

Dieter Wolff

Bergische Universität Wuppertal
Fachbereich A, Deutschland
wolff.dieter@t-online.de



Synergies Italie n° 8 - 2012 pp. 105-116

Résumé: La méthodologie CLIL ne peut pas être simplement considérée comme une tendance dans le domaine de l'apprentissage des langues et/ou des contenus, mais plutôt comme un concept général à travers lequel il est possible d'apporter de réels changements dans le monde de l'éducation. En tant que porteur de changement, elle doit être un facteur d'engagement à la recherche de solutions pour un certain nombre de situations très complexes à gérer, dont l'une des plus difficiles fait l'objet de cette contribution: la formation des enseignants. Dans la première partie, nous développerons une nouvelle vision du CLIL comme facteur de changement dans le monde de l'éducation. En élargissant la définition courante du CLIL, nous espérons démontrer que cette approche recouvre une gamme étendue de questions liées à l'éducation et que cela rend la formation de l'enseignant CLIL encore plus importante dans la valorisation linguistique à l'école. Dans la seconde partie, nous présenterons un cadre de référence pour le développement professionnel des enseignants CLIL en Europe. Ce cadre de référence tente de tracer les lignes directrices pour la formation des professeurs CLIL. En conclusion, nous prendrons des exemples du cadre et nous montrerons de façon détaillée que la formation des enseignants CLIL devrait être perçue comme la base pour toute formation de professeurs, aussi bien de langues que de disciplines.

Mots-clés: formation des enseignants CLIL, valorisation des compétences dans la langue maternelle, apprenants migrants, cadre pour la formation des enseignants CLIL.

Riassunto: La metodologia CLIL non può essere semplicemente considerata come una tendenza nell'ambito dell'apprendimento linguistico e/o di contenuto, ma, piuttosto, deve essere considerata come un concetto generale attraverso il quale possiamo portare cambiamenti reali nell'istruzione. Il fatto che come agente di cambiamento può innovare il sistema scolastico deve essere un fattore di impegno alla ricerca di soluzioni per un numero di situazioni molto complesse da gestire. Una delle più difficili è trattata in questo contributo: la formazione insegnanti. Nella prima parte, svilupperò una nuova visione del CLIL come agente di cambiamento nell'istruzione. Nell'estendere la definizione corrente di CLIL spero di dimostrare che questo approccio copre un'ampia gamma di questioni legate all'istruzione e rende la formazione del docente CLIL più rilevante nella valorizzazione linguistica a scuola. Nella seconda parte, presenterò un quadro di riferimento per lo sviluppo professionale degli insegnanti CLIL in Europa. Questo quadro di riferimento cerca di dare linee guida generali per la formazione di docenti CLIL. Nella parte conclusiva, prenderò degli esempi dal quadro e mostrerò in modo più dettagliato che la formazione dei docenti CLIL dovrebbe essere vista come la base per tutta la formazione degli insegnanti, sia che si tratti di formazione disciplinare sia linguistica.

Parole chiave: formazione dei docenti CLIL, promozione delle competenze nella lingua madre, discenti migranti, quadro per formazione dei docenti CLIL.

Abstract: CLIL cannot simply be called a current trend in language and/or content learning but must rather be seen as a more general concept through which we are able to bring about real change into our educational systems. The fact that as a change agent it has the potential to innovate our school systems commits us to finding solutions for a number of very complex issues. One of the most demanding will be in the focus of this contribution: teacher training. In the first of my paper I will try to develop «another» vision of CLIL as a change agent in education. In extending the current CLIL definition I hope to show that this approach covers a wide range of educational issues and makes CLIL teacher education more relevant in the context of school language promotion. In the second part I will present a framework for the professional development of CLIL teachers in Europe. This framework seeks to give general guidelines for the education of CLIL teachers. In the last part I will take some examples from the framework and show in somewhat more detail that CLIL teacher training should be seen as the basis for all teacher training, whether it is subject or language teacher training.

