

Stefanie Bredthauer

University of Cologne, Germany

Hilke Engfer

University of Cologne, Germany

MULTILINGUALISM IS GREAT – BUT IS IT REALLY MY BUSINESS? – TEACHERS’ APPROACHES TO MULTILINGUAL DIDACTICS IN AUSTRIA AND GERMANY

Summary. Over the past few years, a number of concepts and multilingual pedagogical approaches for all language subjects have been developed that can be summarized under the umbrella term multilingual didactics. These approaches focus on cross-lingual skills and integrated language learning. The need arose because the established didactical concepts assumed a linguistically homogeneous group of students (monolingual habitus), whilst today’s schools are marked by an astonishing and growing linguistic heterogeneity. In this article we present the results of our review of twelve empirical studies that deal with a number of questions concerning how language teachers in Germany and Austria feel about multilingual didactics, the effectiveness of their training, and how they implement it into their teaching. The findings show that language teachers in Austria and Germany advocate a multilingual pedagogical approach. Nevertheless, they treat their multilingual classes like homogeneous monolingual ones. This can be explained by a number of reasons, the most important ones being a lack of professional development and appropriate course books in this area. As a result, a significant number of language teachers do not consider multilingual didactics as part of their responsibility; consequently, students’ experiences as speakers/learners of multiple languages are not taken into account. Based on these key findings, we derive recommendations with regard to the professional development of language teachers, teaching and learning resources, further research, as well as recommendations for practitioners and stakeholders.

Keywords: multilingual didactics; teachers' approaches; Austria and Germany.

Introduction

Over the past few years, a number of concepts and multilingual pedagogical approaches for all language subjects have been developed in Germany and Austria that can be summarized under the umbrella term *multilingual didactics* (Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik). These approaches emphasise “the fact that as an individual person’s experience of language in its cultural contexts expands, from the language of the home to that of society at large and then to the languages of other people (whether learnt at school or college, or by direct experience), he or she does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all

knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact” (CEFR, 2001, p. 4). From a didactical perspective, this understanding acknowledges that all language teaching should explicitly include and promote the multilingual skills of students; not only those pertaining to the target language (see Hu, 2010, p. 215). Multilingual didactics therefore aims at developing integrative multilingualism in students rather than additive multilingualism. The latter is promoted by teaching in the target language only, while integrative multilingualism is achieved by actively establishing relationships between the target language and other languages; that is all languages (first, second, foreign) and language varieties that can be found in the classroom.

The need for such approaches arose because the established didactical concepts assumed a linguistically homogeneous group of students (*monolingual habitus*), whilst today’s schools are marked by an astonishing and growing linguistic heterogeneity. Considering that the established concepts are old-fashioned, even out-dated, questions arise concerning how language teachers feel about and cope with the challenges of multilingual support for their linguistically heterogeneous students, and what kind of support they receive.

In order to provide answers and shed light on contemporary teaching practices, we present a narrative review of twelve German and Austrian studies, which have been selected based on maximum variation sampling that considered the following criteria:

1) The selected studies are case studies, as well as large scale surveys that obtained their data through questionnaires and interviews with teachers and students, participant observations of lessons, and the evaluation of course books.

2) Studies either refer to language teaching at primary or secondary level.

3) In the focus were the subjects of German, German as a second/foreign language, community language classes, as well as the remaining modern languages, typically taught in Germany and Austria (e.g., English, French, Spanish, etc.).

All studies are primary sources (reports by the original researchers of the

respective study) and have been published between 2003 and 2016. To date there do not seem to exist any publications in English that report on teachers' approaches to multilingual didactics in Austria and Germany.

Our review is based on qualitative content analysis and highlights the following questions, how language teachers in Germany and Austria feel about multilingual didactics, the effectiveness of their training, and how they implement it into their teaching. Based on the findings, we derive recommendations with regard to the professional development of language teachers, teaching and learning resources, further research, as well as recommendations for practitioners and stakeholders.

