



MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„Strategies for multilingual cooperative writing in the
German as a second language classroom“

verfasst von / submitted by

Mag. Julia Mayer

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, September 2019 /
Vienna, September 2019

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

A 066 814

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Deutsch als
Fremd- und Zweitsprache

Betreut von /
Supervisor:

Mag. Dr. Magdalena Knappik

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due to my supervisor Mag. Dr. Magdalena Knappik for her continuous guidance, her insightful comments and valuable suggestions throughout my whole research process.

Also, I would like to express my gratitude to my students and especially those who participated in my writing project. It is you, who made this research possible by inspiring me each and every day.

And finally, I owe my deepest gratitude to my family and my best friends. Thank you for constantly believing in me and supporting me in any of my plans and visions.

Eidesstaatliche Erklärung

Ich erkläre eidesstattlich, dass ich die vorliegende wissenschaftliche Arbeit selbstständig angefertigt, keine anderen als die angegebenen Hilfsmittel benutzt und alle aus ungedruckten Quellen, gedruckter Literatur oder aus dem Internet im Wortlaut oder im wesentlichen Inhalt übernommenen Formulierungen und Konzepte gemäß den Richtlinien wissenschaftlicher Arbeiten zitiert und mit genauer Quellenangabe kenntlich gemacht habe. Die wissenschaftliche Arbeit ist noch keiner anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt worden. Diese Arbeit wurde in gedruckter und elektronischer Form abgegeben. Ich bestätige, dass der Inhalt der digitalen Version vollständig mit dem der gedruckten Version übereinstimmt.

Wien, September 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1 DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	5
1.1 MOTHER TONGUE VS. FIRST LANGUAGE.....	5
1.2 MONOLINGUALS VS. BILINGUALS.....	6
1.3 FIRST, SECOND AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION	6
1.4 MULTILINGUALISM	8
1.4.1 Multilingual proficiency.....	9
1.4.2 Plurilingualism	10
1.4.3 Multilingualism and culture	10
1.5 A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON MULTILINGUALISM	11
1.5.1 Multilingualism and conquest.....	12
1.5.2 The power of literacy	14
1.6 VARIOUS VIEWS ON MULTILINGUALISM	16
1.6.1 A growing popularity of multilingualism.....	16
1.6.2 Retrospective vs. prospective multilingualism.....	16
1.7 LANGUAGE PRESTIGE.....	17
1.7.1 Subtractive vs. additive multilingualism.....	18
1.7.2 Diglossia at school.....	19
1.7.3 Reconsidering language prestige	20
1.8 MULTILINGUALISM IN EDUCATION	21
1.8.1 Taking on a holistic view.....	22
1.8.2 Multicompetence: advantages of multilingualism.....	23
1.9 MULTILINGUALISM IN AUSTRIA	25
1.9.1 Current trends.....	25
1.9.2 Current trends in Austria	26
1.9.3 A response to linguistic diversity	28
1.9.4 Sprachstartgruppen/Remedial language courses	29
2 MULTILINGUAL TEACHING STRATEGIES	32
2.1 TRANSLANGUAGING AND MULTILINGUAL AWARENESS	32
2.2 FOCUS ON MULTILINGUALISM.....	34
2.3 USING FIRST LANGUAGES.....	35
2.3.1 Scaffolding	35
2.3.2 First languages as scaffolds	35
2.4 ENGLISH AS THE LINGUA FRANCA.....	37

2.5 TRAINING THE MULTILINGUAL AND METALINGUISTIC AWARENESS	39
2.6 TRANSLATION.....	40
2.7 MULTILINGUAL WRITING IN PEER GROUPS	42
2.7.1 <i>Writing as a skill</i>	42
2.7.2 <i>Writing in peer groups</i>	43
2.8 BEING A TEACHER IN A MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOM.....	44
3. METHODS: A MULTILINGUAL COOPERATIVE WRITING PROJECT	46
3.1 RESEARCH CONTEXT	46
3.2 LESSON PLAN	48
3.3 METHOD OF ANALYSIS	52
3.3.1 <i>Interactional Analysis</i>	52
3.3.2 <i>The different stages of an interactional analysis</i>	54
3.3 POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITATIONS.....	57
3.4 RESEARCH ETHICS.....	60
4 RESULTS.....	62
4.1 THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS.....	62
4.2 DATA PREPARATION.....	63
4.3 INTERACTIONAL ANALYSIS.....	66
4.3.1 <i>Detailed lesson description</i>	66
4.3.2 <i>The classification of interaction units</i>	71
4.3.3 <i>An analysis: Instances of English as a lingua franca</i>	72
4.3.4 <i>An analysis: Instances of L1</i>	79
4.4 AN INTERPRETIVE SUMMARY	87
5 CONCLUSION	91
5.1 DISCUSSION	91
5.2 SUMMARY	92
6. GERMAN SUMMARY.....	95
7 REFERENCES	98
8. APPENDIX	103
8.1 ENGLISH ABSTRACT	103
8.2 SEQUENCE TRANSCRIPT	103
8.3 TEXT OUTLINE	113
8.4 FINAL TEXT PRODUCTION	114

