Plurilingual and intercultural education in curricula for primary education

Seminar

Strasbourg, 22 and 23 November 2012

Report by Francis Goullier

Language Policy Unit
DG II – Education Department
Council of Europe
www.coe.int/lang

Contents

The seminar held on 22 and 23 November 2012 was devoted to the implementation of plurilingual and intercultural education in primary education (ISCED 1)[1]. It concluded a series of three events of the same type which marked an important stage in the Language Policy Unit's ongoing work on the *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education* (hereafter referred to as the "*Guide*"), the first version of which was distributed at the intergovernmental forum in Geneva in November 2010. The other two seminars took place in November 2011 and May 2012.

The organisation and conduct of the seminar were entrusted to a co-ordinating team very much like the one responsible for organising the first two: Ms Johanna Panthier, project co-ordinator, Language Policy Unit, Ms Philia Thalgott (LPU), Mr Jean-Claude Beacco, Ms Mirjam Egli Cuenat, Mr Francis Goullier, Mr Ingo Thonhauser and Ms Marisa Cavalli, who, as consultant for certain projects of the *European Centre for Modern Languages* in Graz (ECML), also acted as a link with this other Council of Europe body.

A. Some points relating to the organisation of the seminar

The choice to focus attention during this seminar on plurilingual and intercultural education in curricula for primary education was made, on the one hand, because of the obvious strategic importance of this level of education for educating and training learners, and on the other, because of the significantly different balance which generally prevails there between questions related to the language of schooling and those related to the teaching of foreign languages[2].

It will be recalled that the seminar held in November 2011 was concerned with the convergences between languages in secondary education in general and that the one held in May 2012 was devoted to languages in short courses of vocational training.

As in the other two cases, participation by the member states depended on an expression of interest in response to an invitation sent to them in the first half of 2012. Each positive response received resulted in the sending of a questionnaire designed not only to help participants to take stock of how the main aspects of plurilingual and intercultural education have been implemented at primary level in their particular context, but also to guide the co-ordinating team, who were able to use the very full replies received as a basis for identifying priority themes and drawing up the programme of the seminar.

15 member states asked to participate, and 17 representatives from 13 of them were actually present, whereas only 10 countries had been expected to participate. These figures, compared with those for the other two seminars (16 participants from 9 member states in November 2011 and 21 participants from 13 member states in May 2012), show that the member states' interest in the implementation of plurilingual and intercultural education has remained very stable: in all, the seminars brought together 21 different states and regions, some of which participated in two or even all three of these events. The high response rate from the European network of curriculum institutes or ministerial departments in charge of curriculum development, set up by the LPU in November 2010, indicates that the specific topic chosen for the last seminar figures prominently in current European thinking on languages and education.

Although the participants' post-seminar assessments may have been positively influenced by the convivial atmosphere which prevailed over the two days, they testify to the satisfaction given by the seminar. The table below shows the marks given on a scale of 1 to 5 (very satisfactory) under each heading:

[1] International classification adopted by UNESCO in1997, revised in 2011 (http://www.uis.unesco.org): International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). Level 1 (ISCED 1) : Primary education.

[2] As in the *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*, the term "foreign language" denotes any modern language of which pupils have no significant experience in the home or in their immediate environment.

	Number of 3s	Number of 4s	Number of 5s	Average
General organisation	0	4	12	4.75
Compliance with the declared aims	1	8	9	4.44
Overall usefulness of the seminar	2	7	8	4.35

The relatively large number of participants and the diversity of their sociolinguistic and educational backgrounds had a very positive impact on the content of the discussions. Similarly, the variety of positions held by the participants in the different education systems was an interesting element in that it provided the opportunity to compare different viewpoints on the topics addressed. The respondents to the questionnaire on the local situation may be broken down into the following categories:

Curriculum managers for primary education	5
Curriculum managers for modern languages	7
Curriculum managers for languages of schooling	5
Managers of specific national projects	5

Clearly, however, given that a considerable number of the participants hold positions having no particular connection with primary education, the content of the seminar may have seemed a little remote from their professional concerns.

The influence of these different parameters on the participants' post-seminar evaluations is reflected in the table below, which compares the participants' assessments of the three successive seminars:

	November 2011	May 2012	November 2012
Relevance of the seminar to your institution's needs	4.23	4.2	4.41
Relevance of the seminar to your current occupation or your duties	4.62	4.6	4.28
Real possibility for exchanges between participants	3.85	4.53	4.29

The replies confirm the relevance of the theme of primary education; the theme of the seminar obtains the highest satisfaction rating. At the same time, however, they confirm the discrepancy perceived by some respondents in relation to their personal needs in the discharge of their responsibilities; only 9 of the 16 forms completed give the rating "very satisfactory" for this criterion. Lastly, the average of 4.29 for the last criterion, which is much higher than the score achieved by the first of the three seminars, rewards the efforts made to give each of the states represented some speaking time to enable it to describe, often, unfortunately, very briefly and all too incompletely, its own experience of one or another of the topics addressed during the seminar. It is even possible to give a very positive assessment of the continuing dissatisfaction, reflected, for example, in 3 very mediocre scores (3). The seminar achieved one of its aims by stimulating demand for the exchange and pooling of experience on these topics among the participants, even if the limited duration of the seminar did not allow all expectations to be met.

This finding is, moreover, amply confirmed by the comments provided by the participants themselves.Questioned about the chief benefit derived from the seminar, they gave, among others, the following replies:

- Opportunity to discuss with experts from other countries on issues related to the implementation of plurilingual and intercultural policies, as well as to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of such policies and to learn about "good practices";

- Exchange with colleagues on primary education and on intercultural education ;
- Learning about different viewpoints and specific linguistic situations and realising that, whatever the problems encountered, there is a shared awareness and a shared will to bring plurilingual and intercultural education to life in schools ;
- Exchanges of experience which are somewhat off-centre in relation to our own approaches and strategies and which expand and enrich our thinking and allow us to glimpse other possible ways of tackling and managing the complexities of the problems specific to particular contexts;
- The exchanges and discussions;
- As usual the CoE seminar was very well organised. I particularly enjoyed having an insight into how other countries think and act on plurilingualism and intercultural education. This was indeed a stimulating intercultural experience.

The structure of the seminar was actually based on a combination between presentations describing in detail schemes or initiatives of particular relevance to the theme of the seminar (19% of the total discussion time), explanations of certain features of the *Guide* and of the Council of Europe's instruments (24%), round tables at which the representatives of certain member states made specific contributions on a number of issues (14%) and group work (43%).