Review of the Literature on German and Austrian Teachers' Attitudes and Practices with Respect to Multilingualism

In the following review of the literature, we begin with what we deem to be essential preconditions for effective multilingual didactics. Building on this, we will then shift the focus to current applications of multilingual didactics in the classroom, as well as its curricular positioning.

Necessary preconditions for multilingual didactics

All reviewed studies conclude that effective professional development for language teachers and appropriate teaching and learning resources are part and parcel of successful implementation of multilingual didactics.

Professional development for language teachers

The majority of teachers claim that they have not been trained sufficiently to teach linguistically heterogeneous classes – neither within the scope of their university courses, nor through staff development programs. Even less preparation has been provided with respect to integrating other languages into their lessons (e.g. Michel, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013; Ekinçi & Güneşli, 2016). Hence, acquisition of autodidactic strategies and beliefs about multilingual didactics – once language teachers are faced with multilingual

students – seems to be the norm currently. Yet, the reviewed studies come to the conclusion that the majority of teachers will not be able to implement a multilingual approach without the corresponding professional development (e.g. Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Michel, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013).

If teachers report that they are not capable of integrating the multilingual backgrounds of their students in any meaningful way, and only a small minority of teachers actually do feel prepared, the apparent deficits in training and staff development run the risk of promoting a view among teachers that multilingualism is a burden, rather than an opportunity not to be missed. Accordingly, teachers feel oftentimes physically and mentally exhausted, unable to deal with the challenge of supporting and promoting their multilingual students. Only few teachers claim to feel up to this task (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013; Ekinici & Güneşli, 2016). They are usually older and look back at many years of teaching experience. It can be argued, though, that younger teachers might be more critical of their own teaching style and methods, in particular with regard to (multilingual) language support, since a highly self-reflective perspective was required in their training (e.g. Ekinici & Güneşli, 2016). This implies that they might be more open and sensitised, yet not confident. Thus, all reviewed studies conclude that it should be a priority to cater to the high demand for professional development (e.g. Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Michel, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013; Jakisch, 2014; Ekinici & Güneşli, 2016). Results also show that professional development programs, or other additional qualifications (e.g., German as a second language, EAL, etc.), positively affect an individual’s attitude towards multilingualism (e.g. Edelmann, 2006). Further research is needed, though, to back up this hypothesis because it is arguable that only those teachers opt for professional development in the area of multilingual didactics who have already received similar training, or who for other reasons show an interest in this topic.

Teaching and learning resources

The majority of teachers state that the course books available to them do not consider their students’ multilingualism (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013;

Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016). This is in line with the results that report on the evaluations of language course books. Although there are books that include units which intend to support and promote the multilingual skills of students, these are few and of inconsistent quality. With regard to the linguistic levels, the scope is narrow, focusing exclusively and overwhelmingly on the lexical level. Likewise, the didactical guidelines are lacking if the authors of course books merely present language comparisons, rather than designing exercises that will help students structure and interpret their own analyses of differences and similarities between languages. This implies that publishers are aware of an increasing focus on the multilingualism of students, yet lack to date suitable concepts for consideration of students' multilingual skills within the course books (e.g. Michel, 2010; Marx, 2014). Therefore most course books are currently insufficient and do not promote multilingual skills (e.g. Michel, 2010; Neveling, 2013; Marx, 2014). This is also reflected in the number of course books that do not at all take into account the sheer number of languages one tends to find in schools these days, as they promote the German or English language exclusively (e.g. Marx, 2014).

Teachers report that they either do not know of, or cannot get hold of multilingual pedagogical resources other than course books, which have been developed for the inclusion of other languages into German, German as a second/foreign language, or community language classes. Hence, not only professional development programs, but also high quality multilingual pedagogical resources, are required and desired by many teachers. We have already established a striking insight that the majority of teachers do not feel confident or capable to integrate multilingual elements into their lessons without corresponding training and resources (e.g. Göbel, Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013).