Introduction

Multilingualism is a constant in today's international and mobile society. When walking through the streets of Vienna, it comes as no surprise that people speak various languages. Especially in recent years, a lot of people have immigrated to Austria and, as a result, our classrooms have become more diverse and multifaceted. Some children have been born in Vienna and speak several languages at home since their parents have grown up in other countries, others were born in another country and have just started to learn German, and even others speak German as their first language. This linguistic diversity represents a major challenge for teachers but it should first and foremost be regarded as an opportunity and enrichment.

Nonetheless, speaking a different first language than German poses a problem to a considerable number of Austrian AHS (short for Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule) students, where close to 30 per cent of all students spoke a different first language than German in the school year 2017/18 (Garnitschnig 2019: 5). As a consequence, the ministry of education introduced remedial German lessons for students who have just started to learn this language. Those classes consist of students with various different first languages and educational backgrounds. The question that now arises is how this existing multilingualism can be used as a resource in modern German as a second language classrooms and how multilingual children can be supported in their language learning processes. Every language teacher's goal should be to support young language trainees in their language learning process by facilitating a positive learning experience for those multilingual learners, who can then make use and benefit from their linguistic potential. A starting point is obviously a positive attitude towards multilingualism and linguistic diversity, which can, consequently, raise students' awareness with regards to their multiple advantages of speaking several languages.

Even though young people are continuously encouraged to learn various languages and are even required to arrive at a certain level of proficiency in foreign languages,

a monolingual habitus is often still prevalent in German lessons and Austrian schools in general (Volgger 2014/15: 42). Instead of regarding multilingualism as a resource, teachers often view the use of various languages in the German as a second language classroom as a threat to students' language learning process (Li Wei 2011: 371). For several years, however, linguists have argued that multilingual students have significant advantages over their monolingual colleagues, since they can refer to their multilingual skills, given that a positive learning environment is created (Cenoz 2013: 10). As research has shown, the acquisition of new languages evolves differently with students who can draw from their existing knowledge of grammar and vocabulary and can, moreover, make use of different learning strategies, which they have developed while acquiring their first language(s) (De Angelis 2007: 3). Multilingual students are, hence, constantly influenced by their existing language competence and establish links between languages by transferring their knowledge from one context to another (Volgger 2014/15: 45).

Instead of focusing on their weaknesses, multilingual learners should be encouraged to make use of their multilingual competence in language learning contexts (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 127). However, they can only benefit from their linguistic competence if their multilingual awareness is, first of all, raised and they, consequently, develop a certain multicompetence (Jessner 2006: 42). This multilingual awareness can be reached by comparing languages and applying 'translanguaging' techniques that create links between languages. Another strategy that can be applied in a multilingual context is translation or code-switching, which happens regularly among multilingual speakers (Malakoff & Hakuta 1991: 142). It is important to understand that the translation of words from one language to another does not show weakness but instead improves students' metalinguistic awareness as well as language competence in general. Thereby students' personal view on their language competence and their first language skills is changed for the better and multilingual language learners are encouraged to appreciate their linguistic potential (Cummins 2008: 65ff.).

To put it in a nutshell, discourse suggests that the acceptance of students' first languages leads to a more positive attitude towards multilingualism. What, however,

happens if a teacher does not speak all of his/her students' first languages or if a student cannot speak his/her first language to any other course participant? Today's globalized and interdependent world encourages students to learn as many languages as possible in order to be able to communicate on a global level. There is one language that is by far learnt most often by foreign language students: English. In fact, English is spoken by 1.75 billion people worldwide and there has never been a language that has been more globally spread than English nowadays (British Council 2013: 2). Nevertheless, previous work has failed to address this global language as a valid resource and efficient form of scaffolding in the German as a second language classroom, even though it could continuously facilitate language comparisons, translations and the in-class communication in general.

