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Introduction

One of the most passionately discussed political issues in Germany in recent decades is the question of whether the country should support immigration and be an *Einwanderungsland* or a country of immigration, as defined by the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. The average German population is increasingly older, with the average age in 2015 being 45.6 years compared to 39.6 years in 2000 (DeStatis – Statistisches Bundesamt 2015). Therefore, it will be a demographic challenge to cope with the needs of senior citizens if there are not enough economically active citizens contributing to the health and pension systems. Although German politicians are reluctant to officially declare Germany as an *Einwanderungsland*, a recently published report on immigration for the year 2013 certainly does (Bundesamt für Migration and Flüchtlinge 2015). The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) ranks Germany in second position in the list of immigrant-receiving countries (OECD 2014). In 2013 16.5 million people had a *Migrationshintergrund* or immigrant background: their grandparents, parents or even themselves are immigrants, constituting 20.5% of the nation’s population (Statistisches Bundesamt 2015).

Today, as in the 1960s, Spain is the country of origin of the majority of Spanish-speaking immigrants in Germany. Given the recent economic recession in Spain, more than 44,000 Spaniards came to Germany in 2013 (Bundesamt für Migration and Flüchtlinge 2015). Therefore, in 2015 almost 156,000 Spaniards were living in Germany. In this ranking Spain is followed by Mexico with 14,204 Mexicans in Germany in 2015, Colombia with almost 14,000 Colombians and Peru with 9,179 Peruvians.

After briefly tracing the presence of non-German languages in Germany, this chapter focuses on the presence of Spanish in the country, the challenges faced for intergenerational transmission, and areas for future research. Most heritage language work in Germany focuses on Turkish, the heritage language with the most speakers in Germany, but similarities will be drawn that are applicable to Spanish as a heritage language.

Heritage languages in Germany

*Herkunftssprachen*, the German word for heritage languages, became an urgent issue in Germany in the mid-1950s due to the arrival of large numbers of *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers). These immigrants
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were needed by German industry during the postwar economy. Between 1955 and 1973, more than 2.6 million immigrants were recruited to Germany from countries such as Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Portugal and Yugoslavia on the basis of Anwerbeabkommen, bilateral treaties between Germany and economically less developed countries (Amt der Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2015). As a result, Turkish is the most spoken heritage language in Germany today with approximately 1.5 million speakers in 2014 (DeStatis – Statistisches Bundesamt 2015). Other top heritage languages are Russian, Polish, Italian, Spanish, Serbian and Romanian.

Germany and Spain signed such a bilateral treaty in 1960. Between 1960 and 1973 approximately 600,000 Spanish guest workers came to Germany, two-thirds of whom were recruited through the Anwerbeabkommen (Muñoz 2004). Upon arriving in Germany, many of these Spanish nationals intended to return to Spain, such that teaching Spanish as a heritage language was intensely supported by both Spanish and German authorities. Yet many Spanish families remained in Germany. Their children are now in the second and third generation, but, as will be seen later in this chapter, Spanish as a heritage language is no longer supported by education authorities in many German federal states.

In the 1980s, facing a growing unemployment rate, the German government intended to reduce the number of immigrants and passed a law to encourage them to return to their countries of origin (Rückkehrhilfegesetz). However, many children and grandchildren of Spanish immigrants remained in Germany because of their successful integration into German society. According to Motte and Ohliger (2010), Spanish immigrants engaged in trade unions, probably because of their liberal political views (many of them had abandoned Spain due to their opposition to Franco’s dictatorial regime); they founded strong representative organizations, like the Confederation of Parents’ Associations in Germany (“Confederación de Asociaciones Españolas de Padres de Familia en la R.F. de Alemania”); and almost 50% had a German husband or wife. Their integration into the German education system is demonstrated by the success of the second generation in school and university compared with immigrants from other countries (Woellert et al. 2009: 7) and even with German students (Muñoz 2004). Sevilla Canicio (2014) provides an overview of factors that fostered this academic success. One of them was undoubtedly the establishment of the “Confederación de Asociaciones Españolas de Padres de Familia en la R.F. de Alemania”, a key association in the promoting of SHL teaching in Germany (Muñoz 2004).