Multilingual didactics in the classroom

The previous section established that if teachers have not acquired the means to realise a multilingual approach to teaching (either through university training, professional staff development, course books, or other materials), this will inevitably affect how they deal with their multilingual students. We therefore want to shift the attention in the following to the teachers' attitudes towards

multilingual didactics and their multilingual students (with a special focus on speakers of community languages).

Attitudes and beliefs of teachers

Whether teachers integrate languages other than the dominant classroom language into their lessons depends to a large extent on how meaningful it is to them to do so. Here, the reviewed studies show that the majority of teachers are not just open-minded about the concept of multilingual didactics, but that it actually makes sense to them (e.g. Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Wojnesitz, 2010; Neveling, 2013). When it comes to hands-on experience, however, the attitudes reported are ambiguous (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013): whilst comparisons of languages are supported in general (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013), a number of teachers question the practicability (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013).

What is striking is that among teachers the idea seems to prevail that an individual can only be referred to as *multilingual* if he or she is fluent (i.e., native speaker level) in more than one language (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011).

Teachers’ arguments *for* multilingual didactics:

- Teachers are convinced that acknowledging their students’ multilingualism promotes tolerance, acceptance, intercultural learning, and confidence in their multilingualism (e.g. Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

- Language comparisons embody a holistic approach to learning (e.g. Neveling, 2013).

- Teachers assume that a high level of competence in one language has a positive effect on the acquisition of further languages (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Jakisch, 2014).

- They share the opinion that multilingual teaching methods ease acquisition of further languages (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011).

We established earlier that the majority of teachers advocate language comparisons. However, at the same time they are sceptical and add the following limitations to their statements:

- Concerning the feasibility, teachers report on less than ideal conditions: ranging from too great a variety of languages in their classes, their

own low level, or lack of necessary language skills, the size of groups, lack of time (in lessons), to too time-consuming lesson planning (e.g. Michel, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Ekinçi & Güneşli, 2016).

- Teachers either approve of productive transfer, yet fear that interferences always result in mistakes and are thus detrimental to learning success, or are sceptical since they question whether they can influence the intended effects (e.g. Neveling, 2013; Jakisch, 2014).

- Furthermore, there is a widespread belief among teachers that language comparisons are too difficult for the majority of students, and therefore only benefit the most motivated and brightest children (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013).

- Implicitly, teachers advocate the 'time-on-task' hypothesis, because they are worried that the time spent on other languages in their language classrooms is effectively 'lost', as the focus is not on the content (i.e., a specific target language), but the multilingual skills during subject-area instruction (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Jakisch, 2014).

It becomes apparent again that teachers perceive of multilingualism as a resource, yet also a challenge (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013). However, proponents of, or teachers in favour of multilingual didactics constitute the majority (e.g. Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Neveling, 2013). In the following, we want to shift the focus from the attitudes and perspectives to actual teaching. Here, we will see that despite reported positive attitudes towards multilingual didactics, this rarely informs the teaching of language teachers.

How teachers integrate multilingual didactics into their teaching

The reviewed studies come to the same conclusion that there is a large gap between the attitudes and beliefs of teachers and their actual teaching: inclusion of multilingualism into German, German as a second/foreign language, and community language classes, as well as other modern languages, has been hardly considered (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; De Florio-Hansen, 2008; Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Wojnesitz, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013; Marx, 2014).

Of course, this is not true for *all* teachers. The reviewed studies do report on a variety of elaborate and didactically appealing lessons designed to stimulate and promote students’ multilingualism (e.g. Neveling, 2013; Jakisch, 2014). The studies also show that the teachers’ beliefs and attitudes towards their students’ multilingualism – for example, an interest in linguistic variety – do shape quite considerably how they deal with linguistic and cultural heterogeneity in their classroom (e.g. Edelmann, 2006).