One of the limiting factors of the seminar was the wide variety of sociolinguistic situations represented by the participants. The question of managing linguistic and cultural diversity is important to a large number of them, either because of the presence of minority languages or because of the size of the immigrant population. In fact, the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages is mentioned several times in the replies to the initial questionnaire. In some other countries, however, this is a minor problem.

Furthermore, the responses to this question differ widely. Some countries essentially offer the pupils concerned the opportunity to learn the language of their minority as a subject, or else give them the opportunity to use it as a language of schooling.

In 10 of the 13 countries represented, however, provision is only made for learning one language of schooling, bearing in mind – as mentioned above – that this language may be a minority language; in the latter case, learning of the dominant language is compulsory. Only two of the countries represented (Andorra and Luxembourg) have more than one language used simultaneously or successively as languages of schooling.

This diversity is a source of enrichment if we bear in mind the specific circumstances of certain local responses to major challenges.

B. Aims of the seminar

This seminar, like the two which preceded it, had the following main aims: to conduct an initial assessment of the implementation of the different components of plurilingual and intercultural education in the member states, encourage participating countries to pool experience drawn from their specific contexts and test the *Guide* in relation to that experience and the member states' expectations.

An additional aim was to incorporate the following elements in an explicit and coherent way into the body of the *Guide*:

- the results of the consideration given since November 2010, at the prompting of the Language Policy Unit, to ways of taking fuller account of the specific potential and difficulties of immigrant children and the diversity of pupils' language repertoires, and of questions relating to the role of the language of schooling in the search for fairness and quality in education;
- tools developed or under development in the context of projects carried out by the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz (such as the *PluriMobil* and *EPLC* projects mentioned below).

The topics addressed more specifically over the two days were therefore determined on the one hand by the characteristics of primary education and on the other by the main lines of thought pursued in connection with plurilingual and intercultural education.

The *Guide* should indeed be perceived as a stage in the process of reflection initiated in connection with the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR). As well as establishing the requirement for transparency and comparability of individual modern language skills, the CEFR introduced into the language teaching and learning debate the question of recognition of plurilingual and intercultural competence, summed up in the term "plurilingual repertoire", which cannot be reduced to the mere juxtaposition of knowledge and skills in different languages learnt or known and which, potentially, brings out the full importance of transversal competences. The discussions on the latter topic were amplified by the publication of the *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies* in 2007. This document considered the implications of recognising the individual repertoire as something much wider than just the languages learnt in the school system. In particular, it brought out the need to aim for horizontal and longitudinal coherence in the language teaching given to a learner. The change of perspective towards a learner-centred approach, already evident in the CEFR, thus takes on its full significance. As a result, we no longer look only at foreign languages but also, in complementary fashion, at the languages spoken other than those taught at school and at the importance of a command of the language(s) of schooling for the success of all and the quality of the education dispensed. The prospects opened up by this gradual widening of the perspective are reflected in the *Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education* on the Language Policy Unit's website[3].

At the same time, a specific view of the curriculum has come to the fore and is taken fully on board in the *Guide*. According to this view, the curriculum should not be confined to the course content specified in official documents, but should cover all the learning experiences and encounters with languages which go to make up the individual learning path.

Against the background sketched out above, the *Guide* seeks to set out and illustrate in as practical a way as possible the implications of plurilingual and intercultural education for the components and stakeholders of the curriculum. Three challenges need to be addressed: how is the learning/teaching of all languages to be integrated with the development of communicative competence and awareness of how language works? How can teachers be helped to factor the linguistic dimension of all subjects into their teaching practices? How can the attention focused on the acquisition of language skills be reconciled with the specific goals of the school context, particularly as regards (inter)cultural discovery and learning?

For these reasons, of all the themes suggested by the *Guide*, four were chosen for this particular seminar:

- vertical and longitudinal coherence in language teaching;
- the language dimension of knowledge acquisition at primary school ;
- intercultural education;
- recognition of the wealth of individual language repertoires in teaching.

The pages that follow provide an account of the presentations given during the seminar, the discussions held on the different themes and the information contained in the replies submitted by the states represented prior to the seminar.

C. Convergences between taught languages

With the exception of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, where pupils have to learn three languages of schooling, which, for many of them, are in fact foreign languages, and where language awareness activities are provided in addition to those classes, all the countries present offer teaching of one compulsory foreign language from primary school onwards.

It is interesting, therefore, to investigate the existing or possible links between the teaching of that language and teaching of the language of schooling.

[3] http://www.coe/int/lang/en

From the plurilingual and intercultural education perspective outlined above, classes related to the different languages and cultures should be conceived as part of the same curriculum, pursuing common goals and ensuring coherence in terms of materials used, approaches adopted, times and places of learning, content taught, assessments and the role played by the different teachers. Furthermore, such coherence, both horizontal (between languages for each year of classes) and longitudinal (in the learning sequence of the same language over the pupil's school career), is a guarantee of curricular economy.

Such a curriculum should also set goals devised with an eye to complementarity: competence profiles in the different languages stressing the role of each of those languages and possibly allowing for partial competences; specification of goals by discourse genre, thus encouraging moments of reflexivity conducive to transfers from one language to another and fostering the development of transversal competences.

As we have already stressed, one important component of a comprehensive curriculum consists of learning experiences, which can be a very strong vehicle for coherence. At primary school (ISCED 1), these experiences include learning to read and write, thinking about language, decoding and using semiotic resources other than languages, awareness of literary writings and personal expression, self- and peer assessment, and experience of an overall language and intercultural education.

1. The role of teachers

The implementation of such a curriculum obviously presupposes, at least, co-ordination and, as far as possible, synergy and co-operation between foreign language teachers and those in charge of teaching the language of schooling. That could be fairly easy if the teaching was done by only one teacher.

However, the reality in the member states represented at the seminar differs somewhat from the tradition in primary education whereby one teacher was in charge of a group of pupils. The single class teacher exists only in a minority of the states represented. In the majority of cases, there are several teachers, one of whom is responsible for teaching foreign languages. The level of competence in the foreign language plays a major role in many situations, even if the requirements are stated in overall terms and are not differentiated according to the type of language activity, which might, however, reflect recognition of the importance of a command of the spoken language for teaching young children. One of the states represented (Armenia) reported an initiative which could have positive implications for the topic under consideration here: there is a specific course for training "plurilingual teachers" capable of teaching two foreign languages. In this connection, the participants regretted that, in most contexts, any plurilingual competences which teachers might possess are not identified and – cause or consequence – are not put to use.