Keywords: CLIL teacher training, language of education or schooling, promotion of first language skills, learners with a migrant background, framework for CLIL teacher training.

Introduction

CLIL (*Content and Language Integrated Learning*) has become a powerful concept in education in Europe. Almost all European countries have incorporated this approach into their school systems, some offer CLIL-type provision on a voluntary basis, others have made it an obligatory part of their education. The latest example is Italy where CLIL will become mandatory in secondary education from next year onward.

It is interesting to note that CLIL, where it has been introduced, is beginning to influence institutionalised education in a positive way. The approach seems to confirm innovative methodological claims and to lead to new pedagogical insights. Practicing CLIL teachers have pointed, for example, to a number of exciting methodological options which can be realised more easily in a CLIL environment: task-based learning, project work, learner orientation and autonomy, to name just a few. Researchers claim that CLIL has an added value both for language and content learning. In recent academic research it could be shown that this assumption is correct: it is not only the learner's language competence but also his content subject competence which benefits from this approach.

But is this really all that qualifies CLIL as a change agent? Do we really make use of its entire potential if we look at this approach simply from this perspective? I believe that in re-interpreting CLIL and in looking at it from a more general perspective, we will see that it could play a much more important role in our schools than we assume at present. I will come back to this issue later, but let me make it clear already at this stage that CLIL cannot simply be called a current trend in language and/or content learning but must be seen as a more general concept through which we are able to bring about real change into language education and education in general.

The fact that CLIL is here to stay and seems to have the potential to innovate our school systems makes it necessary to find solutions for a number of complex problems. One of the most demanding will be in the focus of my contribution: teacher training.

I will present a framework for the professional development of CLIL teachers in Europe (Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, Frigols Martin, 2010). This framework which was developed in the context of an ECML¹ project seeks to present some general guidelines for the education of CLIL teachers. These may be used by institutions responsible for teacher education: initial teacher training institutions like universities or teacher training colleges, in-service training agencies responsible for retraining teachers etc.

In the context of my contribution I will focus on teacher training and relate it to the potential of CLIL to act as a change agent. I will show that CLIL teacher education, if taken seriously, constitutes a fundamental part of all teacher education, that every teacher should be educated, in fact, as a CLIL teacher.

My paper is divided into three main parts. In the first I will present my vision of CLIL as a change agent in education. I will start out with a current definition of CLIL and ask whether this definition is sufficient to cover all forms of CLIL-type provision. In extending this definition I hope to show that CLIL covers a much wider range of educational issues than are built into our present definition and therefore makes CLIL teacher education more relevant as an educational issue. In the second part I will present the European framework: I cannot do this in every detail but will rather focus on its main features with regard to structure and to content. In the last part I will take two issues from the framework and will break them down into something more concrete in order to show why CLIL is such an important issue in teacher education.

1. CLIL in education: Present and future

In the introduction I mentioned that we underestimate the real potential of CLIL as a change agent in education. Here I will discuss the issue further and show in more detail why this is the case.

1.1 Understanding CLIL: today's position

In the beginning of my discussion I would like to remind the reader of our current understanding of CLIL which is based on the seminal definition by Marsh and Langé (2000). This was taken up by the Eurydice Report (2005), and then modified several times until it achieved its present shape. It has been published in the European Framework as follows levels (Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, Frigols Martin, 2010: 1):

CLIL is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of content and language with the objective of promoting both content and language mastery to pre-defined.

The definition is clear with respect to most aspects of CLIL. It accentuates the dual focus of the approach, i.e. both content and language are to be promoted. It also makes clear that the CLIL approach is expected to promote pre-defined competences in the two school subjects, the language and the content subject.