It has to be concluded, however, that a multilingual approach to language teaching is far from being the norm: Despite the fact that teachers overwhelmingly assert that they teach markedly multilingual groups of students (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Pözlbauer, 2011; Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016), only very few report on concrete multilingual lessons that they have taught (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Pözlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013). According to the students’ perception, the use of languages other than the target language in language classes is even rarer than the surveys of teachers’ responses suggest (e.g. De Florio-Hansen, 2008; Wojnesitz, 2010).

Quite disconcertingly, teachers who claim to be teaching multilingual groups of students in most cases have no information about their students’ actual language skills (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011). This implies that in most cases teachers lack essential background knowledge, and thus basis, for including their students’ multilingualism. The only exceptions are teachers whose first language is not German. They tend to know about the linguistic backgrounds of their students (e.g. Edelmann, 2006).

All in all, comparisons of cultures (in particular as project work) seem to be more popular than language comparisons. Hence, teachers seem to be aware of the culturally diverse backgrounds of their students, yet not their multilingual skills. Accordingly, schools showcase posters that portray their multiculturalism, but not their students’ multilingualism (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011).

The blatant discrepancy between the theoretical approval of multilingual didactics and lack of actual translations into teaching can be explained with regard to the teachers’ insecurity and lack of knowledge how to integrate the concepts into their lessons. Only few teachers can formulate concrete ideas for how to use their students’ multilingualism as a resource, such as stressing similarities like international words or differences with regard to prepositions

(e.g. Pölzlbauer, 2011; Neveling, 2013). Currently, multilingual didactics is therefore rarely used; if it is used at all, it seems unsystematic, superficial and lacking in variation (e.g. De Florio-Hansen, 2008; Neveling, 2013). As mentioned before, in the case of language comparisons, for example, the focus is exclusively on the lexical level, disregarding other levels, such as phonetics or syntax (e.g. De Florio-Hansen, 2008; Neveling, 2013).

Accordingly, we come to the conclusion that contemporary teaching of language classes in Germany and in Austria is still designed for linguistically and culturally homogeneous classes (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Wojnesitz, 2010). Considering the fact that Germany and Austria have been experiencing constant immigration over decades, it is all the more surprising, and therefore urgent, that professional development programs on multilingual didactics, which are thoroughly based on existing and modern research in this area, help advance the development of language course books and eventually current practices.

The role of community languages

With regard to the teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards multilingualism, as well as their actual use of other languages in their language classroom, it becomes more and more apparent that teachers differentiate between 'high prestige' and 'low prestige' languages. This is expressed in the view that language skills in one of the traditionally taught foreign languages (i.e., English, German, French, Spanish, etc.) indicate capability, while proficiency in one (or more) community languages (i.e., Arabic, Turkish, Kurdish, etc.) seems to be irrelevant (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Wojnesitz, 2010).

Accordingly, English is considered to be the most important language, followed by German and all other modern languages. Community languages, on the other hand, are thought of as meaningless (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Wojnesitz, 2010; Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010). Among other things, these results explain why students whose native tongue is not German have reported that they do not think that teachers respect their native languages (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010).

Teachers explain their ranking of languages in most cases with regard to the international status of English as lingua franca, and the international

reputation of languages, such as French and Spanish (e.g. Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Wojnesitz, 2010). Concerning the future professional careers of their students, English and German seem to be of utmost importance. It is striking that even teachers whose native tongue is not German think that community languages are not an asset on the job market (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010; Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

This does not mean, however, that teachers believe in general that their students’ native languages are not important. In fact, language skills in a first language are thought of as a scaffold for second (third, fourth, etc.) language acquisition and learning. Furthermore, it is considered common ground that the use of native languages is closely connected with the students’ personality development and positive self-image (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016). Quite paradoxically, this does not imply that teachers advocate community language classes; the majority of teachers de facto do not even know whether their students attend community language classes or not (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011; Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

