A dynamic view of multilingual learning: The Common Plurilingual Curriculum from a DMM perspective

Barbara Hofer[1] und Elisabeth Allgäuer-Hackl[2]

Dieser Beitrag versucht das Konzept des Gesamtsprachencurriculums (GSC), wie z.B. in PlurCur® umgesetzt, mit dem Dynamischen Modell der Mehrsprachigkeit (DMM) zu verbinden, einem psycholinguistischen Modell, das der dynamischen Systemtheorie bzw. Komplexitätstheorie zugeordnet ist. Damit wird eine systemtheoretische Sicht als Basis für das Gesamtsprachencurriculum vorgeschlagen. Schlüsselbegriffe des DMM werden diskutiert und mit mehrsprachigem Lernen im GSC sowie mit GSC-Elementen in zwei Projektschulen in Verbindung gesetzt. Die Autorinnen stellen mit dieser systemtheoretischen Perspektive die Komplexität von Sprachentwicklung in den Mittelpunkt ihrer Überlegungen.

1. A dynamic view of multilingual learning: The Common Plurilingual Curriculum from a DMM perspective

The last few years have seen a rapidly growing interest in multilingualism both in Europe and worldwide. In response to this trend, researchers in applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology and other related fields have put forth a wealth of theories and models with the aim of explicating the mental processes involved in multilingual development and with a view to improving multilingual learning in institutional settings. For the purpose of the present contribution we have selected two such models which we feel can contribute to advancing our understanding of how multiple languages are learned and how multiple language learning in instructed contexts can be optimised. The first, the Dynamic Model of Multilingualism (DMM), is a psycholinguistic model which focuses on multilingual development over time at the level of the individual learner. The Common Plurilingual Curriculum (henceforth CPC), by contrast, operates at the educational policy level and proposes a framework for the implementation of a multilingual model from kindergarten to the A-levels. The two models can be regarded as complementary, with the DMM providing a robust theoretical psycholinguistic basis and solid research-based foundation for the realisation of a

1   Korrespondenzadresse: Dr. Barbara Hofer, DyME Research Group, Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Innrain 52d, A-6020 Innsbruck, E-Mail: hofbar@libero.it
2   Korrespondenzadresse: Dr. Elisabeth Allgäuer-Hackl, DyME Research Group, Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Innrain 52d, A-6020 Innsbruck, E-Mail: elisabeth.allgaeuer.hackl@gmail.com

CPC, and the CPC representing a promising and sustainable instantiation of DMM principles.

In this sense we seek to combine the CPC (Hufeisen 2005, 2011) with key concepts from a dynamic systems and complexity theory (DSCT) approach to multilingual learning and development as adopted by Herdina & Jessner (2002) in the DMM. A central concern of this contribution is to show that the DMM is uniquely suited to providing insights into the psychological and cognitive processes implicated in multilingual learning (cf. Ó Làoire 2005: 49). These insights, we feel, can be put to good use to enhance learning conditions at the institutional level through the introduction of a CPC. An important premise of the current contribution is that multilingual learning within a CPC framework is a) conducive to language growth and can b) result in cognitive benefits for the individual learner.

We begin with a brief introduction on current school policies and general attitudes toward language learning as we witness and perceive them in our everyday work as language teachers. Next, we provide a short summary of CPC principles. Then, in section 4, we delineate some of the theoretical foundations of a DMM perspective on multilingual development and examine how discourses on the implementation of a multilingual curriculum design can benefit from such an approach (cf. Kramsch 2012). In section 5, we identify points of contact between DMM and CPC and provide additional suggestions for DMM-informed CPC approaches. In section 6, we outline the role of the teacher, since we perceive this to be an important aspect of any CPC framework, while in section 7 we present examples of good practice from two schools, one in South Tyrol, Italy, and one in Vorarlberg, Austria, where efforts are being undertaken to satisfy the requirements of an integrated CPC-inspired multilingual approach to teaching and learning.

2. Educational policies and attitudes to (multiple) language learning

The educational and research literature of the past few decades has been unequivocal (cf. García 2009) in its findings that the majority of current school curricula does not adequately prepare students for life and work in a multilingual society and environment and thus fails to do justice to the European Commission's call to promote learners' plurilingual competences (see also CEFR 2001: 5). Instructional policies are typically dominated by monolingual principles for whose clout and validity there is no empirical evidence. What is more, these principles are inconsistent with current understandings of how the multilingual brain operates

and of how we learn. We note with regret that policy-makers and educational authorities have come to internalize these monolingual principles so completely that it is widely assumed today and has become perfectly accepted that languages should occupy separate spaces from each other in the curriculum and classroom (cf. Cummins 2007: 222f). This monolingual bias rests on the erroneous precept that languages occupy separate areas in the learner's mind and that classroom practices ought therefore to adhere to a strict separation of languages so as not to confuse learners. Early studies (cf. Baker 2006: 167) had purported to demonstrate that the languages were stored separately. A balloon illustration, representing the languages as distinct spaces inside the human brain, was used to visualize this compartmentalization of languages.

It comes as little surprise then that official curriculum designs, as they persist in the vast majority of Italian and Austrian schools, for instance, compel the segregation of languages in the classroom and do not provide for much – if any – cooperation between the languages and/or language teachers. Indeed, curriculum planning does not usually even consider the possibility of integrating languages and of thus creating synergies which can result in beneficial effects for the learners. However, we do know from empirical data that such effects occur when learners are encouraged to reflect on and engage with language(s) (cf. Jessner 2006; Cummins 2007; García & Sylvan 2011), and when, as a result of these activities, they gain a deeper and more nuanced understanding and awareness of how languages work. As a corollary of this emerging linguistic awareness learners also become more confident users of their languages, which can have important implications, given that learners' emotional constitution and their subjective perceptions, e.g. of themselves and of their language-related competencies, can affect their learning (cf. Dewaele 2010; MacIntyre, Gregersen & Mercer 2016).

As noted by Hawkins (1999: 124), the general absence of collaboration between language teachers may block "the development of a coherent language apprenticeship in the schools". According to him, teachers' work in the classroom needs to centre much more on language(s) and cross-language comparisons (ibid.: 140). The ideal language curriculum, Hawkins continues, can be imagined as resembling

> a strong oak tree. It would have well-nourished roots in the primary school (confident mastery of mother tongue[s], education of the ear, 'ouverture aux langues', growing awareness of languages[s] [plural-s added by the authors]), a robust trunk at secondary level in the apprenticeship in learning how to learn a language, and progressive awareness of what it means to see language as an instrument […] Finally, […], post 16+, we should encourage a rich growth of branches, foliage, and even some exotic acorns, responding flexibly to society's and to the individual's adult foreign language needs […] (ibid.).