Leaving aside certain officially plurilingual contexts where, as in Andorra, the sharing of teaching time between two teachers makes such co-operation necessary, the arrangements most conducive to co-operation between teachers are the promotion of interdisciplinary projects and the grouping together of subjects by subject field. But the answers to the pre-seminar questionnaire seem to indicate that the existence of such co-operation depends on individual practices (micro level of the curriculum) or school policy (meso level). The subjects of this co-operation are, moreover, very disparate and apply, at best, to only 20% of the participating countries: agreement on shared teaching methods; joint plurilingual projects; setting of co-ordinated goals between modern languages and languages of schooling; production of shared materials; adoption of shared assessment principles ; planning of shared skill progressions; view of all teaching of and in languages as a whole serving the development of the plurilingual repertoire and intercultural competences; encouragement of education in linguistic and cultural diversity through the adoption of joint approaches.

The situation described above makes it all the more necessary to provide teachers with pre- and/or in-service training to develop expertise in the "functioning" of the plurilingual person and what can realistically be expected in terms of skill acquisition, to render them capable of activating transfers from one language to another, from one competence to another or from one subject to another, and to give them better control over the proper use of the diverse language competences present in the group, including when switching between languages. Training should therefore influence teachers' perceptions of their role and the links between the different subjects, and prepare all of them, whatever the subject field, for collaborative activities.

This demand for quality brings out an obvious need. The *Guide* identifies different levels of operation in the implementation of curricula: supra (international), macro (national or regional), meso (the school), micro (teachers' practices) and, lastly, nano (the learner him- or herself). It is essential to involve universities and teacher training institutes in key bodies for the implementation of curricula. Most have a status which gives them a certain degree of autonomy. It is therefore necessary to find ways of ensuring consistency with other decision-making bodies and bridging the institutional gap which is sometimes found between bodies responsible for syllabus design and teacher training. This need for consistency also applies to the authors of teaching materials (textbooks etc.). To achieve this aim, it seems desirable to place the integrated curriculum within, and not alongside, the national curriculum.

It should also be borne in mind that this goal of convergence is not always supported by teachers, who sometimes are attached above all to the subject they teach. The challenge is to convince them of the value of such an approach while avoiding giving the impression of increasing their workload. It is no doubt useful also to counter the misconception that the search for convergence calls for very extensive linguistic competences on the part of teachers. The desire to make use of convergences is usually found more among language teachers than among their colleagues, perhaps precisely because of this unfamiliarity with languages.

However, resources exist and should be disseminated or, in some cases, added to in order to provide teachers with information and pointers enabling them to take account, in the search for convergences, of the different languages learnt or known by their pupils. Periods of training might in fact be the ideal time for producing such materials.

2. Examples of implementation

Despite the difficulties listed above, the great majority of participants reported that the teaching of the different languages involves at least some joint thinking. The search for convergences can be highly developed, as shown by some examples presented during the seminar, or more limited.

French-speaking Switzerland:

Although not a model that could be transferred to other contexts, the example of the curriculum for French-speaking Switzerland developed by the Intercantonal Conference of Public Education of French-speaking Switzerland and Ticino (CIIP) illustrates how far the search for convergence and coherence between different subjects can go in a learning programme. In its January 2003 declaration on language teaching in French-speaking Switzerland, the CIIP outlined the following programme: "Language teaching/learning must be set within the context of an integrated curriculum common to all languages (local language, foreign languages and classical languages). This *integrated language curriculum* will define the place and role of each of them in relation to the general linguistic and cultural objectives. It will specify the respective contributions of, and interactions between, the different language learning activities". For the realisation of these intentions, the curriculum distinguishes three components of the overall learning goal: general education, transversal abilities and subject fields, including languages (the aim here being a command of French and the development of communicative competence in two foreign languages, German and English).

The "language" field is supposed to contribute to the development of a plurilingual language repertoire viewed as a whole in which all linguistic competences have a place (in L1, L2 and L3, but also in other languages, including, in particular, the languages of origin of bi- or trilingual pupils). In this connection, attention should also be drawn to the importance attached in this curriculum to "inter-linguistic approaches", reflected in the setting of, among others, the following goals for French, German and English teaching: "enrich understanding and use [of the language] by establishing links with different languages" and "identify how the language is organised and how it works by observing and handling other languages…". For this purpose, transfers of knowledge and competences between L1 and L2 or L3 are explicitly recommended.

A further aim of the "language" field is to offer pupils, particularly through the discovery of literature in French or other languages, the opportunity to build common cultural references concerning the countries and regions whose language they are learning, language in general, the written word (literature, writing systems

etc.) and, especially in the case of French, the history of the language and its place in the present-day multilingual world.

A number of other states promote convergences between the language of schooling and learnt foreign languages, though without putting them on the same formal footing. This common approach may, as in Georgia, be reflected in analysis of discursive dimensions and in learning strategies. In another of these countries (Romania), stress is placed on the "unitary and transversal view of language education" which prompted, among other things, a common approach and goals conceived in terms of complementarity. Lastly, the discourse genres used in the different subjects have been set out in explicit terms in Andorra in order to facilitate co-operation between Catalan and French teachers, who share the timetable between them.

This complementarity of goals is still quite rare, however; in most cases, goals are set for each language separately. There is no automatic correlation between the premises underlying a common approach and how goals are set for each language.

As regards the content of the respective courses and the recommended teaching methods, there is, however, greater recognition of the value of seeking and utilising the convergences between languages, even if moves in this direction are still very tentative. Among these we find in particular, in descending order of frequency: the learning of strategies in language learning; the transfer of knowledge, skills, competences and strategies from one language to another; an opening up to other languages and cultures during the teaching of a language, with opportunities for comparison between languages; a balance between communicative and (inter)cultural competences; consideration of the linguistic variability inherent in every language; the use of plurilingual materials; the development of competences transversal to all languages; mediation activities and moments of plurilingual communication during classes.

3. Assessment

Questions relating to assessment of pupils' language competences can also be addressed from the perspective opened up by an awareness of the usefulness of the convergences between languages. Some significant changes are noticeable in methods of formative assessment, self-assessment and certificative assessment, which are tending to become more closely aligned in many contexts and are sometimes even identical. In most of the countries represented, common criteria are used for assessment. This approach is sometimes fully subscribed to, as in the case of Lithuania, for example. This country's representative states in the reply to the questionnaire that assessment is built into the primary curriculum according to the same key principles. This has obvious advantages, from which the pupils derive maximum benefit. In Lithuania, these principles are set out in the guidelines of the curriculum and are guaranteed by the Ministry of Education, schools being responsible for implementing the most appropriate procedures.