Another paradox is that many teachers are convinced that the way schools treat community languages directly affects students’ academic achievement (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011). Nevertheless, the majority of students with native tongues other than German do not get the opportunity to use their first language in the classroom. Even between lessons and during recess attitudes towards the use of community languages is ambivalent (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; De Florio-Hansen, 2008; Pözlbauer, 2011). The reviewed studies provide plenty of evidence that community languages are rarely used in everyday school life, and in many cases teachers actually ban the languages completely from their classrooms. This also refers to group work (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Wojnesitz, 2010), although other native speakers of the same language could take on the role of experts and help with the acquisition of the subject’s terminology (e.g. Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

Teachers list in particular the following three reasons why they bar community languages from their lessons:

- Exclusion of students whose (only) first language is German:
 - Many teachers worry that allowing the use of community languages will exclude the primary German-speaking students and promote the

formation of ethnic groups in the classroom (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Ekinici & Güneşli, 2016). Here, teachers insist on the 'right/prerogative of the majority' which requires that linguistic integration has to happen on the part of the students with first languages other than German (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010). While students with German as their first language regularly stress that they would like to learn their friend's native language, teachers do not seem to share this interest (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010). This attitude reflects that linguistic diversity is rarely valued.

- Fear of loss of authority:

- Oftentimes teachers do not only feel disturbed when students use their community languages in the classroom, but fear that this undermines their authority (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Wojnesitz, 2010). On the one hand, they cannot understand their students and are therefore incapable of commenting on what has been said. On the other hand, they worry that students are talking negatively about them, or the school, and their authority is thus undermined without them being aware (e.g. Wojnesitz, 2010).

- Threat to the successful acquisition of German:

- In particular, with regard to community languages, teachers stress the 'time-on-task' hypothesis. This means that they regard the usage of community languages as a threat to the successful acquisition of German (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Wojnesitz, 2010). Teachers highlight the importance of sound knowledge of the dominant language so that the students will succeed in school and partake in society (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Wojnesitz, 2010). It is generally assumed that children speak their native language at home with their family and with friends and that school is the only place where they a) get in touch with the German language and b) learn it properly (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Ekinici & Güneşli, 2016). Simultaneous support of German and the community language in school is not an option because teachers worry that this might challenge students too much (e.g. Pözlbauer, 2011).

Quite sadly, the teachers' responses towards the meaning and usage of community languages all express little appreciation, insecurity, and even suspicion; and yet it is their responsibility to create an atmosphere of trust and appreciation in the classroom (e.g. Leichsering, 2003; Göbel & Vieluf & Hesse, 2010; Wojnesitz, 2010).

Curricular positioning of multilingual didactics

The question of the curricular positioning of multilingual didactics is a bone of contention among teachers. There is disagreement concerning when to introduce it and in which subjects. Opinions on when to introduce it differ quite dramatically depending on the teacher’s background: primary school teachers often think that a serious support of multilingual skills is only possible once the students have achieved advanced levels in different languages, i.e. at secondary school. Secondary school and sixth form teachers, however, believe that other contents are more important at that stage and consequently see the responsibility for early support of multilingual skills at primary schools and even preschool level (e.g. Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

Concerning the responsibility of all language subjects to employ a multilingual lens to teaching, teachers distinguish between integrating it into the mainstream class, on the one hand, and pull-out community language classes and remedial teaching, on the other. A high number of teachers think that the inclusion and support of multilingual skills is an appropriate task for pull-out classes, but not for mainstream ones (e.g. Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

Those teachers who advocate a multilingual approach to mainstream teaching think that teachers of German should take on the responsibility for it, though, given that German is the dominant language in society and of course the education systems in Germany and Austria. Other teachers argue, however, that foreign language classes are more suited, since they believe that students should acquire multilingual skills in these classes. Foreign language teaching encompasses English classes - usually the first foreign language students learn in Germany and Austria - as well as the teaching of so-called tertiary languages - the second/third/fourth language students learn at school (e.g. Jakisch, 2014).

Alongside criteria concerning the grade and subject, teachers also touch upon the possible role of teachers whose first language is not German. However, the latter stress that they are absolutely no experts for multilingual didactics, or multilingualism in general, and they do not want their colleagues to assign this role to them (e.g. Edlmann, 2006).