3. The Common Plurilingual Curriculum (CPC)

A similarly robust and thriving metaphorical tree is envisaged by the CPC (cf. Hufeisen 2011), which, through a combination of language and content learning, provides for an integrated and holistic approach to multiple language acquisition from the very young age of pre-school. A CPC

> creates a framework for planning in which the representatives of the respective languages (e.g., the teachers) communicate among themselves and the representatives of the language and content subjects can work together (Hufeisen 2018: 3).

In broad terms, the CPC aims to bolster individual and institutional multilingualism through the implementation of a multilingual educational model that entails the phased introduction of (foreign) languages at two-year periodic intervals. The more established foreign languages are then employed as vehicular languages in the CLIL classroom. This means that, within the CPC framework, more foreign languages can be taught "in the course of a student's schooling than is currently possible due to scheduling constraints" (ibid.: 4).

In addition to promoting the learning of more languages, the CPC calls for an integrated, holistic approach to (language) learning in institutional settings (cf. Hufeisen 2011: 271; see also Herdina & Jessner 2002: 159). Two key aspects of Hufeisen's prototypical curriculum framework relate to the development of synergies for multilingual learning through cross-language and cross-curricular approaches, i.e. through project work or cultural studies that include several languages and subjects. Another key feature is the strengthening of family languages that students bring to the classroom (cf. Hufeisen 2011: 266) in conjunction with consistent training in the majority language – German in our context – for all those students who need it. A further important objective of the CPC is to develop and strengthen learners' linguistic awareness.

Hufeisen (cf. 2011: 266f.; 2018: 6f.) summarizes the main goals endorsed by the CPC as

- acknowledging and integrating all the learners' languages
- making learners aware of their own multilingualism
- getting learners to perceive their multilingualism as an asset
- sensitising teachers to issues relating to multilingual learning to encourage collaboration between school subjects and to get teachers to work across language borders by looking for similarities and transfer possibilities between languages
- fostering a new understanding of languages as supplementing and reinforcing rather than inhibiting each other

- promoting learners' language and language learning awareness through cross-language and strategy training
- creating synergies with a view to rendering learning less effortful
- integrating intercultural aspects in all subjects (not just in the language classroom) and
- linking language and content learning.

In section 7, we will refer back to these goals and illustrate how two PlurCur partner schools proceed in their endeavour to implement CPC elements.

In the following, we introduce some of the key principles of the DMM, arguing that it offers exciting new perspectives on a range of issues pertaining to the field of multilingualism. Section 4 thus provides the theoretical psycholinguistic groundwork and proposes a dynamic lens through which to look at multilingual learning.

4. Multilingual learning and development from a DMM stance

Propounding a holistic conception of multilingual development and use, the DMM focuses on the systematic interactions between the languages in a speaker's mind and emphasises the cognitive and linguistic advantages of cross-language approaches to language learning in the classroom.

4.1 Total connectivity and complex interaction of language systems in a speaker's mind

The DMM posits that the languages in a speaker's mind are closely linked and that there is continuous interaction between them. These mutual interactions are seen as having significant implications insofar as they transform and potentially enhance the whole system and result in a complete change of quality in the language learning process (cf. Jessner 2008a). For instance, multilingual learners can form links and associations between their languages and transfer what they know from one language to another. Their capacity to do so reveals that they develop special meta- and cross-linguistic skills and metacognitive abilities together with a range of other multilingual competences, which include flexible switching, translation skills, cross-language meaning negotiation skills and mediation skills (cf. Schlabach 2016).

Like all other dynamic systems in the natural world (e.g. the life-cycle, the weather), the learner system is in constant flux (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002: 83), since it is an open system that is inextricably interwoven with and inseparable from its surroundings and therefore subject to influences from outside (cf. Aronin & Jessner 2016; De Bot, Lowie & Verspoor 2007).

4.2 The Multilingualism Factor or Multilingualism Effect

As indicated, DMM specifies that well-developed multilingualism does not diminish an individual's cognitive resources; instead, there are concrete cognitive and linguistic gains as a result of being multilingual (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002: 160). These positive effects are described through the so-called M(ultilingualism)-Factor, an emergent set of skills and abilities in multilinguals that monolingual learners lack and that facilitate and potentially accelerate multilingual development. The M-Factor relates to an enhanced multilingual monitor (EMM), which develops because multilingual learners exert substantial levels of mental vigilance when attending to, managing and recruiting their multiple languages and resources. A further crucial component of the M-Factor that is connected with the EMM reveals itself in enhanced levels of meta- and cross-lingual awareness, which enable learners to reflect on their (use of) languages and to optimize their learning. The development of the M-factor is closely tied in with the number of languages commanded by a given learner (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002: 129; cf. Aronin & Jessner 2016).

4.3 Language development: positive and negative growth

The DMM holds that language development over time (even in very advanced learner-users) cannot automatically be assumed to mean positive growth or progression, but can also manifest as negative growth, i.e. attrition or eventual loss of a language following "a phase of declining language use" (Herdina & Jessner 2002: 97). If insufficient energy is expended on maintaining the system, learners will not progress on their learning trajectory. In order to preserve the multilingual system or a subsystem thereof (i.e. a particular language), the language(s) need(s) to be nurtured and sustained. This can be very hard work and we know that there is a limit to how much effort or energy can be mobilized and deployed at any given moment (ibid.: 99). Maintenance work is therefore seen as an essential com-

ponent of any multilingual curriculum concept and as an important means of supporting learners on their path to multilingual competency.

4.4 Language maintenance

Maintaining one's languages is very much dependent on two factors, namely extensive and continuous use of the languages on the one hand and linguistic awareness on the other (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002: 106). Language use in DMM denotes the "activation of parts of the linguistic system for communicative purposes" (ibid.: 99), whereas linguistic awareness refers to the conscious reflection on how different languages function or operate and the ability to use and exploit this knowledge. According to Jessner (2006: 42), linguistic awareness includes metalinguistic awareness (MLA), which has been defined as the ability to "focus attention on language as an object in itself or to think abstractly about language", and cross-linguistic awareness (XLA), or the awareness of the interactions between languages (cf. De Angelis, Jessner & Krésic 2015).

The DMM also emphasizes the beneficial role that learners' prior linguistic knowledge can play in the learning process. As stated by Herdina & Jessner (2002: 161), "[t]he reactivation of prior language knowledge in the classroom is of a facilitative nature in language learning" and can foster learners' metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness. For this reason, the DMM endorses cross-language contrastive approaches to learning.