Assessment practices obviously differ widely according to countries' educational cultures: in one country, for example, there are no marks or certificative assessments before the 8th grade, whereas marking and tests feature very prominently in very many others.

Nevertheless, self-assessment appears to be an increasingly widespread educational practice, in the case of both languages of schooling and foreign languages. It is sometimes explicitly recommended by the ministry concerned; it may be present in teaching materials; it may involve experiments by pupils with the production of materials in the languages concerned (newspapers, multimedia products) or the use of portfolios, although it may sometimes be noted that the *European Language Portfolio* is not widely used.

Lastly we should note the reference to a specific form of assessment via subject-specific or cross-subject projects carried out by pupils.

D. Coherence between and in language courses

Most of the countries present at the seminar say that horizontal coherence between all language courses is indeed an aim, although some admit that this is not a simple matter and that this aim is only partially achieved. One of the difficulties sometimes mentioned is the identity-building role played by the language of

schooling in the image given to/goals set for the learning of that language, which limits the possibility of viewing it in terms of convergence with the learning of other languages.

When such coherence is sought, the aims pursued are clearly defined. They are listed once again in descending order of the frequency with which they are mentioned in the replies to the questionnaire: improving all language learning; metalinguistic awareness and language learning ability; according value to all the languages present; opening up to diversity and plurality; developing personal expression in several languages; intercultural competences; using the languages present as a resource; decoding semiotic resources other than languages; plurilingual literacy training.

Likewise, vertical coherence in the learning of school languages seems only to pose problems in a fairly small number of countries. Any difficulties mentioned are related to the discontinuity in the ways languages are used between primary and lower secondary school, the difficulty of providing effective support for immigrant children, the excessive breadth of the curriculum or a lack of reliable and useful information about pupils' abilities and needs when they move up to ESCED 2. As one participant pointed out, however, this overall satisfaction is based essentially on the goals set out in the curriculum and not always on solid observed facts.

The measures cited as promoting real vertical coherence in the progression observed in languages of schooling are:

- the existence of a national strategic plan giving a central position to the question of command of languages of schooling, the setting up of a national co-ordinating body or emphasis in the curriculum on the importance of such continuity;
- development in the curriculum of a general approach to the learning of the language of schooling;
- availability to teaching teams of examples of good practice;
- organisation of the curriculum around "curricular areas" (such as "language and communication");
- the existence of a final assessment at the end of ISCED 1;
- organisation of ISCED 1 and ISCED 2 as a single, basic level of education.

As regards longitudinal coherence in the learning of foreign languages, the picture presented by most of the participating states was, once again, positive on the whole. The reasons are not the same as those given in connection with languages of schooling:

- reference to the levels of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages,*
- the adoption of a portfolio-type approach,
- the existence of methodological guides,
- the value of close co-operation between the boards responsible for curriculum development for the different levels,
- the goals set, which focus less on functional skills than on the intercultural dimension or the development of attitudes and the promotion of values,
- lastly, use of the same teachers in ISCED 1 and ISCED 2.

A few words on this last point: what seems effective for horizontal coherence in languages of schooling (single teacher) seems ineffective for vertical coherence in foreign languages, for which the merits of using specialist teachers (operating at different levels) are advanced.
A special mention should be made here of the strategy adopted in Georgia, where the standards for primary and secondary education are defined in such a way that it is possible to take account, not of the pupils' grades, but of their actual level of competence, in determining the progression to be followed in a particular class.

E Language dimensions of knowledge acquisition at primary school

Exploration of the scope of plurilingual and intercultural education has expanded the range of the Language Policy Unit's investigations to include consideration of the language dimensions of knowledge acquisition in subjects other than the teaching of languages as subjects in their own right.

A distinction needs to be drawn here between the use of languages of schooling as vehicles for learning subjects and the use of foreign languages in connection with the content of different subjects.

1. The language of schooling as a vehicle of learning

A command of the language of communication as it is most commonly used for everyday communication in and outside the school is an obvious requirement if all children are to become integrated in society and school life and if they are to be able to participate in lessons given in that language. The challenge posed by this requirement is met in widely varying ways depending on the context and pupils' specific needs, with special arrangements usually being made for children from an immigrant background. A majority of the countries represented also referred to the existence of special measures for pupils speaking regional or minority languages and, more generally, children with learning difficulties.

Only a minority of the participating states said that the problems of children speaking a minority or regional language or an immigrant language are not dealt with separately but are addressed in the same way as those of children in difficulty, with a diagnosis of the difficulties encountered, the involvement in some cases of a team of specialists and, in one case, transfer of the responsibility to schools.

This last point is interesting to note here because it ties in with findings which stress that focusing on the difficulties encountered by children who do not speak the language of schooling in the home should not cause us to lose sight of the fact that the problems posed by the language dimensions of knowledge acquisition are not confined to immigrant children. Indeed, the challenge posed by the use of language in the different subjects from primary level onwards is a much wider issue than that of the ability to use that language for the purposes of everyday communication. Taking up this challenge is one way of promoting fairness and quality in teaching and education generally.

What this means for pupils is acquiring forms of discourse which are sometimes only remotely connected with the uses of language with which they are familiar. Language is the medium through which all subject contents (maths, geography, English, French etc.) are acquired. Of course, most acquisitions of subject content are not language-related, but developing them, handling them and talking about them call for verbalisation. It is important, therefore, to draw all the implications from an analysis of the verbal forms involved in this process. Analysis shows that, for many pupils, mastery of these verbal forms represents a "discursive leap". What this means is helping them to move from discourse centred on themselves, their immediate experience or their close environment to forms of discourse more suited to the cognitive operations employed in or required by the study of different subject contents. Accompanied sometimes by other forms of transition to the abstract (diagrams, sketches, models etc.) and by experimentation, the reflexive activity expected of pupils in these learning processes should lead them to shift from narrative to reporting. The components of this particular discourse genre, which is prioritised at primary level, are related to the cognitive processes activated in processing or expounding knowledge, such as calculating, classifying, comparing, describing/representing, deducing etc. Ordinary discourse genres, such as conversation, admittedly have a place in teaching, but mainly as a means of access to the new discourse genres which need to be acquired and which are outside children's usual experience. Explicit, conscious recognition of the distance between these discourse genres is one of the preconditions for fighting inequality in access to knowledge and combating underachievement.

Even if awareness of the importance of this approach to promoting quality in education is relatively recent and still applies only to some education systems, some advances may nevertheless be noted.