At the same time, cooperation with other language teachers do not seem to be desired. However, this in turn implies that there is little cross-curricular

exchange in terms of experiences and advice in particular between a school's modern languages staff and teachers of community languages (e.g. Ekinci & Güneşli, 2016).

It has become apparent that teachers fear that integrating the support of multilingual skills into their lessons comes at the expense of their 'actual' tasks and aims (e.g. Jakisch, 2014). This explains why the responsibility for multilingual didactics is oftentimes consigned to teachers of other (lower or upper) grades, as well as bilingual colleagues. Hence, the implementation of continuous multilingual support – horizontally as well as vertically – is not desired, or at least voiced, which in turn supports the impression that cross-curricular exchange and cooperation between schools and different grades does not occur. This lack of exchange effectively produces individuals with additive multilingualism, rather than integrative multilingualism, which is stimulated through cross-linked language learning (e.g. Jakisch, 2014).

There are exceptions, however the studies come to the remarkable conclusion that teachers are most susceptible to their school's ideology, i.e. it matters a great deal if a school values its multilingualism and actively promotes a multilingual pedagogical approach (e.g. Edlmann, 2006).

Conclusion & Recommendations

In this article we presented the results of our review of twelve empirical studies that deal with a number of questions concerning how language teachers in Germany and Austria feel about multilingual didactics, the effectiveness of their training, and how they implement it into their teaching.

Conclusion

Our key findings are the following:

- In general, language teachers advocate a multilingual pedagogical approach and express the wish to implement it into their teaching.
- They also list, however, a number of reasons why they are not able to do so currently, the most important one being that they feel that their

university courses and pre-service training have not prepared them properly for this task. Just as important is a significant lack of professional development programs and teaching and learning resources.

- This surely must be taken into account, when a high number of teachers report that they feel exhausted and overwhelmed by their students’ multilingualism. Many teachers have neither concrete ideas, nor vague notions of how they could support and promote their students’ multilingual skills within the scope of their lessons. On top of that, the subjective beliefs and attitudes of teachers at times do not match the insights we gain from latest research.

- As a result, teachers do not take into account their students’ experiences as speakers of multiple languages, as well as their language learning biographies, but – in line with the traditional didactical concepts – treat their multilingual classes like homogeneous monolingual (i.e., native German) ones. Lessons are thus disconnected from the students’ prior experiences and background knowledge. The impact of this should not be underestimated, since it directly affects the intrinsic motivation of students and teachers alike and potentially leads to frustration.

- In our review we identified one high-risk group in particular: students whose first language is not German. Results show that way too often their potential is not valued and appreciated. The fact that a considerable number of teachers even stated that they perceive of their students’ mother tongues as ‘hurdles’ or ‘threats’ shows that lack of knowledge, or false beliefs, are not only detrimental to the teaching practices, but also potentially reinforce stereotypes and racism.

- Likewise, lack of knowledge seems to account for the unequivocal ignorance concerning the idea of continuous multilingual support at all grade levels and cross-curricular exchange and cooperation. Furthermore there is disagreement concerning when to introduce multilingual didactics and in which subjects. Most of the teachers do not, or at least do not want to feel responsible for the introduction of multilingual didactics.

Recommendations

Based on these key findings, we derive the following recommendations:

Professional development

Multilingual didactics should be a crucial element of teacher training. The results show clearly that in modern multicultural societies, this should be considered a key skill for all language teachers. We have not discussed two-way bilingual programs, CLIL, or subjects, such as maths for EAL learners, but we want to stress at this point that multilingual pedagogical approaches can and should be adapted to contexts, which are beyond traditional language classes. This recommendation therefore appeals to modern languages and the sciences alike. Further resources must be developed (such as, handouts or workshops), in particular for experienced teachers, as the review identified a high demand in professional development. Programs should provide thorough insight into appropriate methods and contents, but also effective aims.