4.5 Multilingual competence

From a dynamic view "there is no final state of learning" (Lowie 2017: 5). The existing monolingual norms in language learning presume that the aim of any kind of language learning is and must be an end-state of native-like levels of proficiency; they further imply that any kind of language learning is only actually worthwhile with this type of goal in view as a measure of success. By contrast, a DMM view of multilingual learning and proficiency sees domain-specific, or what many would still call 'partial' language skills, as perfectly acceptable and worth achieving in themselves. As a matter of fact, the DMM "does not regard the absolute command of a language as a realistic perspective. A certain degree of underachievement is to be expected" (Herdina & Jessner 2002: 101). The issue of what ultimate attainment in any language means is a matter of on-going debate but, as suggested by Cook (2002: 6), "there is no intrinsic reason why it should be

the same as that of a monolingual native speaker".

It follows that when looking at multilingual learners' language skills, it is not sufficient, nor indeed fruitful, to merely focus on learners' command of their single languages because multilinguals will *per force* have differential knowledge of these languages compared to monolingual native speakers or learners of only that language (cf. Cook 2002). Rather, one needs to take account of their overall language-related knowledge, i.e. *all* their languages (including dialects, minority and migrant languages), their metaknowledge of language(s) and their capacity to put this specific (meta)knowledge to use in a range of academic and real-life contexts (cf. Cook 2016; Hofer 2017; Schlabach 2016 on multicompetence/plurilingual competence).

5. CPC approaches from a DMM perspective

We know from the literature that learners' development and mental processes are inseparably connected with their experiences in the real world (cf. Larsen-Freeman & Cameron 2008: 155). Experience can function as a powerful catalyst and propeller for human learning (cf. Kemp 2001: 30). According to Bialystok (2011), learning occurs as the human brain transforms our experiences into knowledge or expertise in a particular field. If, following Bialystok, we accept that experience determines how basic cognitive abilities develop, function and change throughout the life span (cf. ibid.: 229; see also Sternberg 2005: 189), and if we further accept that practice will reinforce and consolidate the system (cf. Bialystok 2011: 230), then learning within an integrated multilingual educational model is to be endorsed because it can provide students with abundant multilingual experience and cross-language practice.

In this section we show how CPC teaching proposals connect with key aspects of DMM, including learner-internal and learner-external factors, language learning, maintenance and management in the classroom.

5.1 Language development: Learner internal and external factors

As stated earlier, language development is restricted by time and energy constraints (cf. Jessner 2008a: 274) as well as by personal factors. In DMM, personal factors including motivation, self-esteem and perceived language competence are seen as playing a central role in language learning in so far as they can influence

the direction and the pace at which the learner system moves and evolves (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002: 138).

A multilingual instructional model such as the CPC, where content and language learning are integrated and multiple languages and different social/cultural viewpoints are given space and voice, may appeal more to students' emotional and affective state than traditional forms of language teaching. Studying subject matter in an L2 or L3, for example, can occasion direct experience of a sense of accomplishment at being able to negotiate and communicate complex meaning in a language that is not one's dominant tongue. The inclusion of students' heritage languages and dialects ascribes (if not equal then at least some) importance to every learner's linguistic equipment. Hence, the CPC may hold the psycho-affective potential to raise students' interest and their motivation to engage, lead to more positive learning attitudes and learning outcomes and even result in higher levels of self-confidence in learners.

From a DMM point of view it is important to provide a linguistically rich and diverse learning environment which takes account of and integrates the languages and the cultural knowledge of all the pupils in the classroom. This seems to us to be particularly important in learning contexts where students may not be able to cultivate their L1 because all their efforts are going into learning the dominant majority language. However, the type of environment described is equally important in contexts where learners experience negative reactions to their multilingual practices or in contexts where learners do not have access to socially accepted multilingual practices and where they are made to feel that their home languages or translanguaging practices (cf. García 2009) are worthless or not appreciated. In any such case, targeted interventions at the curriculum level, with a language education policy that shows equal appreciation of all the languages (and their speakers) in a school, can help redress imbalances and create more equal opportunities for all. CPC provisions to this effect champion a decidedly favourable attitude towards all children's family languages, for instance through heritage language classes or collaborative learning arrangements and special emphasis on mutual respect. They include comprehensive scaffolding in the school languages for learners with other-language backgrounds and/or CLIL in languages other than the official school language. In addition, CPC provisions encompass a strong language awareness component with cross-language and cross-cultural elements.

5.2 Language learning

Allgäuer-Hackl and Jessner (2013: 131) note that "[m]ehrsprachig zu arbeiten heißt […], Transfer als Lernstrategie zu vermitteln und Interferenzen bewusst zu machen und sie für das Lernen zu nutzen". Following this line of argument, we contend that the creation of synergies through the bridging of languages in a CPC is a worthwhile and expedient objective with beneficial effects for language learning and maintenance (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002: 161).

In the (multilingual) classroom, synergies (i.e. learning-enhancing energies) are created when links are established and languages are put into relation with one another. While only some decades ago a bi- or multilingual speaker's languages were seen as competing and interfering with each other, recent holistic approaches contend that cross-linguistic interaction (cf. Jessner 2006) can be strategically harnessed in and for language learning. For instance, it has been found that students who routinely work on linguistic forms and functions across languages develop an enhanced awareness of both their first language and of all subsequent languages (cf. Cook 2002; Ó Làoire 2005; Jessner 2008b; García 2009: 304; Hofer & Jessner 2017).

On this premise, the CPC approach encourages the learning of several languages, including Latin (Hufeisen 2018). The use of prior language knowledge in CPC is trained through EuroCom methods, and there is a special focus on interconnecting languages. Particular attention is also given to subject and language teaching in all languages, which means that CALP can be promoted alongside BICS (cf. Cummins 1979). In addition, learning the first foreign language in school contexts provides learners with an initial set of language learning strategies, as pointed out by Hufeisen (2010) in the Factor Model.

5.3 Language maintenance skills

Language maintenance skills – which, as explained above, consist of a language 'use' and a language 'awareness' factor – are not explicitly defined or mentioned as such in the CPC; even so, they clearly underlie and/or form an important part of many of the suggestions made there. Using all the languages learnt in all subjects is one basic CPC principle. Language awareness training, for example, is proposed as part of the German language classes right from the beginning of the educational career, and the interconnected teaching of languages and of subjects with languages provides a good basis for MLA/XLA training.