The definition is less detailed with respect to a number of other issues. It does not say much about methodological aspects, for example about how to transform the dual focus mentioned in the definition into a concrete methodology. In CLIL practice a «dual-focused» approach is understood in many countries as an approach which prioritizes the content subject: CLIL teaching and learning is foremost content subject teaching and learning. The additional language in which teaching and learning takes place, is not taught as such but referred to whenever it seems useful. CLIL is therefore often called *language-sensitive content teaching*.

The concept of language-sensitive content teaching is based on a set of different scientific concepts derived from second language acquisition research, from cognitive psychology and from constructivism. Empirical research in second language acquisition has shown that languages are learnt while they are used (*language learning is language use*); cognitive and constructivist psychologists have made it clear that language learning takes place when learners are involved in the content they are dealing with. These findings provide a sound theoretical basis for a CLIL approach which is content- and not language-oriented (Wolff, 2002).

Going back to the definition, there is one term which can be misinterpreted and therefore lead to a rather narrow understanding of CLIL and its real potential. This is the term «additional language» which is usually understood to be a foreign language or in some countries also a second language. As we know, the languages being used as CLIL languages are most often standard languages from the Western hemisphere, for example English, German, French or Italian. In some countries we also come across Eastern European languages like Polish or Russian, in others even *exotic* languages like Chinese or Japanese. We can also see that second languages are being used, a second language meaning in this case «another official language» of a country². I believe, however, that this understanding of an additional language is rather limited with respect to CLIL and might hamper its further development especially with respect to CLIL teacher education. I would rather argue for a wider understanding of CLIL which also includes a new understanding of «additional language».

1.2 Widening our understanding of CLIL

I mentioned already that CLIL is understood in many European countries as a specific form of content teaching. A content subject like Geography, History, Physics, and Mathematics etc. is taught in another, an additional language. I also mentioned that the additional languages are usually foreign languages; sometimes second languages in the narrow sense of the term are included. Let us have a look now at the teaching and learning of content subjects in our schools in general. Normally, i.e. where no CLIL provision is made, they are taught in the official school language which is usually the language which is spoken in the country where the school is located; in Germany Geography is taught in German, in Italy in Italian etc. It is assumed that the students are highly competent speakers of this language.

In reality the situation is quite different, however. Although we pretend that our schools are monolingual this is not at all the case. Let us have a look in an ordinary secondary school classroom in Italy or in Germany. All content subjects are taught in the standard language or school language (in German it is called *Bildungssprache* = language of education or language of schooling) which all the students are expected to understand,

to speak, to read and to write. A closer look shows, however, that learners are quite heterogeneous with respect to their proficiency in the language of schooling. There are students who have just entered the country and do not speak the vernacular language at all; there are quite large numbers of learners who, because of their migrant background, speak the vernacular language as a second language, and there are the so-called native speakers who usually speak Italian or German perfectly well but have difficulties with the language of schooling. Here is a very general overview of the types of speakers which can be found, I think, in any European content subject classroom:

Type of speaker	L 1 speaker (non-migrant)	L 2 speaker (migrant)	Foreigner
Characteristics	high oral proficiency in the vernacular language (BICS) low proficiency in the school language (CALP)	average oral proficiency in the vernacular language (BICS) very low proficiency in the school language (reading and writing) (CALP)	very low (oral) proficiency in the vernacular language (BICS) no proficiency at all in the school language (reading and writing) (CALP)

The types of speakers are average, that is to say that within each category we can find learners with a higher or a lower degree of proficiency. The terms BICS and CALP were coined by Cummins (1987): BICS are *basic interpersonal communication skills*; CALP is *cognitive academic language proficiency*. The former are the communicative skills which almost all native speakers have; they are used in oral communication although they can also be found in written form, for example in email communication. CALP, on the other hand, is the proficiency which is necessary to master the formal language registers, among others also the language of education or schooling.