Teaching and learning resources

(Language) course books should contain more and varied multilingual pedagogical sections. We gave the example earlier that exercises should encourage learners to reflect critically and tasks should refer to all linguistic levels and not just the lexicon (of the classroom language and a community language, for example). Language comparisons then should provide the opportunity to include the students' language learning biographies, so that learning strategies and learner autonomy are strengthened. Basically, an underlying clear multilingual concept should be recognizable.

Practitioners and stakeholders

Schools can effectively promote an awareness of multilingual didactics through actively appreciating its own multiculturalism and multilingualism. The promotion and support of multilingual skills should be part of the school's concept, so that

(language) teachers feel that they are working towards a shared pedagogical aim. Schools should, for instance, promote cross-linking of language learning through the active encouragement of cooperation among their modern and classical languages staff (e.g., regular meetings, symposia, etc.).

Further research

In order to pave the way for truly multilingual didactical training and teaching/learning resources, further research is necessary. Up to date there exist few empirical studies in Germany and Austria and little is yet known about the effectiveness of existing concepts³⁶.

References

- Council of Europe (2001). Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Florio-Hansen, I. (2008). Mehrsprachigkeit – ein Gesamtsprachenkonzept für alle. Wie kann der Französischunterricht zu seiner Umsetzung beitragen? In M. Frings & E. Vetter (Eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit als Schlüsselkompetenz? Theorie und Praxis in Lehr- und Lernkontexten* (pp. 85–108). Stuttgart: ibidem.
- Edelmann, D. (2006). Pädagogische Professionalität im transnationalen sozialen Raum. Eine Studie über Sichtweisen und Erfahrungen von Primarlehrpersonen in Bezug auf die kulturelle Heterogenität ihrer Schulklassen. In C. Allemann-Ghionda & E. Terhart (Eds.), *Kompetenzen und Kompetenzentwicklung von Lehrerinnen und Lehrern* (pp. 235–249). Weinheim: Beltz.
- Ekinci, Y. & Güneşli, H. (2016) (Eds.). *Mehrsprachigkeit im Alltag von Schule und Unterricht in Deutschland – Eine empirische Studie*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

³⁶ The authors are currently preparing an article which discusses international concepts for multilingual didactics.

- Göbel, K. & Vieluf, S. & Hesse, H. (2010). Die Sprachtransferunterstützung im Deutsch- und Englischunterricht bei Schülerinnen und Schülern unterschiedlicher Sprachenlernerfahrung. In C. Allemann-Ghionda, P. Stanat, K. Göbel & C. Röhner (Eds.), *Migration, Identität, Sprache und Bildungserfolg* (pp. 101–122). Weinheim: Beltz.
- Haenisch, H. (2011). Empirische Befunde über Aktivitäten und Rahmenbedingungen von Sprachbildung in offenen Ganztagschulen. In Institut für soziale Arbeit e.V. (Eds.), *Beim Wort genommen! Chancen integrativer Sprachbildung im Ganzttag* (pp. 10–15). Münster: Serviceagentur Ganztägig Lernen in Nordrhein-Westfalen.
- Hu, A. (2010). Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik. In C. Surkamp (Eds.), *Metzler Lexikon Fremdsprachendidaktik. Ansätze – Methoden – Grundbegriffe* (pp. 215–217). Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.
- Jakisch, J. (2014). Lehrerperspektiven auf Englischunterricht und Mehrsprachigkeit. Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht, 19.1/2014, 202–2015. Retrieved from <http://zif.spz.tu-darmstadt.de/jg-19-1/beitrag/Jakisch.pdf>.
- Leichsering, T. (2003). Viele Sprachen – eine Schulklasse. Vom Umgang mit migrationsbedingter Mehrsprachigkeit. In G. Budach, J. Erfurt & S. Hofmann (2003), *Mehrsprachigkeit und Migration. Ressourcen sozialer Identifikation* (pp. 227–238). Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
- Marx, N. (2014). Häppchen oder Hauptgericht? Zeichen der Stagnation in der deutschen Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik. *Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 1/2014, 8–24.
- Michel, A. (2010). Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik zwischen Interkomprehension und Interferenz. In G. Veldre-Gerner & S. Thiele (2010), *Sprachvergleich und Sprachdidaktik* (pp. 31–50). Stuttgart: ibidem.
- Neveling, C. (2013). „Kiosco, televisión, tomate – das, was automatisch klar ist“. Eine Interview-Studie zum sprachenübergreifenden Lernen im Spanischunterricht aus Lehrerperspektive. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Sprachen und ihre Didaktik*, 7.2, 97–129.
- Pözlbauer, A. (2011). „Mehr (als) Deutsch“. Subjektive Theorien von DeutschlehrerInnen zur Bedeutung der Erstsprache für den Zweitspracherwerb. In H. J. Krumm & P.R. Portmann-Tselikas (Eds.)