For a better understanding of the contemporary situation in Germany, I present here a brief summary of three issues: the status of regional vs. immigrant vs. “world” languages; beliefs about the best ways to promote proficiency in German among immigrant children held by educators and by immigrant parents; and the support required for heritage language education initiatives.

**Regional vs. immigrant vs. “world” languages**

In Germany, there are several regional minority (RM) languages, such as Danish (spoken in Schleswig-Holstein by the Danish minority of Southern Schleswig) and Sorbian (spoken in Upper Lusatia, Saxony and Brandenburg by the Sorbs). These can be contrasted with immigrant minority (IM) or heritage languages such as Spanish and Turkish (Extra & Yağmur 2004: 17). Although they have much in common, most notably their striving to exist alongside majority languages, RM languages are much more protected by law than IM languages. In addition, many German schools consider that heritage languages are not prestigious enough to be included in the curricula except for those that are considered “world languages” such as Italian or Spanish (Roche 2013; Schmitz & Olfert 2013). On the other hand, education authorities
in some German federal states are beginning to consider that teaching of heritage languages is worth it including in additional curricula to the foreign languages and to German as a second language, for example in Rhineland-Palatinate and Hamburg (Reich 2014).

As mentioned earlier, the most commonly spoken minority language in Germany is Turkish, yet Turkish as a foreign language is rarely taught in Germany (despite the fact that Turkey is a frequent vacation destination for Germans) and a German with a Turkish accent is socially stigmatized (Dirim 2010) However, some language projects like KOALA and FÖRMIG (see below) are beginning to promote this issue. The case of Spanish shows a clear contradiction: almost half a million people learn Spanish as a foreign language in Germany at school, university and adult education programs, but classes in Spanish as a heritage language mostly depend on private initiatives and lack materials (see Part II of this volume for the differences between heritage and foreign language students’ needs).

**Beliefs about how to promote proficiency in German**

Educators and policy makers in Germany generally exhibit reluctance towards immigrants’ native languages, assuming that they are obstacles in the way to full integration in the national language and culture (Schmitz & Olfert 2013). Although some areas of Germany such as North Rhine-Westphalia promote the learning of heritage languages as an important means of building identity, others like Bavaria omit them in their curricula in order to fund more German classes for immigrant background children. Dirim (2010) criticizes the general belief in Germany, even among teachers, that learning of the heritage language prevents children from learning German. Cummins’ plea for encouraging children to learn their heritage languages as a basis for identity development and, therefore, for school success, as well as the success of dual language programs in promoting English language achievement in the U.S. (see Lindholm Leary, this volume) has been mostly unheard in Germany (Cummins 2009). This is sometimes compounded by a lack of interest from immigrant background families themselves, who do not feel that their native language will offer any advantages at school, university or at work. Such attitudes are more common among non-prestigious language groups more than prestigious ones.

These issues are compounded by the findings of several studies since 2000 (PISA, Program for International Student Assessment, developed and carried out by the OECD) showing that children with an immigrant background obtain poorer schooling results than monolingual German children. In general, this has been mainly interpreted as a lack of command of the German language. However, many of these students in fact belong to the third generation and speak German fluently without any “foreign” accent. As noted by Duarte (2012), the problem is thus not lack of German fluency but that these students lack command of a formal academic register in German (“Bildungssprache”). Therefore, a main point in the current discussion is that formal register should be explicitly taught at school (Duarte 2012; Gogolin et al. 2011). For a review of the challenge of teaching this linguistic register, see Gogolin et al. (2013).

In summary, according to Duarte (2012), there are two positions in the debate about the importance of heritage languages in Germany:

Encouraging bilingualism in immigrant families is mistakenly interpreted as neglect of learning German (by Esser 2006 and others). Educators who believe this feel that integration is possible only through linguistic assimilation.

Command of everyday German is not sufficient for success at school; competence in “Bildungssprache” is required.
A very important finding is the positive impact of bilingualism on academic achievement (Lindholm-Leary, this volume). Thus, balanced teaching of the heritage language and German—including academic skills in both—could promote success at school for immigrant children.