It is quite astonishing that at least in Germany the implications of this rather problematic situation were not really seen for a long time although every teacher knows that not only foreign and L2 but also L1 students have enormous difficulties in becoming successful learners in their content subjects, and that this is due to their students' deficits in the school language. Even when Ingrid Gogolin published (in 1994) her seminal book *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*³ in which she made clear that in the German school system the use of several languages was part and parcel of everyday school life, the reaction in the educational world was quite hesitant. The provision of isolated language courses for foreign and L2 students with language deficits in German was meant to serve as a solution and was favoured by many politicians; it did not, however, improve anything. This rather unsatisfactory state of affairs in Germany and in many other countries was reported recently again by Thürmann, Vollmer, Pieper (2010) in a Council of Europe document. In *Languages of Schooling: Focusing on vulnerable learners* they convincingly argue that success or failure in school is dependent not on the learner's proficiency in the vernacular language but on his proficiency in the language of schooling.

In a way, it can be argued that most content subject teachers in our schools are teaching in a CLIL context: for most of their learners the language of schooling is an «additional language», a language which they do not master, but need to cope with in order to become proficient content subject learners. But most content subject teachers feel left alone with this problem. They know that their learners have language problems,

but in general, they argue that promoting language proficiency should be the task of the teachers of the language of schooling. As far as we can see, teachers of German or Italian or any other language are overburdened by this task if they have to solve it by themselves, however. A solution is to train content-subject teachers to use a language-sensitive approach with respect to the language of schooling. Of course, this will not solve all the problems but it will at least help to support the language teachers' difficult tasks.

For the professional development of teachers in general this means that all who teach content subjects should be trained in CLIL, i.e. they should learn how to integrate content and language teaching and become language-sensitive in their approach. CLIL as a language-sensitive methodological approach would thus become an essential part of all teacher training, and even language teachers could benefit from it. I am not the first one to make such a proposal: in a monumental book entitled *Handbuch Sprachförderung im Fach - Sprachsensibler Fachunterricht in der Praxis*⁴ Josef Leisen argues for such an approach and shows by using numerous practical examples on how to teach in a language-sensitive way (Leisen, 2010). Josef Leisen is an experienced CLIL specialist. He wrote several books on how to teach content subjects (in German) in the so-called *Auslandsschulen*, i.e. German schools abroad in which all content teaching is done through German.

2. The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education: Describing its structure and content

In the following I will give a short overview of the *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education* which I mentioned already and in which we tried to incorporate elements of language sensitive content teaching some of which I will discuss in the last part of my paper. To begin with let me quote the introductory paragraph of the *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education*:

The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education aims to provide a set of principles and ideas for designing CLIL professional development curricula. The framework also seeks to serve as a tool for reflection. It is proposed as a conceptual lens and model, not as a prescriptive template. The European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education is the result of a CLIL curriculum development project financed by the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) in Graz. As CLIL programmes in the European member states differ from country to country in their organization, content, intensity and choice of languages this framework for CLIL Teacher Education focuses on macro-level universal competences of CLIL educators.

The framework was devised by Maria Frigols, David Marsh, Peeter Mehisto and the author.

Before work began on the framework we looked at a variety of teacher training programmes which had been developed by universities and other training agencies in Europe. It came out very quickly that most of the older curricula were limited to defining the content which had to be studied by future teachers: a foreign language teacher was expected, for example, to be proficient in the literary history of the target language; a history teacher was trained to know historical facts like the succession of kings or the length of wars. The pedagogical competences which future teachers need, played no or only a minor role. Only since the concept of *competence* became more prominent - influenced by the *Common European Framework of Reference* (CEFR) - more and more curricula are being developed which start out by defining the expertise a student is expected to attain when enrolling in such a programme.

In the European Framework this approach was pursued as well: for only such an analysis makes it possible to build up the prospect of what might be called the «ideal CLIL teacher» and to construct the teaching modules necessary to attain the goal of educating such a teacher. Analysis was based on an examination of teacher education, learning and curricular needs in CLIL contexts, and on a pan-European process of consultation.