Elements of a CPC have been introduced at the two schools presented in this paper (see chapter 7), where special attention is given to establishing linkages between the languages in the curriculum and, whenever possible, those languages that learners bring to the classroom. In classes held jointly by different language teachers these linkages and their historical origins and etymological connections are investigated and discussed with the learners. In the South Tyrolean context, the students, whose L1 German and L3 English derive from the same language family and thus exhibit a substantive degree of parallelism, presently come to re-alise that this typological closeness affords them an extensive transfer base which they can draw upon and exploit. The structural and lexico-semantic overlap be-tween their L2 Italian and L4 Latin or Spanish (all Romance languages) is also relatively transparent and obvious to a majority of learners, but our students are often surprised to find that there is also a considerable amount of structural and/or lexical analogies between their L2 Italian and L3 English and even between their L2 Italian and L4 Russian. This realization leads students to comprehend that all languages (whether minimally related or typologically close) can function as bridge languages which students can use to transfer linguistic knowledge from one language to another. For instance, German-speaking students in South Tyrol who are familiar with the L2 Italian word *introdurre* can draw on this knowledge to decode the English equivalent 'introduce'. In the Austrian context, Turkish-speaking students, for example, discover lexical analogies when studying Span-ish, since there are many French loan words that are fairly common in Turkish (e.g. Turkish *pantolon*, French *le pantalon*, Spanish *el pantalón*) but also a num-ber of Arabic loan words used in Turkish and Spanish. Arabic and French are thus bridge languages for Spanish.

Of course, relating new target language information to one's pre-existing knowledge entails deep processing and allows for the new information to become firmly entrenched in the learner's multilingual lexicon. Hence, if in the classroom students are familiarized with and recurrently apply techniques of resource and strategy deployment, if they learn how to (re)-activate their extant linguistic and metacognitive knowledge and how to exploit potential affordances (such as inter-lingual correspondences, contextual or paralinguistic clues), this will propel their learning forward (see also Kordt's article in this volume and Kordt 2016).

In this sense, we should like to point to the advantages of complementing a CPC with an explicit and sustained focus on multilingual awareness training as part of language maintenance strategies, either as part of all language teaching or in a specific curricular subject (compulsory or optional), as put into practice by Allgäuer-Hackl (2017; cf. Jessner, Allgäuer-Hackl & Hofer 2016) at the HLW Rankweil in Vorarlberg/Austria, and by the Manzoni primary school in Bozen (cf. Hofer 2015) or, alternatively, in the form of one-off single projects that extend

over several days, as undertaken by Kordt in Germany (2015; see also Krumm & Reich 2011 for more ideas).

The use of all languages present at a given school (second languages, home languages, foreign languages) for subject teaching and cross-curricular projects represents a consistent language maintenance strategy in the CPC, as does CLIL teaching in all the languages learnt.

5.4 Promoting language management: multilingual communication skills

One of the central aims of an integrated multilingual educational model is to enhance learners' communicative competence across languages and to prepare them for multilingual encounters and meaning negotiations in an increasingly globalized and complex world. Interactions in multilingual settings typically call for the swift and precise coordination and monitoring of several parallel processes with sometimes limited linguistic resources at one's disposal. This requires good management skills in the sense that students need to be capable of coordinating the linguistic means available to make sure that the appropriate linguistic resources are deployed at the appropriate moment for successful communication. Multilingual communication can easily be simulated (see Multilingual Sketch-Shop in section 7.1), and language management skills can also be trained in the classroom (cf. Allgäuer-Hackl 2017).

From a holistic perspective, a curriculum design with a strong emphasis on multilingual communication and language management strategies is preferable to traditional curricula which typically focus on and deal with languages in isolation and thus leave a wealth of resources lying fallow. The CPC provides for a variety of settings where flexible use of multiple languages and language management are required: cross-curricular and cross-language projects, cultural studies that include all languages and subjects, a term abroad with multilingual experience and the need for multi-competence (see also HLW work placements below).

Since language maintenance and language management skills and strategies as defined in DMM are fairly new concepts, we want to highlight them in Table 1, which summarizes the points of convergence between them (column 1) and a CPC design that puts such strategies into practice at the classroom and school level (column 2). The suggestions added by the authors in column 3 underline the necessity to discuss basic views, establish a common knowledge base among all teachers in a school and introduce systematic and explicit language maintenance

and management awareness and strategy training. At the level of school development, joint decisions supported by the school management as to which CPC features should be introduced in a particular school are vital for their successful implementation.

Table 1: DMM-based language teaching focusing on language maintenance and language management connected with existing CPC approaches and further proposals

DMM-based concepts		CPC-based features	Further proposals added by the authors
LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE	MLA/XLA training/ M-factor Language use	Language awareness training (in German)	
		Use of prior language knowledge in language classes	Systematic use of prior language knowledge in all language and subject classes
		Language learning strategies Receptive multilingualism – EuroCom	Systematic MLA/XLA and language learning strategy training, e.g. in a multilingual class/*riflessione lingua* class/as a common approach in all classes
		Heritage/family language classes Interconnected subject and language(s) teaching	Active involvement of parents and the community
		Language use in CLIL classes (= bilingual CLIL) Language use in projects across languages and subjects	Use of languages other than the majority language in day-to-day activities at the school Multilingual linguistic landscape in school building
		Term/school year abroad Cultural studies across subjects and languages	Use of multiple languages connected with information/communication technology
			Work placement abroad
LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT	Cross-linguistic interaction Enhanced Multilingual Monitor EMM Enhanced flexibility in using multiple languages	Use of all languages present at the school in project work Interconnected subject and language(s) teaching	Language management (awareness) training
		(Inter)cultural studies across subjects and languages Text competence (in the languages of schooling)	Multilingual class to practise multilingual/plurilingual competences (e.g. mediating, translanguaging)
		Study abroad in multilingual environment	Awareness raising and flexibility training in the use of language variants in German/the languages of schooling (e.g. text competence versus communicative competence)

6. What is the role of the teacher in a CPC framework?

Teachers play a central and decisive role in making multilingual learning a success (or failure). Haukås (2016: 3) makes reference to studies which suggest that teachers' attitudes and beliefs are "a strong predictor of what occurs in the classroom" in the sense that these beliefs and attitudes influence their pedagogical decisions. Velasco and Fialais (2016) similarly underscore the importance of the teacher, particularly with regard to fostering emerging cross-language abilities in young learners and with regard to the creation of translanguaging spaces (cf. García 2009) aimed at encouraging cross-language practices and metalinguistic reflexion. In her investigation of primary school children in multilingual educational programmes in South Tyrol, Hofer (2015) found that learners benefit in a number of ways if such spaces are opened up in the classroom and if learners become actively involved in cross-language practices and explicit focus on form. In consonance with the research literature (cf. Hawkins 1999; Jessner 2006; Hufeisen 2011; Haukås 2016) we want to stress that for multilingual pedagogical approaches to be effective it is paramount that teachers

- conceive of themselves as multilingual teachers (cf. Pavlenko 2003) and not merely as teachers of a single language
- believe in the pertinence of fostering students' multi-and cross-lingual skills
- be sensitive to their students' cognitive and linguistic capabilities and needs
- possess a minimum level of meta- and cross-language awareness and be able to impart this meta-knowledge to their students
- acknowledge that monolingual norms and assessment tools do not do justice to multilingual learners.