Two additional issues are important: a pedagogical one and a pragmatic one. First, minority languages speakers’ identities should not be neglected. Second is the utilitarian viewpoint that knowledge of languages is an important professional qualification required by companies. For example, Settelmeyer (2010), on the basis of the ELAN study (European Commission 2006), defends that knowledge of heritage languages is an asset to the German economy. As in other industrialized countries, it is not only important to have relevant qualifications, but they should also be officially certified. Settelmeyer points out that certificates and formal requirements are very important in the German labor market, which is why competence in heritage languages should also be properly certified (Settelmeyer 2010: 74). Therefore, from this perspective, heritage languages represent an academic and professional asset for children from families with an immigrant background.

Support required for heritage language education initiatives

One main difficulty for the organization of classes in SHL is the lack of coordination with regular subjects and curricula. Children often experience these classes as a “parallel world” to regular school, without any connection. To make things worse, heritage language classes are often considered extracurricular and are thus normally held in the afternoon, whereas regular classes take place in the morning. SHL teachers in Germany are mostly employed by the Spanish authorities and are not integrated in regular schools or regular training programs. Many of them teach at several schools during the week and are not part of the staff of any of them. Whereas many German universities offer teacher training programs for Spanish as a foreign language (ELE) at school, no university offers a training program or a focus on teaching of SHL.

Despite the challenges explored in this section, I now turn to several attempts to provide education through the Spanish language to heritage speakers in Germany.

Spanish as a heritage language (SHL) in the German education system today

According to the Statistisches Bundesamt (2016), in 2015 almost 156,000 Spaniards were registered in Germany, approximately 50,000 more than in 2008, which shows the effect of the economic crisis in Spain. Most of them (more than 43,000) live in North Rhine-Westphalia. Other states with a considerable number of Spanish-origin people (between 21,000 and almost 25,000) are Baden-Württemberg, Hesse and Bavaria. These are also the “Bundesländer” where most of the Spanish-speaking people live. In 2015 more than 82,000 Spanish-speaking people from Latin America were living in Germany: more than 34,000 from the Caribbean area, Mexico and Central America, and more than 48,000 from South America (Statistisches Bundesamt 2016).

Education in Germany is not centralized; it falls under the responsibility of regional education authorities in each of the sixteen states or Bundesländer. For that reason, it is a very arduous task to determine if there is any teaching of SHL in each state (see also Reich 2014). In addition, treatment of heritage languages in the different states is subject to frequent changes. As already explained, in German schools SHL is mostly taught in complementary, extracurricular classes, with few exceptions that will be explained later on; it is not fully integrated in regular curricula. For these reasons, Table 32.1 can only be a snapshot and is not intended to be exhaustive. It provides a current overview of SHL classes in Germany.
As is obvious from Table 32.1, most of the Bundesländer (13 out of 16) do not offer classes in SHL. Consulates and parent groups are in many cases responsible for this issue, with no state institutional support. Particularly in the eastern states, there are no SHL classes at all. This may be due to the fact that Spanish-origin people did not move to eastern states, but rather to the industrialized western states like North Rhine-Westphalia.

As for SHL in higher education, no specific Spanish courses for heritage speakers could be found at German universities. Students often choose Spanish as a foreign language either as a part of a major in philology or as a complement to other subjects like economics. Many German universities provide Spanish courses between levels A1 and B2, and sometimes C1 (in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages), but no courses for Spanish as a heritage language could be found. In some universities, students in teacher training programs can specialize in teaching Turkish (like in the University Duisburg-Essen, University Hamburg or University Tübingen) or Chinese (like in the University Göttingen or University Tübingen) as a heritage language, but no such specialization for Spanish could be found.

Outside of public schooling, since 1973, financial and organizational support for teaching of SHL has been gradually decreasing from both German and Spanish authorities. Most recently, due to the economic crisis that began in Spain in 2008, the Spanish government has drawn back from funding these programs. Parent associations have to start new initiatives if they want to maintain SHL teaching for their children. Two of them are ALCE and IMPULSO. ALCE, or Agrupaciones de Lengua y Cultura Españolas (Spanish Language and Culture Associations) is supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education. ALCE organizes Spanish language and culture classes (“Aulas de Lengua y Cultura Españolas”) from three headquarters in Germany: Hamburg, Mannheim and Stuttgart. It works with its own curriculum, approved by the Spanish Ministry of Education and is based on the language levels established in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Classes are organized according to these levels. The minimum number of students for one group is fourteen. As this is a quite high number for many
small cities and towns, there is no guarantee of homogeneous student proficiency or age groups. In addition, ALCE stipulates that only children with Spanish nationality or with one Spanish national parent may attend these classes, which excludes students from Latin American countries. Moreover, ALCE has complained about a 50% reduction in contact hours of SHL funded by the Spanish government. Instead of contact hours, some online activities are provided that do not meet the learning needs of children, especially the youngest ones.7