The overall structure of the framework is determined by two main components: (1) the target professional competences and (2) the professional development modules. The framework also contains an introduction and a terminology section in which the key terms used in the framework are situated within a defined scope of meaning. Here is an overview of the main components:

(1) Target professional competences

1. Personal reflection	5. Research and evaluation
2. CLIL fundamentals	6. Learning resources and environment
3. Content and language awareness	7. Classroom management
4. Methodology and assessment	8. CLIL management

A few examples will have to suffice to illustrate what is meant by these categories of professional competences. Personal reflection includes the ability «to define one’s own pedagogical and content competences, and related developmental needs». Content and language awareness comprises the ability «to identify the appropriate content to be taught and obstacles to content learning». Methodology and assessment comprises the largest set of competences and includes, for example, the ability «identify key concepts of content subjects and make them accessible to learners by modifying teaching to take into account students’ diverse language competences and needs». Research and evaluation includes the ability «to conduct action research in collaboration with colleagues and other stakeholders, including students». Classroom management comprises the ability «to use diverse classroom set-ups to promote student communication, co-operative learning and teacher-ship».

(2) Professional development modules

Module 1: Approaching CLIL	Module 2: Implementing CLIL	Module 3: Consolidating CLIL
1. Situating CLIL (1, 2, 4, 8)	5. Designing CLIL classroom curricula (4, 7, 8)	10. Assessing for learning (4, 5)
2. Adopting action research (1,5)	6. Anchoring CLIL in the classroom (4, 5, 8)	11. Networking locally, nationally and internationally (4, 8)
3. Examining good pedagogy and CLIL (1, 3, 4)	7. Interweaving psychological and pedagogical aspects in the CLIL classroom (4, 7)	12. Practicing CLIL (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)
4. Focusing on CLIL in the school context (7, 8)	8. Accessing and adapting CLIL learning resources and environments (4, 6)	
	9. Becoming an evidence-based practitioner (5)	

These modules are sub-divided into different courses which relate to their topics. In general four to five courses In general four to five courses which cover each topic. In the following, an example is provided for one course.

Example: Module 1: course 1: Situating CLIL

Competences for the information age	CLIL contexts, models and variants	Autonomy, authenticity, agency
Bi-, multi- and plurilingualism: Overview	CLIL objectives	Professionalism and personal profile
Bilingual education past and present: assumptions and facts	CLIL aims and objectives within a regional, national and institutional infrastructure	

3. The European Framework of CLIL Teacher Education: Uncovering its potential for teaching in a language-sensitive way

In the last part of my contribution I will look at the framework from the perspective of the assumption that all teachers should be educated as CLIL teachers in order to enable them to develop their learners' language of schooling. This potential for teaching in a language-sensitive way is incorporated in a large number of the professional competences described in the framework. I have chosen two examples and would like to show in what way language-sensitive content teaching can be integrated in content-subject and CLIL teacher training and in the CLIL classroom. My first example is from the third target professional competence «Content and Language Awareness».

Example 1: CLIL teachers are able to deploy strategies to support language learning in content classes.

In order to be able to develop and use this target professional competence the future content-subject and CLIL teacher will have to acquire a basic knowledge of how learners learn languages in a CLIL context. She needs to be acquainted with the developmental stages of learner language, with the main SLA theories, with the factors influencing second language learning, and with the differences between first and second language learning. He also needs to know how learners are able to store and retain the new language in their brain, how they are able to separate it from their first or any other language they speak. And finally, he or she will have to know how language is used, how humans comprehend and produce language either orally or in written form. This background knowledge is necessary to be able to understand and deploy the strategies necessary to promote language learning in a content class.