The teacher in the multilingual classroom is no longer the (only) expert. Students (and their parents) may have command of (a) language(s) that the teacher does not speak, in which case it is the student who assumes the role of the expert.

We have found that teachers are often unsure about cross-language approaches (and what they entail) and feel even more insecure about how to tackle the new multilingual realities in their classrooms. Teachers therefore need guidance and reassurance that working across languages and allowing multiple languages to be heard and made visible in an educational setting neither harms the learning process nor interferes with the learning task. It seems that decades of language separation have left their mark, because it is often those teachers who have themselves

undergone their language training in the monolingual tradition who find it diffi-cult to acknowledge that conjoining the languages in an integrated multilingual pedagogy is not only acceptable but can have favourable effects. CPC approaches, in that they include the whole linguistic repertoire of the students in a given school and highlight the need for interconnected teaching, implicitly point to these as-pects related to the role of the teacher in a multilingual setting.

Finally, two important aspects should be added: First, in a CPC framework, the teacher is committed to employing assessment formats which take into ac-count the learner's entire linguistic repertoire, not just their proficiency in a single language or domain, and which focus on learners' progress instead of on their deficits (cf. Jessner 2016). Second, language teacher education will have to take account of and adapt to the new status quo by providing targeted and scientifically grounded training in integrated multilingual didactics and methodology (cf. Boeckmann et al. 2011: 31-36; Hufeisen 2018: 23f.).

7. First steps towards implementing a CPC

As official partner schools participating in the PlurCur® project (2012-2015; www.ecml.at/plurcur), which was initiated and overseen by Hufeisen and her team and funded by the ECML (European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz), the Gymnasium of Social Sciences and School of Tourism in Bozen and the HLW Rankweil in Vorarlberg aim to promote integrated cross-language teaching and learning and to allow for a greater variety of languages and cultures to become accessible to their students.

7.1 The Gymnasium of Social Sciences and School of Tourism

The Gymnasium of Social Sciences/School of Tourism (www.sogym.bz.it) is a five-year upper-secondary college (grade levels 9-13) with primary focus on hu-manities, Latin, business economics and tourism. Though located in South Tyrol's capital city of Bozen/Bolzano, where a large majority of the population are Italian speakers (73 % Italian speakers vs. 26 % speakers of German), the Gymnasium of Social Sciences and School of Tourism caters predominantly to German-speak-ing students, and therefore has German as its main language of instruction.

All the students at the school study L2 Italian for a total of 4 hours per week (as prescribed by the law). L3 English is taught as a language subject for 3 hours. Some students in the Gymnasium additionally study Latin (for 3 hours per week

from grade 9), while all the students enrolled in the School of Tourism study either Spanish or Russian as a L4 from the 10th class onwards.

7.1.1 The wider South Tyrol context

Viewed from the outside, one might be under the impression that schools in South Tyrol would by nature operate on bi- or multilingual principles. In reality, however, the schools have always (and this is particularly the case in German schools in the region) been distinctly separated by language group (Alcock 2001: 20, speaks of a form of *apartheid*). The main reason underlying this particular state of affairs is the widely held conviction, particularly among German speakers, that contact between the languages would cause interference and disruption and would stand in the way of high attainment in the individual languages. Prior attempts, undertaken by the German school board in the early 1990s (Gelmi & Saxalber 1992), to join the languages together in the form of integrated language didactics went largely unnoticed and thus failed to develop traction. In a similar way, the 2004 "*Sprachenkonzept für die deutschen Kindergärten und Schulen in Südtirol*", which is in many points consonant with both Hufeisen's CPC (2005, 2011, 2018) and with the holistic view of multilingual learning endorsed in the DMM (cf. Herdina & Jessner 2002; Jessner 2008b), has been given very little consideration.

More recently, the wider recognition that multilingualism constitutes no threat to learners' linguistic and cognitive development, but that instead a whole range of advantages can be expected to accrue for speakers of multiple languages, has led to an attitudinal shift and a tentative change of direction in South Tyrol's educational landscape. One of the steps in this new process has been the publication of a manual which was given the promising title "Auf dem Weg zur sprachsensiblen Schule. Das Mehrsprachencurriculum Südtirol" (Schwienbacher, Quartapelle & Patscheider 2016). The "Mehrsprachencurriculum Südtirol" is meant to provide guidance and concrete good-practice examples on how to implement multilingual approaches in institutionalized learning contexts from the primary to the upper secondary level. Initial responses and first feedback on the book have been very positive, but only time will tell how much of an impact this multilingual foray will have on educational practices in schools throughout South Tyrol.

7.1.2 CPC elements in the curriculum

In the following section, good practice examples based on CPC and DMM principles will be presented. They include a Workshop on Scandinavian Languages and Cultures, a Multilingual Sketch-Shop and a Language*S* Café. The projects and activities can be carried out at the classroom level by individual teachers, across form groups or at the school level.

In the 'Workshop on Scandinavian Languages and Way of Life' students gain a first insight into the idiosyncrasies of the Danish, Swedish and Norwegian languages and the way of life in the Scandinavian countries. In keeping with CPC and DMM axioms, students investigate lexico-semantic and structural analogies between the three typologically related languages and discover that there exists considerable overlap with at least two of the languages they themselves speak, namely German and English. In small groups students work on selected texts (pop songs, recipes, excerpts from children's stories like "The Gruffalo" or "Pippi Longstocking") in Danish, Swedish and Norwegian and extract meaning by drawing on their previous linguistic and general (world) knowledge. Particular attention is paid to contrastive cross-language analysis, and learners are encouraged to form their own hypotheses about formal and functional aspects of languages. The activities in the workshop are specifically aimed at promoting learners' receptive competences and analytical skills, in particular their perception and understanding of cross-linguistic parallels. If learners are able to establish and exploit such parallels, this can significantly support decoding and comprehension processes (cf. Hufeisen 2005; Jessner 2006; Allgäuer-Hackl 2017). The realization that etymological proximity, i.e. a shared derivation, serves as a connecting element between languages is another important insight that students gain in the course of the workshop.

In line with CPC and DMM precepts, the 'Multilingual Sketch-Shop' aims to foster multilingual communicative skills through multilingual negotiation training (cf. Schlabach 2014). Students work together in small groups and enact sketches in which they negotiate meaning in simulated multilingual encounters (e.g. on a holiday abroad, at the hotel reception or restaurant, on a guided city tour, etc.). As intended in a CPC design, there is a strong emphasis on the development of multi-lingual, cross-language skills such as mediating, translating and flexible switching so that learners can use their pre-existing linguistic and metacognitive knowledge (cf. Jessner 2008b; Hufeisen 2011; Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 129f).