An initial round table held during the seminar heard accounts from six countries (Andorra, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Georgia and Sweden). The, necessarily very short, contributions showed, with reference to several educational contexts, that the curriculum includes a recommendation to take account of the language dimension in subject teaching. This taking into account covers mainly the following aspects: discourse functions; linguistic elements (grammar, syntax, phonetics); the discourse genres present in different subjects; types of sequence within texts; and the vocabulary specific to each subject. These few advances should not, however, obscure the general need to make significant progress in this direction. Despite its importance, the role played by mastery of the language dimensions in subjects remains merely implicit in many other contexts.

2. An example of implementation: the maths syllabus in Luxembourg

It is, indeed, still all too rare for the discursive requirements in the different subjects, which represent a kind of "hidden curriculum", to be set out explicitly, this being the precondition if teachers are to take account of them in a reasoned and structured manner, and not simply deal with certain difficulties that may occasionally arise. Luxembourg's particular sociolinguistic situation poses the question under consideration here in specific terms. This is because all subjects are taught in a language which, for many pupils, is a foreign language. It is all the more necessary for all those involved to take account of the linguistic difficulties.
Therefore, it would be particularly useful to see how the problem of language dimensions is addressed in syllabuses, with reference to the example of maths.

Every syllabus is designed in such a way as to facilitate differentiation of learning that takes account of pupils' widely differing linguistic backgrounds; the challenge of establishing links between the language dimension of subjects and the development of knowledge and competences in the different subjects is approached from several complementary angles.

Teaching of the different branches or subjects is sub-divided into four areas of competence and the progressions to be followed between stages of the common core are set out explicitly in the context of these areas of competence. In the "maths" branch, for example, the competences identified include: familiarity with numbers, ability to perform arithmetical operations; recognition and use of arithmetical structures and rules, and ability to represent and communicate numbers and operations correctly. For each of these competences, ten levels of progression are specified. This strictly parallel structure obviously facilitates links in the development of these competences, particularly from the standpoint of language competences.

The language competences which need to be developed in subject teaching can be classified as follows: grasping information (functional perspective, use of other language codes); processing information (understanding through structuring, analysis and synthesis…); memorising information (building knowledge through the combined activation of visual, auditory and motor memory…).

Upon reading the descriptions of competence levels in maths for stages 1 to 3 of basic education, we see that the role played by verbalisation of cognitive operations and related written or oral expression is mentioned explicitly several times. Two examples taken at random in competence level 3 for stage 2 of the common core serve to illustrate this statement:

- "familiarity with numbers": "pupils can read and write numbers 0 to 100, compare them and place them in order".
- "analyse the wording of an arithmetical problem and plan an approach to solving it": "Pupils can pick out the relevant information in the wording of a very simple arithmetical problem, even if verbal rephrasing is sometimes necessary".

For each of these descriptors, teachers are provided with examples of instructions in the language used, pupils' productions and forms of words which pupils should be capable of producing. Great importance is attached in these syllabuses and the accompanying documents to the language activities required for classroom interaction, oral presentations in front of the group or writing down the steps in a process. The purpose of this emphasis on moments of verbalisation is, in addition to developing language competences, to give a sense of worth to all children who are called upon to present their findings to their classmates. This verbalisation is also an opportunity for teachers to encourage their pupils to reflect jointly on the learning processes in progress, which fosters the development of metacognitive abilities.

3. Access to knowledge through foreign languages

Except in contexts similar to that described above or in bilingual education, it seems difficult, at primary level, to draw a parallel, as regards the way in which the language dimensions of knowledge acquisition are taken into account, between cases where the language of schooling is used or those where recourse is had to a foreign language.

The most widespread practices for teaching foreign languages at primary level are based on continuity of the ordinary interactions mastered by pupils in their usual language of communication. Exercises on speech acts (complaining, proposing etc.) are by far the most common. Gradual mastery of cognitive operations (comparing, describing etc.) is usually introduced much later. Furthermore, the utterances learnt and used at this level are often used in isolation, and not as part of texts, i.e. forms of words belonging to discourse genres and reflecting the discursive continuum required for communication appropriate to the subject content. Lastly, competence levels A1/A2 constitute an essential but, in many respects, restrictive framework. It is clear that the prevailing methodologies for teaching foreign languages at this level do not meet the conditions for use of those languages to acquire knowledge and proficiency in other subjects.

It is not surprising, therefore, that only a very small number of countries give specific thought to the link between the teaching of foreign languages and the teaching of subjects other than languages. Thinking appears to focus essentially on the situation of pupils taught in a minority language, as emerged from the accounts given by participants at a second round table held during the seminar.

Where this is the case, however, there are some points in common with approaches to the link between subject teaching and the language of schooling, such as the acknowledged importance of sequence types in texts and discourse genres. But there are mainly some very significant differences in relation to the foregoing. The question of the specific lexicon is the foremost concern, although it comes last where the language of schooling is concerned. The reverse is true when it comes to consideration of discourse functions, which do not seem to play an important part in the learning of foreign language, even in CLIL/EMILE.

However, this does not detract from the value of this Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL/EMILE), although it concerns only a very small minority of primary schools. The presentation given during the seminar on the results of the "*Enseignement précoce des langues modernes par des contenus*" project (EPLC, www.ecml.at), carried out by the ECML in 2008-2011, illustrates the contribution made by this approach. The idea here is not to investigate the language conditions of knowledge acquisition but to try and motivate pupils to learn a foreign language and give it meaning by using it as a means of access to subject-based knowledge. By centring modern language classes around subject content tailored to the age of the pupils and the class syllabus (science, history, geography, civics, music, arts, literature, sport, maths etc.), the aim is to arouse their interest, to encourage them to use the foreign language as a means of communication from the early years of learning onwards and thus to improve their competences in the foreign language by building knowledge in other fields.

At this level of education, discursive competence can only be introduced in a foreign language very gradually and, initially, with heavy reliance on the language of schooling. It is perfectly conceivable to think in terms of a discursive continuum adapted to the language development of children: formulation in the language of schooling, suggestions by the teacher as to the lexicon and structures in the foreign language, assimilation of the structures and lexicon by learners, use of the structure and lexicon to form definitional utterances, transition from experiential narrative to description and explanation, and transition – guided by the teacher – from brief verbal utterances to simple subject-specific discourse which is, however, more structured in writing.