What are, then, the strategies teachers should deploy to support language learning in a CLIL classroom? Here I will refer to Leisen (Leisen, 2010) who has compiled a comprehensive collection of support strategies which he calls a *methodological tool box*. This tool box consists of forty language support tools and was developed to support communicative situations in the classroom and to help learners cope with them. The tool box is based on the theoretical assumption developed in modern SLA research that language learning is language use. According to SLA theory language should be used in

genuine communicative situations, otherwise learning will not take place. Leisen's tool box helps learners to cope with such genuine communicative situations in the classroom and thus supports language learning.

Let me, at this stage, have a look at some of the support tools which are needed to support language learning in content classes (Leisen, 2010: II, 12-96)

a: *Model Sentence*: Model sentences are standardized expressions in technical language; they are sample sentences which appear with modifications in content subjects. Model sentences are of great help for weaker students because they make it possible for them to use technical jargon correctly. Model sentences are important in content subjects in which the density of technical language is very high (Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology); they should be collected jointly by teacher and learners and be available on posters in the classroom.

b: *Flow Chart*: Flow charts present complex actions, processes, or paths to solve a problem in a symbolic way to mark clear functional relations or chronological events. Flow charts can be used, for example, to describe an experiment. They are very helpful when learners are expected to describe complex processes in oral or written form. Learners have to learn how to assemble a flow chart: verbalizing a simple action or a process or posing a yes/no question is a highly effective and genuine language practice.

c: *Congress of experts*: This language supporting tool is based on the idea of forming learner groups who discuss a question or solve a task. In the second phase each member of each group becomes part of another group in which he or she presents the results of his/her group which are then compared with the results of the members of the other groups who are now also represented in this group. Members become experts in the first group and develop new expertise in the second group. This is a successful strategy to practice presentation techniques, and techniques of bringing forward arguments and defending them.

These three tools can only give an incomplete picture of the highly elaborate compilation of language learning support tools in Leisen's book. It is interesting to note that all support tools proposed by Leisen can be used both in CLIL and also in first language content subject teaching.

Example 2: CLIL teachers are able to use appropriate language for classroom interaction in order to manage classroom proceedings.

When students of the teaching professions have finished their training they do not know very much about discourse, about discourse strategies and about the particularities of classroom discourse. This is also true of language teaching: although future language teachers might have heard about classroom discourse, they are often limited in their understanding of the term to classroom interactions related to the «here and now» (*please, close the window! Open your books on p.25! Your homework will be...*) The competence we are aiming at in this context is more extensive: classroom proceedings do not simply relate to classroom management; in classroom interaction the teacher should also be able to influence the teaching and learning process itself: he or she should be able to guide all the interactions in such a way that learning can take place. In this

way students will also learn how to manage formal interaction in non-classroom settings, a language-oriented competence which is badly developed in L2, but also in L1 students.

This is only possible through interactional strategies which the teacher needs to use and adapt in the context of the interaction. The term teacher-controlled interaction which is used in the relevant literature is not quite correct in this context. Well-trained teachers can guide classroom interactions without impeding the students' autonomy and creative thinking. The term teacher-guided interaction seems to be more appropriate.

Here is a summary of the background knowledge a future content-subject or CLIL teacher needs to have in this field:

- She needs to have a thorough knowledge of what discourse is (including everyday and classroom discourse).
- He needs to know the strategic repertoire which characterizes everyday discourse, formal discourse and classroom discourse.
- She needs to have background knowledge of the relationship between thinking (concepts) and language.
- He needs to know models of linguistic interaction, especially those of a socio-constructivist nature which permit the joint negotiation of meaning.
- She should be able to correctly judge interactional difficulties, i.e. she needs to know what constitutes linguistic difficulty.
- He should have knowledge of rhetoric and the way people can be influenced by interactional strategies.

From a discourse point of view, the language of schooling is situated between classroom language and formal language.

It is interesting to note that these knowledge components are not at all CLIL-specific; every content teacher should be able to use the appropriate linguistic and language-related strategies in order to manage classroom proceedings.