In the 'Language*S* Café' learners choose 3 out of 10 to 15 languages (including Latin, Ladin, Italian, English, Polish, Russian, Romanian, Bulgarian, modern Greek, Arabic, Chinese, Danish, Norwegian, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese or

French). At each language table an expert provides some information about the social and cultural practices of the respective language community in a particular country and introduces students to some elementary vocabulary and structures. Students get a first impression of how basic concepts or intentions are verbalized in that language and learn that different languages have recourse to differential linguistic means to convey meaning. In pairs or small groups students work on short texts or dialogues and focus on a range of language functions such as greeting people and introducing oneself, asking for and giving directions, buying things or ordering food and drinks. They use their newly acquired knowledge either in simple conversations or in activities that require them to focalise the new lexical items and grammatical structures, and/or engage in cross-language comparisons which also include their previously learned languages.

The major educational objectives pursued with the CPC and DMM-inspired projects and activities presented above are concisely summarized by Meißner (2005: 130) who states "Es kommt im Kern darauf an, über das Vergleichen von sprachlichen Phänomenen aus mehreren Sprachen, der eigenen Lernhypothesen und Lösungswege Einsicht in die eigenen Lern-[…]prozesse zu gewinnen und das Lernen […] fremder Sprachen zu verbessern."

7.2 HLW Rankweil

The Höhere Lehranstalt für wirtschaftliche Berufe (HLW) Rankweil, Austria, is a five-year (upper-secondary level) college of management and services industries that provides general education combined with vocational training. It prepares students for careers in the tourism and catering sectors and additionally provides university entrance qualifications (i.e. exit exams known as the *Matura*). The curriculum includes a wide range of subject areas including German plus three compulsory foreign languages (www.hlwrankweil.at). In addition to in-school classes, students complete a 12-week mandatory work-placement during the summer holidays between the third and fourth year (grade levels 11 and 12), for which most students choose tourist facilities abroad.

The more than 450 students aged 14 to 19 are from towns and villages from all over the province of Vorarlberg, which is characterized by a variety of German variants or dialects used in everyday life and a wide range of languages spoken due to migratory flows. The percentage of students in Vorarlberg who speak languages other than German at home amounts to nearly 25% (Statistik Austria 2016). Standard German is used as the language of instruction. The foreign languages commonly taught as subjects are English, French, Spanish and Italian.

7.2.1 CPC elements

Cenoz and Gorter (2014: 246) use the image of weaving to illustrate language teaching and learning in school contexts. Taking up this metaphor,

> we can think of the longitudinal threads, or warp, as the languages that are being learnt. They are vertical and parallel and they do not touch each other, they are the languages in the curriculum that are separate from each other. However, we can add the lateral threads, the weft, so as to create the interlacing or interaction between these languages and the processes of learning them. The weft goes across the curriculum of languages and establishes interrelationships. The weft adds support to the cloth even if it also requires time, effort, attention and interest.

Table 2 provides an overview of the languages and some subjects taught at the school and of elective classes, activities and projects that overlap with CPC approaches. The languages and subjects presented in the upper part of Table 2 are typically taught in a compartmentalized way, i.e. in isolation from each other. This is symbolized by their vertical arrangement (warp). CPC or DMM-based teaching and learning efforts, by contrast, are arranged horizontally to indicate their interconnected nature (weft). Both warp and weft are needed to weave robust cloth.

Table 2: Subjects versus CPC elements in the HLW Curriculum

HLW Rankweil: Language and subject teaching (selection of subjects)									
year 5	German	English	French	Spanish / Italian	History	Geography	Music	Mathematics	Nutrition
year 4									
year 3									
year 2									
year 1									
HLW Rankweil: CPC elements									
year 5									
year 4	Multilingual Seminar / CLIL classes (PE/French)								
summer	Internship abroad (3 months)								
year 3	Multilingual preparation for internship								
Any school year	Teaching for Transfer								
Any school year	Cross-curricular projects								

In the following paragraphs, some of the CPC elements will only be outlined while the two most interesting offers will be described in more detail. They constitute examples of multiple language use and linguistic awareness training that can be adapted to other contexts.

Important CPC pillars include one-off projects, such as short-term work placements of students (e.g. as catering servers) at international events, language cafés organized by students and projects carried out by teachers. Such projects are relatively easy to implement, since they depend mainly on an individual teacher's or on students' initiative and commitment rather than on any kind of school development process.

Teaching for transfer (cf. Cummins 2017) is another CPC-related approach adopted by language teachers who try to include their students' prior language and concept knowledge in their own (language) teaching. This happens, for example, when the teachers point out interferences or show transfer opportunities between the target language and the languages that the students already know. This approach, however, is not consistently applied in foreign language teaching and is even less common with respect to cross-language connections between German and the foreign languages, or between subject and language teaching.

As far as CLIL classes – a main CPC feature – are concerned, the curricular foreign languages or even heritage languages could be integrated as vehicular languages in the CLIL classroom to a much higher degree (cf. Hufeisen 2018). Currently, only one teacher uses French CLIL-teaching in her PE lessons in year 4 (cf. Kessler 2015), which is a clear sign that there is room for expansion and improvement.

7.2.2 Work placement abroad

The most interesting multilingual experience for HLW students is provided through work placements abroad, which constitute a unique learning opportunity in multilingual settings (see the 'year/term abroad' concept within the CPC). Students' feedback shows that the work placement provides translanguaging practice (cf. García 2009) and implicit MLA/XLA training. Those students who complete their internship abroad experience multilingual communication with guests and colleagues, gain flexibility in switching between languages, reduce their foreign language anxiety and come back with an enhanced understanding of multiple language use and of the connections between languages (cf. Allgäuer-Hackl 2017). The work placement thus constitutes a perfect example of how enhanced language maintenance/management can be achieved (see Table 1 above). It is the only offer that is firmly anchored and not subject to curricular changes, the number of students enrolled or resources allocated for one school year.

7.2.3 The Multilingual Seminar (MS) classes

The 'Multilingual Seminar' is an elective class of one lesson per week taught during one school year (cf. Jessner et al. 2016; Allgäuer-Hackl 2017) to students from the third and/or fourth year (see Table 2). The classes are learner-centred and place communication at the top of their agenda. Teachers and students are perceived as language users (cf. Cook 2002) since they are experts of some and learners of other languages.

Capitalizing on the (linguistic and world) knowledge students bring to the class is one of the main goals of the 'Multilingual Seminar', which is based on (a) multiple language use involving all the languages that the students have in their repertoires, connected with (b) comparing and contrasting languages and discussing interference phenomena and transfer opportunities. These foci help the students to draw on prior language knowledge and to make efficient use of the "enhanced multilingual monitor" (Jessner 2006: 59f.) detected in multilingual people.