Hence, this paper proposes a new approach to the German as a second language classroom and a new attitude towards the use of English as a working language and the use of first languages. The following Master's thesis claims that not only the inclusion of language learners' first languages but primarily also the use of English as a working language facilitates communication and language learning progress in the German as a second language classroom. In this paper I try to find out whether students' existing linguistic knowledge can be integrated in a multilingual writing process, in which students' multilingual competence is promoted by their discussions in peer groups.

The project was conceived during my time working at an Austrian AHS, where I have been teaching foreign languages and German as a second language for the last three years. As a German as a second language teacher, I witnessed that most of my German student were proficient speakers of English, who needed to arrive at a higher level of German in a very short amount of time. As a consequence, they all appreciated the use of English as a working language in my remedial classes in order to facilitate their understanding of complex grammatical structures, and at the same time to support and scaffold their learning progress. The research data in this thesis is drawn from a writing project that was carried out in one of my remedial German classes. In my research project, I tried to create a learning environment that facilitates a multilingual writing process and utilizes students' existing multilingual

language competence to support them in their learning process. For this purpose, a group of six German as a second language students engaged in a multilingual cooperative writing process and was instructed to write a 120-words comment on an ÖSD (Österreichisches Sprachendiplom) writing prompt. In short, the students were encouraged to work as a team and use any language at their disposal while phrasing appropriate sentences.

The research project tries to investigate the use of English as a lingua franca as well as students' first languages during a cooperative multilingual writing process in a German as a second language class. The major objective of this case study is to present a possible way of how multilingualism can be included in a simple peer writing task and to examine the significance of the use of the lingua franca English as well as various students' first languages during a cooperative writing task. The key research question of this paper asks if German as a second language learners' multicompetence is used in a cooperative multilingual writing process by the inclusion of English as a lingua franca as well as other languages. The study that was carried out at a Viennese grammar school has been analyzed based on Krummheuer's interactional analysis, focusing on the thematical development of a conversation between two or more people, which is created by the reference to other people's speech utterances as well as actions (Deurer 2018: 104f.). Hence, it served as a suitable tool of analysis, as the paper tries to investigate the inclusion of English and other languages in a peer group's multilingual writing process.

This paper is divided into five sections. The first section provides definitions of various terms relating to multilingualism and the second section reviews the main approaches on multilingual language learning strategies. In the third part, the method is presented and an analysis follows in the fourth section. A discussion as well as a conclusion is presented in the last part of the paper.

1 Definition of terms

The research project that will be presented in a subsequent chapter of this paper involves students with various different linguistic backgrounds. In this context, several terms referring to students' linguistic competence will be used to describe the language learners' linguistic competence, which will, therefore, be defined appropriately in the following chapter. It, firstly, refers to the terms first, second, third and foreign language acquisition and, secondly, tries to define multilingualism and its advantages in an educational context. Finally, the advantages of writing in a peer group are elaborated and the concept of multilingual writing is presented.

1.1 Mother tongue vs. first language

The first part of this chapter tries to differentiate between the two terms 'mother tongue' and 'first language'. Since the research project focuses on students' first language use in a multilingual setting, a clear definition of the latter term is indispensable.

When talking about multilingualism and describing students' language biographies, the definition of a speakers' first language as 'mother tongue' can be viewed as critical. In former times, people used to define students' first language as the latter, as mothers were in most cases involved in their children's the language learning process (Pokorn 2005: 2). However, since also other "carers", such as fathers, nannies or siblings are nowadays involved in children's language learning processes, the first language a child acquires is more accurately defined as 'first language' (Pokorn 2005: 2; Crystal 1994: 398). Without a doubt, also relatives or other people that surround the child on a regular basis contribute to the child's language competence from an early stage onwards. These people may speak different languages and, therefore, the term 'first language' cannot always be interpreted without bias either, due to the fact that it may imply a ranking of importance amongst the languages a person speaks. This thesis henceforth defines the term 'first language' as the language that is acquired first in the process of language learning, which is often referred to as "dominant language" or "home language" in other contexts and is referred to as L1 in the following chapters (Pokorn 2005: 2).

