜΕ  
ΧΑΜΗΛΕΣ ΔΕΞΙΟΤΗΤΕΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΥ**

Περίληψη

Στην παρούσα έρευνα η εστίαση είναι στη διδασκαλία της Ελληνικής ως Γ2 σε ενήλικες μετανάστες και πρόσφυγες με μηδενικές ή χαμηλές δεξιότητες γραμματισμού. Βασιζόμενη σε ποιοτικά δεδομένα, η εργασία εξετάζει δεδομένα από εκπαιδευτικούς με διδακτική εμπειρία σε ενήλικες μετανάστες και πρόσφυγες με μηδενικές ή χαμηλές δεξιότητες γραμματισμού σχετικά με τα προφίλ γραμματισμού των μαθητών/τριών τους, τις προκλήσεις που αντιμετωπίζουν οι ίδιοι/ες στη διδακτική διαδικασία. Τα αποτελέσματα οδηγούν σε λεπτομερή προφίλ των μαθητών/τριών τους σε σχέση με τα προφίλ γραμματισμού που ακολουθεί το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης και επιχειρείται και μια σύνδεση με τον Οδηγό Αναφοράς LASLLIAM. Επίσης, από τα δεδομένα προέκυψε η ανάγκη να διδαχτεί ο γραμματισμός ως ένα ουσιαστικό μέρος της διαδικασίας συμπερίληψης του εξεταζόμενου πληθυσμού, καθώς επίσης και «καλές» διδακτικές πρακτικές και τεχνικές για την επίτευξη του στόχου αυτού μέσα από την επίγνωση των ίδιων των εκπαιδευτικών.

**Λέξεις-κλειδιά:** προφίλ γραμματισμού, Γ2, ενήλικες με μηδενικές ή χαμηλές δεξιότητες γραμματισμού, πρόσφυγες και μετανάστες, γλωσσική εκπαίδευση