What skills should the teacher deploy in content subject teaching practice, taking into account that classroom interaction should be language-sensitive? Here are a few examples of practical strategies which teachers can use to guide classroom interaction (Leisen, 2010: I, 103):

- Show that you are always ready to listen and to talk (signal attentiveness, make notes, repeat contributions and summarize them)
- Provide situations for interaction (collect learner contributions, let learners decide who can contribute next)
- Take up contributions (ask learners to repeat their contributions, ask other learners to comment, remind learners of other contributions and relate them to each other)
- Structure and categorize content (set up categories and ask learners to assign their contributions to them, relate categories to more abstract concepts)
- Secure results (ask learners to sum up results, relate to the initial question, link newly acquired knowledge to previous knowledge)
- Help learners when they want to contribute (support them by mimics and gestures, relate to word lists or list of structures on posters, help out by whispering words or structures).

In his book, Leisen proposes seven standard strategies which can promote integrated content and language learning in teacher-guided interaction, and which the teacher should apply in the content subject classroom (Leisen, 2010, I, 105):

- Repeat and activate previous knowledge
- Assemble features and properties and describe them
- Build hypotheses and express ideas and assumptions
- Formulate terms, rules, and laws
- Help students understand problems, aims and objectives
- Guide students to generate thinking processes
- Work out generalizations.

I believe this example has made clear that the sub-components relating to the eight professional competences of a future CLL teacher consist of definable lower-order components which should be part of the professional development modules. The example should have made clear as well that those knowledge components must be seen as basic for the teacher's methodological approach; they are strategies he is expected to transfer from his linguistic and discursive knowledge and which should, therefore, be in the focus of the training programme. This example has also shown that CLIL methodology and content subject methodology are very similar when it comes to foster classroom interaction and thus to teach in a language-sensitive mode. The knowledge and the strategies which I discussed should be part and parcel both of CLIL teacher and content subject teacher education.

Notes

¹ The ECML, the European Centre for Modern Languages is a Council of Europe Institution located in Graz.

² Belgium and Switzerland are examples of countries in which several official languages are used.

³ In English «The monolingual habit of the multilingual school».

⁴ In English «A handbook of promoting language in the content subject - language sensitive content teaching in practice».

Bibliography

Cummins, J. 1987. Bilingualism, language proficiency and metalinguistic development. In: Homel, P., Palji, M., Aaronson, D. (eds): *Childhood Bilingualism: Aspects of Linguistic, Cognitive and Social Development*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, pp. 57-73.

EURYDICE REPORT, EURYDICE European Unit. 2005. *Key Data on Teaching Languages in Europe*. Brüssel: Kommission der Europäischen Union.

Gogolin, I. 2010. *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.

Leisen, J. 2010. *Handbuch Sprachförderung im Fach - Sprachsensibler Fachunterricht in der Praxis*. Bonn: Varus Verlag.

Marsh, D., Mehisto, P., Wolff, D., Frigols Martin, M. J. 2010. *European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education: A framework for the professional development of CLIL teachers*. Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages.

Marsh, D., Langé, G. 2000. *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Language*. Jyväskylä: UniCOM.

Thürmann, E., Vollmer, H., Pieper, I. 2010. *Language(s) of Schooling - Focusing on Vulnerable Learners*. Geneva: Council of Europe.

Wolff, D. 2009. *Fremdsprachenlernen als Konstruktion: Grundlagen für eine konstruktivistische Fremdsprachendidaktik*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Author Presentation

Dr. Dieter Wolff is professor emeritus of Applied Psycholinguistics at the Bergische Universität Wuppertal (Germany). His main research interests are second language processing, language teaching and learning in school, and bilingual education (CLIL). His list of publications includes twelve books and more than 220 articles in scientific journals and similar publications. His latest book publication *Fremdsprachenlernen als Konstruktion: Grundlagen einer konstruktivistischen Fremdsprachendidaktik* was published by Peter Lang in 2002 and re-edited in 2009.