1.2 Monolinguals vs. bilinguals

When describing children's language learning process, it soon becomes apparent that in a growing number of cases the term 'first language' often does not suffice. Hence, the two distinctive forms of language acquisition will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Nowadays, young language learners are often surrounded with more than one language and, as a consequence, a clear difference can, for instance, be perceived between a student who speaks English as a first and German as a second language, and one who grew up speaking both languages since birth.

A child's language acquisition process is constantly stimulated by his or her speaking environment, but it also refers back to an innate language learning ability, referred to as Language Acquisition Device, short LAD, introduced by Chomsky (Tracy 2014: 21). Even though a human's language competence develops similarly, regardless of what language they are learning, two different forms of first language acquisition processes are to be distinguished, as children can be brought up monolingually or bilingually (Tracy 2014: 21).

Nowadays, bilingual or even trilingual children are the rule rather than the exception. While, monolingual learners encounter and speak one language only, bilingual speakers are confronted with one or two languages at home and, consequently, also encounter a second language that is spoken in their social surrounding and that often differs from the official language (Tracy 2014: 22; Rösch 2011: 159). Hence, the biggest difference between mono- and bilingual language learners is that the former speak one language from birth and the latter are surrounded with two or sometimes even more languages (Rösch 2011: 159).

1.3 First, second and foreign language acquisition

The research project was carried out in a German as a second language classroom. In order to be able to distinguish between DaF (German as a foreign language) and DaZ (German as a second language), the two terms as well as the primary definition of a first language acquisition process are presented in the following chapter.

Whenever a child starts attending an educational institution such as kindergarten, the language learning process of this new language is referred to as 'early second language acquisition'. It is similar to the first language acquisition in that speakers are surrounded by the language on a daily basis and are taught by authentic speakers (Tracy 2014: 23). If a child is involved in the acquisition process of a second language, the very language is not spoken at home. Any language learning process that involves two languages learned consecutively is, hence, referred to as second language acquisition, as opposed to bilingual language learning (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 124). In this context, it is important to note that the language acquisition process never evolves in linear ways because learners might stop learning or speaking one language and might focus on one or might pick up another language again after some years (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 125).

Another important distinction has to be made between second and foreign language learning. Languages that are learned by a child older than three or four years are defined as foreign or second languages. A person, who learns a second language, has to be living in a country where this particular language is spoken, whereas a student learning a foreign language is confronted with this foreign language in an institutional or educational context only (Tracy 2014: 24). For illustrating the difference between second language acquisition (short: SLA) and bilingualism, one could look at a child that grew up bilingually at home and has acquired two languages from birth in a natural context. In contrast, a child who spoke one language at home and then came to kindergarten at the age of three, started learning his or her second language in an artificial, educational setting but is constantly surrounded by the language, is considered a second language learner (Jessner 2008: 20). A young language learner who moves to another country where his or her first language is not used as the language of education is also considered a second language learner of the present language of education.

All research participants of the study that will be presented in chapter 3 can, hence, be referred to as second language learners, since they have moved to Austria and learn German in a natural setting. They all speak different first languages and have learnt English, as well as other languages, as foreign languages in their countries of

origin. In fact, three of them have learnt German as a foreign language back Slovakia but now improve their language skills in a German as a second language setting.

In this context, it is interesting to briefly revisit the common claim that younger children learn languages more easily. Research, however, proves that older learners can even outdo younger learners if they have enough motivation and have worked out effective learning strategies (Tracy 2014: 22). Experienced language learners figure out strategies that work for them and are only developed when learning a second or foreign language (Tracy 2014: 22). Nevertheless, if a second language is acquired at an early stage, those very speakers have a higher chance of a native-like language competence (Tracy 2014: 22).

1.4 Multilingualism

From what could be read in the previous chapter focusing on a distinction between the different forms of language learning and acquisition, it becomes evident that people's language profiles can vary considerably. Some people grow up bilingually, speaking both German as well as another language as their first languages, and others learn German as their second language. What, however, makes a person multilingual? The following chapter gives a clear definition of the term multilingualism and what the concept of multilingualism entails for language learners.

In the international world of the 21st century, numerous students' language learning profiles include more than one language, which is consequently referred to as multilingualism (Volgger 2014/15: 45). Research has shown that learners, who are proficient in several languages, can fall back on a knowledge of different grammar structures as well as a selection of language learning strategies and, as a consequence, they experience the language learning process differently than monolingual learners (De Angelis 2007: 3). Multilingual language learners are constantly influenced by their existent linguistic knowledge and, thus, draw connections between languages, which research defines as language transfers (Volgger 2014/15: 45).