The participants experience multiple language use in role-plays and simulations, in discussions that include several languages and in mediating exercises and train their language management skills. One of our former students remembers a multilingual activity in the following way:

> In my opinion, one of the most fascinating exercises was the 'multilingual dialog', where the dialog partners would use two different languages during the same conversation. I would speak, for instance, Spanish with an Italian-speaking student […]; these multilingual dialogs helped me to focus on one language, while using it actively, and at the same time paying attention to and learning another language. I loved this exercise because I had to switch languages 'in real life' during my professional life, internships, studies etc. as well [original English] (P., e-mail message 2017).

Metalinguistic and cross-linguistic comparison enhances students' language awareness and helps them to expand their language learning strategies, as the same student observes:

> Moreover, we used to compare the languages we learnt (vocabulary, grammar) in order to see not only the differences (e.g. using 'en' in Spanish and 'à' in French; orthography) but also the similarities (especially vocabulary), which was very helpful for studying and remembering [original English]. (P., e-mail message 2017).

The benefits of contrastive analysis as a metalinguistic activity (cf. James 1996) are clearly seen by this student, who adds that cross-linguistic comparisons helped her to learn new words (e.g. *menacer – amenazar – to menace*) and "showed me how I could use all my language resources to learn new languages" (P., e-mail message 2017).

A study carried out by Allgäuer-Hackl (2017) on MLA training in these MS classes revealed a significant advantage for the participants of the MS in tasks

related to metalinguistic awareness. Seminar participants also displayed a higher awareness of language learning and language management strategies than non-participants.

In sum, students in multilingual classes such as the MS develop

- enhanced metalinguistic and cross-linguistic awareness
- an increased repertoire of language learning strategies
- greater flexibility in the use of languages
- enhanced sensibility for language management and maintenance
- strategies
- enhanced learner autonomy and increased self-esteem.

8. Conclusion

In this paper we have introduced some of the central tenets of the DMM and have linked them to (language) learning in a CPC framework. We have suggested that the DMM presents a useful tool for explaining the complex dynamics involved in multilingual learning and development. We have furthermore argued that the complexities and the dynamics inherent in multilingual development are best accommodated in an integrated CPC model which acknowledges and promotes diverse multilingual competences and resources, fosters transversal meta- and cross-lingual abilities as well as metacognitive skills and builds upon learners' extant linguistic and world knowledge for the promotion of learning and personal development.

While clearly presenting valuable steps in the right direction, the majority of the projects described here are hardly more than piecemeal interventions. What is missing (in our and in many other schools) is a sustainable anchoring of CPC elements in the school curriculum and a more assertive move towards aligning all the languages in a common plurilingual framework. Realizing a CPC concept requires a paradigm shift and a common knowledge base shared by teachers and the management team, which includes positive attitudes towards multilingualism, a (w)holistic analysis of the (dynamic) processes of language development through language use, a critical analysis of the still widely endorsed native-speaker norm in language teaching, a discussion of interconnected teaching approaches and, consequently, a re-definition of the role of the teacher.

Literaturverzeichnis

Alcock, Antony (2001): *The South Tyrol autonomy. A short introduction*. County Londonderry, Bozen/Bolzano [Online: www.provinz.bz.it/news/de/publikationen.asp?publ_page=2, 18.06.2018].

Allgäuer-Hackl, Elisabeth (2017): *The development of metalinguistic awareness in multilingual learners. How effective is multilingual training in the classroom?* Unpublished Dissertation. University of Innsbruck.

Allgäuer-Hackl, Elisabeth & Jessner, Ulrike (2013): Mehrsprachigkeitsunterricht aus mehrsprachiger Sicht: Zur Förderung des metalinguistischen Bewusstseins. In: Vetter, Eva (Hrsg.): *Professionalisierung für sprachliche Vielfalt. Perspektiven für eine neue LehrerInnenbildung*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider, 111-147.

Aronin, Larissa & Jessner, Ulrike (2016): Spacetimes of multilingualism. In: Gałajda, Dagmara; Zakrajewski, Pawel & Pawlak, Miroslav (eds.): *Researching second language learning and teaching from a psycholinguistic perspective*. Cham: Springer, 27-35.

Baker, Colin (2006): *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bialystok, Ellen (2011): Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology* 65: 4, 229-235.

Boeckmann, Klaus-Börge; Aalto, Eija; Abel, Andrea; Atanasoska, Tatjana & Lamb, Terry (2011): *Promoting plurilingualism – Majority language in multilingual settings* [Online: http://marille.ecml.at, 18.06.2018].

Candelier, Michel; Grima Camilleri; Castellotti, Véronique; de Pietro, Jean-Francois; Lörincz, Ildikó; Meißner, Franz-Joseph; Molinié, Muriel; Noquerol, Artur; Schröder-Sura, Anna (2012): *Le CARAP – Compétences et ressources*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.

Cenoz, Jasone & Gorter, Durk (2014): Focus on multilingualism as an approach in educational contexts. In: Blackledge, Adrian & Creese, Angela (eds.): *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy,* Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media, 239-254.

Cook, Vivian (2002): *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, Vivian (2016): Premises of multi-competence. In: Cook, Vivian & Li Wei (eds.): *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-25.

Council of Europe (2001): *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit.

Cummins, Jim (1979): Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19, 121-129.

Cummins, Jim (2007): Rethinking Monolingual Instructional Strategies in Multilingual Classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics (CJAL)/Revue Canadienne de Linguistique Appliquée (RCLA)* 10, 221-240.

Cummins, Jim (2017): Teaching for transfer in multilingual school contexts. In: García, Ofelia; Lin, Angel & May, Stephen (eds.): *Bilingual and multilingual education. Encyclopedia of language and education*. New York: Springer, 103-115.

De Angelis, Gessica; Jessner, Ulrike & Krésic, Marijana (eds.) (2015): *Crosslinguistic Influence and Crosslinguistic Interaction in Multilingual Language Learning*. London: Bloomsbury.

De Bot, Kees; Lowie, Wander & Verspoor, Marjolin (2007): A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 10: 1, 7-21.

Dewaele, Jean-Marc (2010): Multilingualism and affordances: Variation in self-perceived communicative competence and communicative anxiety in French L1, L2, L3 and L4. *IRAL* 48, 105-129.

García, Ofelia (2009): *Bilingual education in the 21st century. A global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, Ofelia & Sylvan, Claire (2011): Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Learning Journal* 95: 3, 385-400.

Gelmi, Rita & Saxalber, Annemarie (1992): *Integrierte Sprachdidaktik: Muttersprache – Zweitsprache. Theoretische Beiträge*. Bozen: Pädagogisches Institut.

Haukås, Åsta (2016): Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13: 1, 1-18.

Hawkins, Eric (1999): Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language Awareness* 8: 3 & 4, 124-142.