Such an approach also fosters the development in pupils of a linguistic awareness thanks to comparisons with the mother tongue and other languages and leads them to discover similarities and differences between the culture of origin and the culture encountered through these activities. Lastly, thanks to the gradual stages described in this project for treating the topics dealt with, there is undeniably a real possibility of implementing cognitive operations, even if they are limited in language terms. For there to be a cognitive benefit, however, certain conditions would need to be met, and these warrant consideration.

Investigations into subject teaching in foreign languages should also incorporate another dimension. The contribution made by bilingual education can also be viewed from another perspective already very present in the approach suggested in the ECML materials referred to above: the intercultural dimension in the treatment of topics. Placing topics in a wider context helps to raise pupils' awareness of the differences and similarities between cultures both in the country and outside it.

Lastly, we should note, as did the representative of Armenia during the discussions, the usefulness of bilingual education schemes to research on methods of knowledge acquisition, such as, for example, the role played in cognitive processes by the use of other modes of representation complementary to verbalisation.

F. Intercultural education at primary level

Although intercultural education could be one of the central learning goals at primary level, accounts by participants, particularly in their replies to the questionnaire, indicate that little explicit provision is made for it in curricula. It is true that that the concept of intercultural education warrants further explanation and that misgivings may arise as to its use with children of this age[4].

The purpose of intercultural education is to develop open, proactive, reflexive and critical attitudes among pupils when they first come into contact with any form of otherness. The idea is to enable them to relax any ego/ethnocentric attitudes and to develop in them a benevolent curiosity about cultural diversity. The main thing is not knowledge, which, as we shall see, is essential, but learners' attitudes and reactions.

The implementation of intercultural education is consistent with the developments outlined at the beginning of this report, leading to a focus on the learner as a social being. The approach to teaching therefore involves introducing activities in the classroom whose function is to:

- construct encounters with otherness which are as many opportunities for discovery and inputs of knowledge and information;
- stimulate responses to those discoveries, which means that pupils are called upon to verbalise them;
- enable learners, on that basis, to move on from spontaneous responses to controlled, thought-out responses, with the aim of lending greater complexity to representations and hence influencing attitudes.

To be effective among children of the age group concerned, this approach to teaching and education needs to start from experiences of otherness in their own social, cultural and linguistic space and move towards an analysis of experiences of a more external or more "foreign" kind of otherness.

The activities implemented in this context represent opportunities for socio-affective experiences and demand knowledge and competences. It is therefore proposed that these activities be organised around three interdependent strands:

- access to new societal knowledge;
- development of social competences;
- greater complexity of attitudes.

A parallel may in fact be drawn with scientific discovery activities pursuing both cognitive and discursive aims. The purpose of the "social awareness activities" offered as part of intercultural education is to provide inputs of necessary knowledge, develop non-naïve interpretative competences and stimulate discourses in response to these experiences which will be the raw material for educational work on the attitudes which these verbalisations express.

This can be the basis for a dialogue between the pupils and the teacher as moderator, mediator and educator, acting as custodian of the founding social values which it is the school's responsibility to pass on. This dialogue may be seen as an exemplary form of linguistic benevolence (as opposed to verbal violence), which is a prerequisite for democratic co-existence.

1. The Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters

This dialogue can, for example, be started and conducted with the help of the *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters*, a tool developed by the Language Policy Unit[5]. This document is designed to give effect to the

[4] Reference may usefully be made to the paper delivered by Professor Jean-Claude Beacco at the seminar on *Intercultural education at primary school*, on which the following paragraphs are largely based.
[5] http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/autobiography/default_EN.asp?

recommendations of the Council of Europe's White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue "Living Together as Equals in Dignity" (www.coe.int/dialogue), in particular those of section 5.3 " Learning and teaching intercultural competences": "Complementary tools should be developed to encourage students to exercise independent critical faculties including to reflect critically on their own responses and attitudes to experiences of other cultures".
There are two versions of the document, one for young learners up to the age of 11, including those still unable to read or write. These can be downloaded and used free of charge. They are available in both of the Council of Europe's official languages, French and English. Translations officially approved by the relevant authorities in the member states can be put on line on the Language Policy Unit's website, as is already the case for the Italian and Russian versions.

The *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters* is designed to encourage children to take some time to think about their experience of different cultural backgrounds (meetings with people from other countries, people from different regions in the same country or people speaking a different language from them). The intercultural experience which children choose to talk about may be relatively deep insofar as it has led them to an awareness of cultural difference.

This document offers a structure for reporting that experience, describing one's reactions and reflecting on it. The wording of the questions may of course be modified and adapted provided this does not affect the internal dynamics of the Autobiography, i.e. the order of the headings and the questions asked. What matters above all in the Autobiography is the sequence of the section headings and the main questions in each section, more than the exact wording of the questions.

It may be used in a variety of ways, ranging from one-on-one interviews to group discussions in which the whole class participates, and including discussions in groups of two about the questions asked. If children experience difficulties in putting their feelings into words, they may be given additional materials (such as drawings, crayons or puppets) to help them express their feelings or those of the other persons involved in the encounter.

This document should very soon be supplemented by a second volume devoted to pupils' experience of encounters through visual media.

2. The role played by mobility

While the *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters* is concerned primarily with intercultural encounters in children's immediate environment, mobility, whether virtual or real, and whatever its duration and context, represents another unique opportunity for intercultural learning. As well as contributing to the development of plurilingual competence, it promotes awareness of the importance of diversity and leads pupils, in a great many cases, to acquire experience of mediating between cultures. All forms of mobility contribute to the experiential dimension of the curriculum, whose importance is heavily emphasised in the *Guide*. Yet mobility is only included in the curriculum in about half of the participating states, with cross-border mobility playing a major role in these cases.

A project forming part of the work programme of the *European Centre for Modern Languages* (ECML) in Graz was presented during the seminar. Its aim is to make mobility an integral part of teacher training[6]. The logic behind this "PluriMobil" project may be summarised as follows: conceived from this perspective, experience of mobility in teacher training facilitates their future work with their pupils in this area; for this purpose, their possible future activities with the pupils for whom they are responsible must be built into the mobility project from the outset. In this project,

- different scenarios are compiled which foresee how future teachers might go about preparing for a period of mobility and how they might manage it and make use of it on their return;
- materials are produced to support the mobility of future teachers and that of primary and secondary pupils;

[6]PluriMobil project, led by Mirjam Egli Cuenat (http://plurimobil.ecml.at/). This project was started under the ECML's previous work programme (2010-2011) and is continuing under the current work programme (2012-2014).

- various Council of Europe tools are integrated coherently into this approach (*European Language Portfolio, Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters*, etc.).