**IMPULSO** (not an acronym) is a professional development program supported by the **Confederación de Asociaciones Españolas de Padres de Familia en la R.F. de Alemania** (translation). According to its website:

> La idea fundacional de IMPULSO se basa sencillamente en el reconocimiento de la existencia en Alemania, Bélgica, Francia y Suiza de un fuerte potencial de jóvenes biculturales y bilingües, la llamada segunda o tercera generación de emigrantes originarios de España. Éstos constituyen una fuente especial de recursos humanos, puesto que han crecido y se han formado en dichos países y, a la vez, han conservado la identidad cultural y la capacidad idiomática de origen. Y, sin embargo, sus posibilidades apenas se han explotado.

The founding idea of IMPULSO is based on the recognition of the strong potential of bilingual and bicultural young people, the second or third generation of immigrants from Spain who live in Germany, Belgium, France and Switzerland. They are valuable human resources because they have grown up and have been educated in those countries, having preserved their cultural identity and competence in their heritage language. And yet, their potential has hardly been utilized (Dirim 2010; Roche 2013). For some prestigious professional sectors like the civil service, this seems to be changing. In this field Spanish immigrants obtain better results than other immigrants from Southern Europe (Woellert & Klingholz 2014). Of the Spanish immigrants in Germany, 56% meet the requirements for university entrance and 27% have a higher education degree, significantly more than the average for immigrants.

### New approaches for heritage languages in Germany

While ALCE and IMPULSO are due to parents’ initiatives (ALCE with consulate support), this section describes larger projects that demonstrate a global idea of the benefits of multilingualism. They refer to languages other than Spanish, but they might be expanded to Spanish in the future.

**PlurCur**

PlurCur was a European project funded by the European Centre for Modern Languages, whose main aim was to “pilot and assess the concept of a plurilingual, inclusive and intercultural whole school policy comprising majority and minority, regional, heritage and neighbouring languages” (PlurCur 2013). The project began in 2013 and concluded in 2015. It involved pilot schools in several European countries (Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Italy and Lithuania). The associate partners for research were universities and other institutions in several European countries. Bearing in mind that educational contexts are very different, one key idea was expressed in the words of the PlurCur team:
Given that our classrooms are becoming more and more intercultural and plurilingual in nature, we are responsible for providing learning opportunities which use those competencies and skills which learners bring with them to their learning environment. Our concept of systematically combining all content learning with language learning and all languages will include all learners in their own right.

PlurCur 2013

This was an attempt, based on research findings on topics like multilingualism and metalinguistic awareness, to combine an integrated language curriculum that included foreign and heritage languages with Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). From this perspective, there were no more differences regarding the prestige of different languages. PlurCur schools worked with all languages already existing on the basis of equal treatment and relevance. The project addressed teachers, teacher educators, decision-makers in educational policy and researchers. On the practical side, it looked for schools that were interested in this approach and supported them in implementing such a language and content integrated curriculum. Since the PlurCur project has concluded, it will now be interesting to find out to what extent the central idea has been established in the discussion about foreign and heritage languages, so that it can prevail in the design and implementation of general curricula.

KOALA

KOALA stands for “Koordinierte Alphabetisierung im Anfangsunterricht”, or coordinated literacy teaching for beginners (Nakipoğlu-Schimang 2014). The KOALA project began in the school year 1991/92 in Frankfurt/Main at the Francke-Schule. One of the main problems was the lack of language competence of Turkish students and the necessity that they achieve better results during the four years of elementary school. This was the main goal of the KOALA project.

KOALA is a literacy program in German and the students’ heritage language. Unfortunately, KOALA has only been implemented in schools with German-Turkish and German-Portuguese so far, although its rationale is valid for any other heritage language in combination with German. Children learn reading and writing in German and, a short time later, in their heritage language. A contrastive progression of letters and sounds is implemented in order to make students aware of the differences between languages and to avoid interferences. A very common pedagogic approach is project work and team teaching, with mixed teams of German and, for example, Turkish teachers. One of the challenges of this project is the requirement that German teachers have a basic knowledge of the heritage language and culture involved. Teachers of the heritage language should have a very good command of German. Team teaching and coordination of teaching materials and methods are essential. Not only students, but also teachers engage in an intense learning process.