Theorie und Praxis. 14. Schwerpunkt: Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachförderung Deutsch (pp. 61–70). Innsbruck, Wien: Studienverlag.

Wojnesitz, A. (2010). “Drei Sprachen sind mehr als zwei”. Mehrsprachigkeit an Wiener Gymnasien im Kontext von Migration. Münster: Waxmann.

Stefanie Bredthauer

Kelno universitetas, Vokietija;
stefanie.bredthauer@mercator.uni-koeln.de

Hilke Engfer

Kelno universitetas, Vokietija;
hilke.engfer@mercator.uni-koeln.de

DAUGIAKALBYSTĖ – PUIKU, BET AR TAI TIKRAI MANO REIKALAS? AUSTRIJOS IR VOKIETIJOS MOKYTOJŲ POŽIŪRIS Į DAUGIAKALBYSTĖS DIDAKTIKĄ

Santrauka. Pastaraisiais metais sukurta nemažai sąvokų ir daugiakalbių ugdymo metodikų, kurias galima apibendrinti skėtiniu daugiakalbystės didaktikos terminu. Visos šios metodikos akcentuoja gebėjimų perkėlimą mokantis skirtingų kalbų ir integruotą kalbos mokymąsi. Poreikį naujam terminui padiktavo pasikeitusi kalbą besimokančiojo situacija, iki šiol nusistovėjusios didaktinės sąvokos apibūdindavo lingvistiškai homogenišką kalbos besimokančiųjų grupę (vienakalbę habitus), tačiau šiandieninėse mokyklose stebėtina išaugo lingvistinio heterogeniškumo atvejų. Šiame straipsnyje apžvelgiame dvyliką empirinių tyrimų, kuriuose analizuojami įvairūs klausimai, susiję su Vokietijos ir Austrijos mokytojų požiūriu į daugiakalbystės didaktiką, savo profesinio pasirengimo veiksmingumą ir tai, kaip jie įgyvendina daugiakalbystės didaktikos nuostatas savo mokymo praktikoje. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad Austrijos ir Vokietijos mokytojai pasisako už daugiakalbio ugdymo metodiką, tačiau dirbdami daugiakalbėje klasėje mokytojai dirba taip pat kaip ir vienakalbėje. Tai galima paaiškinti įvairiai, tačiau svarbiausios priežastys yra profesinio tobulėjimo trūkumas ir tinkamų vadovėlių stygius. Dėl šių priežasčių didelė dalis pedagogų nemano, kad daugiakalbystės didaktika yra dalis jų atsakomybės, o į mokinių turimą patirtį mokantis ir vartojant keletą kalbų yra neatsižvelgiama. Remiantis tyrimo rezultatais, pateikiamos rekomendacijos kalbų specialistams ir kitoms suinteresuotoms šalims profesinės kalbų mokytojų raidos, mokymo ir mokymosi priemonių kūrimo bei tolesnių tyrimų vykdymo klausimais.

Pagrindinės sąvokos daugiakalbystės didaktika; mokytojų požiūriai; Austrija ir Vokietija.