This project encourages trainee teachers to think about the scenarios they might themselves put into practice in their future teaching work.

One of the examples presented as an illustration of this process is an experiment in virtual mobility at primary level based on the "Culture in a box" approach developed by the British Council between pupils of a Franco-Polish bilingual school (age 7-8) and French pupils (age 10-11), in which the learners send and receive from their correspondents boxes containing objects on selected themes (e.g. self-portraits or class timetables). This long-distance exchange is accompanied by discussions, documented in a portfolio, encouraging a focus on discovery of others and thus contributing to pupils' intercultural education. The plurilingual dimension is given particular emphasis through a compilation of terms used (interactive glossary), covering not only French and Polish but also the different languages of origin of the allophone children in these classes.

3. The narrative approach

Lastly, a third approach to intercultural education was described which touches on the actual goals of primary education. The narrative approach based on literary texts is known to play an extremely important role in children's language development, whether in their mother tongue, the language of schooling or foreign languages. It promotes both the development of meaning-seeking strategies, by mobilising the child's knowledge about the characteristics of the narrative, and encounters with cultural components. It thus helps to build capacity for personal expression. It gives pupils an understanding of the discursive structure of the narrative, a factor facilitating learning in general. It helps to develop and enhance pupil literacy.

The use of narrative texts in foreign language teaching is highly recommended. They are an authentic language source giving access to areas of the culture concerned. Their use creates a very useful link with classwork on literary texts in the language of schooling and thus provides an opportunity for intercultural learning by encouraging verbalisation in comparison and reflection activities. It also makes an effective contribution to the development of proficiency in the foreign language, if only by observing the principle that understanding precedes production and by making it possible to avoid focusing unduly on micro-elements of the target language (morphology, syntactic structures, lexicon etc.).

G. Recognition of the wealth of individual language repertoires in teaching

This part of the seminar echoes another event organised by the Language Policy Unit, on 7 and 8 March 2012, entitled "Meeting the challenge of multilingual classrooms: exploiting plurilingual repertoires, managing transitions and developing proficiency in the language(s) of schooling", the report of which is available on the Language Policy Unit's website[7].

The shared finding reached by the participants in the seminar confirms that linguistic diversity in the classroom is perceived mainly, if not exclusively, as an obstacle to scholastic success or as a factor making for difficulties. Indeed, the same perception is found to a great extent in the replies to the questionnaire, from which it emerges that development of pupils' plurilingual repertoires is a policy choice made in only very few of the participating states, although a concern to give pupils a greater sense of worth by recognising their linguistic identities is more common.

Rather negative attitudes of this kind can no doubt be put in perspective to some extent through consideration of research findings on bi-/plurilingualism and how bi-/plurilingual people function and increased awareness of the persistent prejudice against *some* bilingual or plurilingual repertoires.

The "*Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education*" provides a good illustration of how the multilingualism of a very large number of schools can be perceived as being a

[7] http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Source2012_Conf/SemMarch12_report_EN.pdf

resource for education and learning, by enabling pupils to harness their knowledge and competences in different languages in order to acquire knowledge in the language of schooling, for example.

Of course, teachers face real difficulties in implementing such an approach. What are they to do, for example, when the language spoken by the class are many and varied? What attitudes should they adopt in the classroom when faced with these complex situations? Research conducted by Ms Nathalie Auger, a lecturer in language science at Paul Valéry University (Montpellier 3 in France), on verbal interactions in multilingual classes was presented at the seminar as food for collective thought[8], although, as some participants pointed out in the group sessions, the practices described cannot be transferred lock, stock and barrel in all contexts.

In the activities described, the idea is to take the pupils' prior knowledge as a basis and to draw comparisons between their languages and the target language in order to aim for better acquisition of the language of schooling. These comparisons between languages are based, for example, on phonetics and grammar.

All participants were struck by the extremely positive effects of such an approach on teacher-pupil relations: in these co-construction and co-learning activities, everyone in turn takes on the role of expert or learner, including the teacher. By leading the pupils to engage in co-operative comparison activities, this approach obviously develops metalinguistic and metacognitive competences. Furthermore, these co-operative activities foster the development of respect for diversity, which is one of the components of intercultural education.

The adoption of such approaches calls above all for work to be done on the attitudes of the teachers, who, in general, are afraid of being unable to cope with the situation because of their lack of proficiency in the languages spoken by the pupils. Yet experience shows that this can turn out to be a pedagogical advantage. Furthermore, there are tools which provide teachers with practical information about the different languages and enable them to perform contrastive activities between them.

One example of resources available for language teaching at primary school was provided by the presentation on the work of the Austrian Centre for Language Proficiency (Őesterreichisches Sprachenkompetenzzentrum), and in particular the teaching materials for multilingual classes produced by way of a complement to the version of the *European Language Portfolio* approved for primary education. This *Kiesel* project[9] compiles resources for use with children aged 8-12. It offers teaching aids, games, comparisons between languages and recordings that can be used to discover the diversity of languages in the world. A further document provides teachers with information on 38 different languages.

Certain other successful language awareness schemes also open up promising avenues for managing the variety of languages present in the classroom in a way that benefits learning for all pupils. We will look at three which were mentioned during the seminar or in the replies to the questionnaire.

The aims of the *Eole* project (language education and awareness at school) in the cantons of French-speaking Switzerland are, on the one hand, to enable pupils to enrich their understanding and use of French by establishing links with different languages, and on the other, to help them to identify how the language is organised and how it functions by observing and handling other languages.

The Luxembourg curriculum for stages 1 to 4 includes specific content, together with competences to be developed, and approaches for promoting "openness to languages", whose "main aim is to develop in pupils a metalinguistic awareness and a receptiveness to other languages and cultures and to enhance the value of their knowledge and competences in different languages, including those which are not teaching languages".

In Andorra, fact-sheets are made available to teachers to enable them to learn key words in several languages and search for information in the languages present at school.

---

[8] *Comparons nos langues. Démarche d'apprentissage du français auprès d'enfants nouvellement arrivés* (2005), DVD (26 mins) and teaching guide produced by Editions CNDP, collection Ressources Formation (www/crdp-montpellier.fr et www.cndp.fr).

[9] *Kinder entdecken Sprachen* (www.oesez.at).

Another way of recognising the reality of pupils' plurilingual repertoires was discussed during the seminar in connection with an example presented by the Romanian representative. Schools attended by children who have experience of linguistic plurality in their usual environment and whose identity is marked by membership of a dual language community, particularly in border areas, can offer them extra teaching in a language of their individual repertoire other than the language of schooling. This placing of real value on the plurilingual repertoire can be interpreted as a significant step towards the putting in place of plural learning.