In the long run, the KOALA project intends to encourage language proficiency of bilingual children, but also their self-esteem in both languages and cultures.

Förmig

FÖRMIG stands for “Förderung von Kindern und Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund”, or encouragement of children and teenagers with an immigrant background. In existence from 2004 and 2009, it has been very thought-provoking in the field of German as a second language.
and in the educational discussion about how to improve the school results of immigrant chil-
dren and teenagers. It has not been possible to transfer the project to a federal level with the
implication of all German “Länder”, but, nevertheless, the “FÖRMIG-Kompetenzzentrum”
(FÖRMIG center of competence) in Hamburg will go on supporting institutions that wish to
implement some of the results of the project. A comprehensive report on the project is provided
by Gogolin et al. (2011). A brief outline, including key information about aims, structure and
implementation will be given here.

As mentioned earlier, “Bildungssprache”, or academic discourse, is seen as one of the
keys for success of immigrant students. As opposite to everyday language, it is the regis-
ter that students have to use at school if they want to achieve good results (Duarte 2012).
Many immigrant children do not have good academic and writing skills (“Bildungssprache”)
in their heritage language. They often fail in transferring academic discourse from their
heritage language into German. Besides, bilingual children feel insecure in both languages
when it comes to demonstrating competence in academic contexts. The FÖRMIG project
attempts to encourage students to be aware of their languages across the curriculum, in all
subjects. It promotes a general language education (“eine durchgängige Sprachbildung”),
assuming that language skills can be best developed if they are stimulated in various but
coherent ways, that is if such stimuli focus on achievement of goals that are complementary
and not divergent (Gogolin et al. 2011: 52). In this way, FÖRMIG tries to break the tradi-
tion of monolingual schools.

The FÖRMIG project promotes a local implementation, because educational contexts can-
not be generalized. The project supports regional language education networks (“regionales
Sprachbildungsnetzwerk”) that involves a basic unit (“Basiseinheit”), including regional edu-
cational institutions, and strategic partners (“Strategische Partner”) in charge of support and
transfer tasks. One basic unit and its strategic partners make up a language education network
(Gogolin et al. 2011: 19).

The future of heritage language in Germany with a focus on Spanish

The idea of a “common underlying proficiency” (Cummins 2009: 20), the capacity of transfer-
ing abilities between the first and second languages, is beginning to be considered, but it is not
the mainstream yet in the discussion about language learning in Germany. Cummins assures:

> although the surface aspects of different languages (e.g. pronunciation, fluency,
> orthography, etc.) are clearly separate, there is an underlying cognitive/academic pro-
> ficiency that is common across languages. This “common underlying proficiency”
> makes possible the transfer of cognitive/academic or literacy-related skills across
> languages.

*Cummins, 2009: 25*

As already mentioned, a very popular frequent argument against bilingual education in
Germany is based on the poor results achieved by immigrant children. Cummins (2013)
strongly claims against this assertion. He refers to empirical evidence in support of the idea that
different languages at home and at school are not responsible for academic underachievement
and suggests that unequal social relations between the host country language and the heritage
language are the main source of failure at school. In his opinion, this dimension has not been
sufficiently considered:
Socioeconomic factors are viewed in almost a fatalistic way as beyond the influence of teachers or instruction. Because socioeconomic characteristics are not subject to a “quick fix”, the policy emphasis has been on linguistic variables that are perceived as easier to manipulate despite the absence of empirical evidence for the independent influence of these factors.

Cummins 2013: 29; italics in the original

That is the reason why Cummins proposes a specific pedagogical framework to promote academic development of immigrant children (for a detailed explanation of his proposal with a classroom example, see Cummins 2013: 33–38).