Herdina, Philip & Jessner, Ulrike (2002): *A dynamic model of multilingualism. Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hofer, Barbara (2015): *On the dynamics of early multilingualism. A psycholinguistic study*. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hofer, Barbara (2017): Emergent multicompetence at the primary level: a dynamic conception of multicompetence. *Language Awareness* 26: 2, 96-112.

Hofer, Barbara & Jessner, Ulrike (2017): Is multilingual learning advantageous? *Rivista di Psicolinguistica Applicata/Journal of Applied Psycholinguistics* XVII: 1, 9-32.

Hufeisen, Britta (2005): Gesamtsprachencurriculum. Einflussfaktoren und Bedingungsgefüge. In: Hufeisen, Britta & Lutjeharms, Madeline (Hrsg.): *Gesamtsprachencurriculum – Integrierte Sprachendidaktik – Common Curriculum. Theoretische Überlegungen und Beispiele der Umsetzung*. Tübingen: Narr, 9-18.

Hufeisen, Britta (2010): Theoretische Fundierung multiplen Sprachenlernens – Faktorenmodell 2.0. *Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 36, 200-207.

Hufeisen, Britta (2011): Gesamtsprachencurriculum: Überlegungen zu einem prototypischen Modell. In: Baur, Rupprecht & Hufeisen, Britta (eds.): "*Vieles ist sehr ähnlich*". *Individuelle und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit als bildungspolitische Aufgabe*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider, 265-282.

Hufeisen, Britta (2018): Institutional education and multilingualism: PlurCur as a prototype of a multilingual whole school policy. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6: 1, 1-32.

James, Carl (1996): A cross-linguistic approach to language awareness. *Language Awareness* 5: 3 & 4, 138-148.

Jessner, Ulrike (2006): *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: University Press.

Jessner, Ulrike (2008a): A DST model of multilingualism and the role of metalinguistic awareness. *The Modern Language Journal* 92: ii, 270-283.

Jessner, Ulrike (2008b): State-of-the-art article. Teaching third languages: findings, trends and challenges, *Language Teaching* 41: 1, 15-56.

Jessner, Ulrike (2016): Multicompetence approaches to language proficiency development in multilingual education. In: García, Ofelia; Lin, Angel & May, Stephen (eds.): *Encyclopedia of language and education*, Vol. 5: *Bilingual Programs*. New York: Springer, 161-173.

Jessner, Ulrike; Allgäuer-Hackl, Elisabeth & Hofer, Barbara (2016): Emerging multilingual awareness in educational contexts: From theory to practice. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 72: 2, 157-182.

Kemp, Charlotte (2001): *Metalinguistic awareness in multilinguals: implicit and explicit grammatical awareness and its relationship with language experience and language attainment*. Doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Edinburgh.

Kessler, Angelika (2015): Bilingualer Sportunterricht – ein Forschungsbericht. In: Allgäuer-Hackl, Elisabeth; Brogan, Kristin; Henning, Ute; Hufeisen, Britta & Schlabach, Joachim (Hrsg.): *MehrSprachen? PlurCur! Berichte aus Forschung und Praxis zu Gesamtsprachencurricula*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider, 169-208.

Kordt, Birgit (2015): Die Affordanzwahrnehmung von SchülerInnen bei der schulischen Umsetzung des EuroComGerm-Konzepts – Einblicke in eine explorativ-interpretative Studie. In: Allgäuer-Hackl, Elisabeth; Brogan, Kristin; Henning, Ute; Hufeisen, Britta & Schlabach, Joachim (Hrsg.): *MehrSprachen? PlurCur! Berichte aus Forschung und Praxis zu Gesamtsprachencurricula*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider, 85-106.

Kordt, Birgit (2016): Affordance theory and multiple language learning and teaching, *International Journal of Multilingualism* 15: 2, 135-148.

Kramsch, Claire (2012): Why is everyone so excited about complexity theory in applied linguistics? In: Bailly, Sophie; Boulton, Alex & Macarie, Dominique (eds.). *Didactique des langues et comlexité. En hommage a Richard Duda*. Melanges: CRAPEL 33, 9-25.

Krumm, Hans-Jürgen & Reich, Hans H. (2011): *Curriculum Mehrsprachigkeit*. [Online: oesz.at/download/cm/CurriculumMehrsprachigkeit2011.pdf, 20.12.2017].

Larsen-Freeman, Diane & Cameron, Lynne (2008): *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lowie, Wander (2017): Emergentism: Wide-ranging theoretical framework or just one more meta-theory? *Recherches en didactique des langues et des culture, Les cahier de l'Acedle*, 14: 1. [Online: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313126588, 05.02.2018]

MacIntyre, Peter; Gregersen, Tammy & Mercer, Sarah (eds.) (2016): *Positive psychology in SLA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Meißner, Franz-Joseph (2005): Vorläufige Erfahrungen mit autonomem Lernen qua Mehrsprachigkeitsunterricht. In: Hufeisen, Britta & Lutjeharms, Madeline (Hrsg.): *Gesamtsprachencurriculum –Integrierte Sprachdidaktik – Common Curriculum*. Tübingen: Narr, 129-135.

Ó Làoire, Muiris (2005): L1, L2 and L3 teaching in Ireland – Towards a common curriculum. In: Hufeisen, Britta & Lutjeharms, Madeline (eds.): *Gesamtsprachencurriculum – Integrierte Sprachendidaktik – Common Curriculum*. Tübingen: Narr, 45-50.

Pavlenko, Aneta (2003): "I never knew I was a bilingual": Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 2: 4, 251-268.

Schlabach, Joachim (2014): Auf dem Weg zur plurilingualen Kompetenz. *Fremdsprache Deutsch* 50, 42-47.

Schlabach, Joachim (2016): Plurilingual proficiency as a learning objective for a multilingual curriculum in the study of business in Finland. *Language Learning in Higher Education* 6: 2, 495-507.

Schwienbacher, Evi Debora; Quartapelle, Franca & Patscheider, Ferdinand (Hrsg.) (2016): *Auf dem Weg zur sprachsensiblen Schule. Das Mehrsprachencurriculum Südtirol*. Köln: Carl Link.

Statistik Austria (2016): *Schulstatistik 2016. Schülerinnen und Schüler mit nicht-deutscher Umgangssprache im Schuljahr 2015/2016*. [Online: www.statistikaustria.at, 01.02.2018].

Sternberg, Robert (2005): The theory of successful intelligence. *Revista Interamericana de Psicologia/Interamerican Journal of Psychology* 39: 2, 189-202.

Velasco, Patricia & Fialais, Valérie (2016): Moments of metalinguistic awareness in a Kindergarten class: translanguaging for simultaneous biliterate development. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15.