Lastly, the approach to managing the diversity of languages present at school is also reflected in the following question: where pupils have a language other than the language of schooling as their usual medium of communication and the learning of that language of schooling might appear to represent a cognitive overload, should they be dispensed from learning a foreign language? This is the option chosen in four of the participating states. In the light of the group discussions held during the seminar, it is clear that such teaching could only represent an overload for these children in terms of lesson time and is by no means a cognitive overload, provided, of course, the methods are differentiated, appropriate strategies are employed, conditions are created for pupils to activate knowledge transfers and the goals pursued are set in terms of partial competences.

H. Taking account of the different curriculum levels

The importance of teaching materials has been mentioned several times over the preceding pages. It is clear from the discussions held during the seminar and from the replies to the questionnaire that the implementation of plurilingual and intercultural education necessarily involves the availability of teaching materials illustrating the possible approaches according to a typology of situations and the goals pursued. The key to implementing many of the main thrusts of the discussions lies in the pedagogical approach and in the methodology, whether for intercultural education, recognition of the wealth of individual repertoires or support for the development of pupils' discursive competences.

As emerged very clearly from the previous two seminars, methods of curriculum management vary widely from one participating state to another. In some cases, schools enjoy a very wide degree of independence, subject to compliance with a national framework. In a number of countries, schools can vary the arrangements for teaching languages either in terms of the starting age or weekly lesson time, including the possibility of sometimes introducing a second foreign language from primary school onwards.

Admittedly, as several participants pointed out, new teaching programmes which are much more ambitious in terms of pluralistic approaches and new educational standards, e.g. in Andorra, Bulgaria and the Czech Republic, place certain constraints on practices. But it is equally obvious that it is necessary, in curriculum management, to supplement recommendations or regulations adopted at national or regional level (macro level) with measures that help to ensure consistency with other levels of operation.

One approach consists in promptings from the macro level to schools and teachers. The most frequently mentioned forms are encouragement to use the *European Language Portfolio* or a portfolio-type approach (including the development of an electronic ELP in the Czech Republic), the work of a *National Centre for Intercultural Education* (in Norway), proposed training in the FREPA (in Finland) and promotion of the *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters* (Flemish Community of Belgium).

Several other states mention initiatives which are as many potential levers for change as regards the management of new language curricula in primary school: discussion forum for teachers, language games and competitions for pupils, pedagogical guides accompanying teaching methods etc. Mention was made of an original initiative in Luxembourg: the appointment of "resource teachers" to provide impetus for their colleagues. Lastly, as in Andorra, change is encouraged through school policies which set up experiments in the light of the existing teaching teams.

In order to achieve the desired degree of effectiveness, the *Guide for the development and implementation of plurilingual and intercultural education,* which endeavours to take account of the different curriculum levels,

will no doubt have to be further expanded to include practical examples of implementation at micro or nano level.

Appendix: Programme

Thursday 22 November 2012

08.30 – 09.00	*Registration*
9.00 – 10.00	**Opening** The aims of the seminar relating to the Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education and the other tools of the Language Policy Unit **Johanna Panthier**, Council of Europe **Presentation of the participants** Plurilingual and intercultural education: challenges and definitions **Ingo Thonhauser** Summary of the responses to the questionnaire: **Francis Goullier**, General Rapporteur
Chair: Mirjam Egli	***BLOCK A: LANGUAGE OF SCHOOLING AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES – ARE THERE CONVERGENCES, IS THERE CONTINUITY?***
10.00 – 10.15	Introduction: Coherence across the curriculum - **Mirjam Egli**
10.15 – 11.00	**Examples of implementation:** *Convergences in the School Curriculum for Western Switzerland ("Le plan d'études Romand – PER")* **- Ingo Thonhauser** *The Austrian project « Fremdsprachenlernen in der Grundschule » [foreign language learning in primary education] (Österreichisches Sprachenkompetenzzentrum)* - **Ulrike Haslinger**
11.00 – 11.30	*Coffee break*
11.30 – 13.00	***Group work*** What are the consequences of promoting convergence of the language of schooling and foreign languages for the content and objectives of teacher training?
13.00 – 14.30	*Lunch-buffet (offered)*
14.30 – 15.00	Feedback from the working groups
Chair : Ingo Thonhauser	***BLOCK B : LANGUAGES AND OTHER SUBJECT AREAS***
15.00 – 15.15	Introduction: the language dimension in the acquisition of knowledge – **Jean-Claude Beacco**
15.15 – 15.45	Example of implementation: the programme of study of mathematics in Luxembourg - **Robi Brachmond**

15.45 – 16.30	Round Table 1 [chair: Ingo Thonhauser] To what extent is the language dimension being taken into account in knowledge building in the language of schooling? What is the current state of affairs? Participants: Andorra, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Georgia, Sweden
16.30 – 17.00	Coffee break
17.00 – 17.15	Examples of implementation of CLIL-type approaches in primary education (including an ECML project) - **Marisa Cavalli**
17.15 – 18.00	Round Table 2 [chair: Marisa Cavalli] To what extent can the learning of several languages contribute to knowledge building in school subjects, particularly in the context of bilingual education? Participants : Armenia, Croatia, Norway, Romania, Lithuania

Friday 23 November

Chair : Marisa Cavalli	**BLOCK C: PLURILINGUAL REPERTOIRES AS RESOURCES**
09.00 – 09.30	The didactic exploitation of learners' plurilingual resources in knowledge building Introduction to group work
09.30 – 11.30 (Coffee break from 10.30)	Group work Should learners for whom the learning of the language of schooling appears to be a cognitive overload – in particular those with a different language of origin - be exempted from learning other languages?
11.30 – 12.00	Feedback from the working groups
12.00 – 13.30	Lunch
Chair : Jean-Claude Beacco	**BLOCK D: INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION**
13.30 – 13.45	**Introduction**: Intercultural education – what is specific to primary education? - **Jean-Claude Beacco**
13.45 – 14.45	**Three approaches:** • *Autobiography of intercultural encounters* - Christopher Reynolds • *'Plurimobil' Project (ECML): supporting mobility for sustainable intercultural learning* - Mirjam Egli • *The narrative approach: working with literary texts* - Ingo Thonhauser
14.45 – 15.00	**Discussion**
	Close
15.00 – 15.30	Highlights of the seminar – **Francis Goullier** Conclusion – **Johanna Panthier**