More specific research in the field of heritage language acquisition with focus on SHL in Germany is needed. Not many studies have been conducted so far, but it is worth mentioning the FUSED project (“Forschungsbezogene Unterstützung des spanischen Ergänzungsunterricht in Deutschland”, Research Support for Spanish Heritage Teaching in Germany), carried out at the University of Hamburg between 2007 and 2010. The main aim of this project was to identify and describe phonological, lexical and orthographic difficulties of bilingual children (German-Spanish) with the purpose of designing specific teaching materials for SHL classes. Lleó et al. (2013) show clearly this transfer function of the project, from language acquisition to design of teaching materials.

Fortunately, some teachers and researchers are conscious of the advantages and challenges of having heritage language speakers in the foreign language classrooms at school. This is the reason why this topic is beginning to be thoroughly explored at conferences and meetings, like the panel “Diversity in the Language Classroom” at the annual conference of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Fremdsprachenforschung (German Society for the Teaching of Foreign Languages), held in 2015 in Ludwigsburg and the conference “Mehrsprachen”, with a specific focus on diversity of minority speakers in foreign language classrooms, held in 2016 in Munich. As a result of these research efforts, a monographic volume of the journal “Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung” (Brehmer and Mehlhorn 2015) on heritage languages has recently been published.

The focus of this chapter lies clearly on issues concerning heritage speakers from Spain, mainly because Spain was the country of origin of a great number of “guest workers” or “emigrantes” and this was the beginning of SHL in Germany. Heritage speakers from Latin America are also represented in bilingual schools and, of course, they also attend classes in institutions like the Instituto Cervantes. Unfortunately, they cannot benefit from the ALCE program.

As far as multilingualism and support for heritage languages in Germany is concerned, there is still a long way to go, but promising projects are coming up. Interestingly, most of them are being developed in Hamburg, Berlin or Hesse, but not in Baden-Württemberg or in Bavaria. These two economically prosperous states have opted for a stronger support of German teaching to the detriment of heritage language teaching, mainly driven by political ideology.

According to Reich (2014), teaching heritage languages can contribute to political and social cohesion of European people, to multilingual competence as described by the Council of Europe and to lifelong learning of European citizens. The Council of Europe includes heritage languages in its language policy of multilingualism (Council of Europe 2016). Research in Germany does not support the thesis that heritage language teaching has a negative effect on the learning of German by immigrant children. A positive effect cannot be automatically achieved but requires an understanding for a global language education that integrates foreign and heritage languages in school curricula (Reich 2014). An important implication would be that teaching of heritage languages would follow the same quality standards as foreign language teaching.
That would mean an equal treatment for all languages and would, thus, help overcome some of the negative beliefs about heritage languages.

With respect to Spanish, it will be a challenge to overcome the contradiction between Spanish as a heritage language (SHL) and Spanish as a foreign language (ELE), that means the decreasing funding and institutional support of SHL classes versus the significantly increasing offer of classes in ELE. In the case of SHL, parents have to strive in many federal states to provide their children with SHL teaching in order to benefit from their potential. ELE courses have been steadily increasing over the last fifteen years. Numbers of teacher training programs with a focus on ELE are also increasing. It would be necessary to establish teacher-training programs that allow a specialization on SHL teaching. In the same way, universities could offer special courses for Spanish heritage speakers to train their language skills, but also their specific academic and professional qualifications so that they can make the most of their bilingualism.

Notes

1 I would like to thank my colleague Andrew Williams for his careful review of a first draft of this chapter.
2 In this chapter, key German concepts are maintained in the original to facilitate word search in relevant documents.
5 These treaties were abruptly cancelled in 1973 due to the economic world crisis, yet by then, 70% of Spanish workers had already returned to Spain (Muñoz 2004) in a movement termed remigración.
6 Dirim (2010) notes that Esler does not disapprove of all bilingual schools, only those that foster learning of heritage languages, which effectively limits bilingual education to elite groups of society.
7 ALCE, Boletín Julio 2016 www.confederacion.de/español/comités/comité-de-escuelas/ [15.1.2017].

Further reading


This volume provides an overview of multilingualism in European urban settings, with some examples of good practice. It is the final report of the Multilingual Cities Project and focuses on the global database of the project as well as on local perspectives of cities in several European countries.


This final report of the FÖRMIG program reaches from the conceptualization of key issues regarding immigrants in Germany to educational opportunities and a focus on characteristics and explicit teaching of “Bildungsprache”, German academic discourse.


A very useful compilation of papers that shed light on the “new” migration from Spain to Germany without losing sight of the “old” migration.
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