Researchers have, in fact, always had difficulties in distinguishing between bilingual and multilingual speakers. As a consequence, the definitions of multilingualism vary in different publications. Braun (1937: 115) was one of the first to define multilingualism as an “active” balance between two or more languages as well as a certain level of proficiency. In 2007, the European Commission (2007: 6) published a report on multilingualism, in which it is defined as the proficiency of speaking one or more languages on a daily basis. Their definition of multilingualism is of special interest, since it includes both standard languages as well as variants (European Commission 2007: 6).

What, however, does it mean to be ‘proficient’ in two languages? Is it enough to be able to communicate one’s ideas? Are there specific levels of language competence that one has to reach? The following paragraphs offers answers by introducing the term ‘multilingual proficiency’ and ‘plurilingualism’. Also, a connection is made between the concept of culture and multilingualism.

1.4.1 Multilingual proficiency

The term ‘proficiency’ can also be found in Braun’s definition of multilingualism. Hence, it should be noted that the level of proficiency of a speaker is no longer measured by native speaker level but by the speaker’s ability to communicate successfully (Tracy 2014: 18). Cenoz (2013: 6) and Grosjean (2010: 22) define unbalanced multilingualism as a person’s language competence that involves one dominant language, which the speaker speaks fluently and on a daily basis, and one non-dominant language that is only used in certain situations. The level of proficiency of a particular language, however, might change over time and the choice of a dominant language depends on the social context of a multilingual speaker, who is usually capable of adapting to various situations (Tracy 2014: 19).

Even though Cenoz (2013: 7) points out that a differentiation is to be made between bilingual speakers and those who speak three or more languages, this paper refers to a multilingual speaker as a competent user of two or more languages (European Commission 2007: 6; Jessner 2008: 18f.). Also, the adjective ‘proficient’ is to be

understood as the ability to communicate successfully, which seems to be the most important ‘proficiency’ a language learner can achieve.

1.4.2 Plurilingualism

Another term that is often used alternately with multilingualism is ‘plurilingualism’. According to Jessner (2008: 18), the word multilingualism describes a society’s linguistic profile, in which several languages are used, while plurilingualism refers to the language competence levels of an individual speaker. As mentioned before, it does not matter if a person ‘becomes multilingual’ or whether they learned a language at school or acquired the same in a natural context, but quite on the contrary, any person who speaks several languages is defined as multilingual (Jessner 2008: 19). To provide an example: a student who was brought up monolingually, started learning English at the age of ten and then also learned Spanish and French is considered multilingual. This is also true for a child who grew up in France speaking French and whose parents speak to him or her in German and English.

When talking about multilingualism one has to be aware that the term might be used to describe a multilingual society but also the multilingual speaker’s language competence (Tracy 2014: 15; Rösch 2011: 160). When using the word ‘multilingualism’, this paper does not refer to a society’s linguistic profile but rather individual learner’s profiles and, hence, the word is used as an umbrella term for both societal and individual multilingualism. In fact, the present study always views multilingualism from a micro-level, focusing on multilingual language learners themselves. Any findings on a micro-level might, however, at the same time bring insights for educational institutions on a meso-level.

1.4.3 Multilingualism and culture

People grow up bi- or multilingually or become multilinguals in the course of their life for various reasons. In fact, our society as a whole is comprised of groups of speakers who have different first languages. Stavans and Hoffmann (2015: 2) mention the following factors as reasons for the diverse linguistic backgrounds of any groups of language users:

Our stories are replicated many times over all over the world, for it is factors relating to birth, upbringing, and education, travel, marriage, personal contacts and occupation, and the cultural and sociopolitical context in which one finds oneself, that clearly have a bearing in the development and maintenance of bilingualism and multilingualism.

In this quote, Stavans and Hoffmann (2015: 3) bring in an important viewpoint when saying that “learning and using other languages is not just additive but that individuals and communities are enriched both linguistically and culturally through the interaction of different language”. Thereby they take into account the aspect of culture and identity, which are closely related to the process of learning languages, stating that languages can help speakers identify with a certain group. Also, Lo (1999: 462) links multilingualism to culture, ethnicity and identity. She gives code-switching as an example of an act that enables a speaker to become part of a speech community, since also ethnic identity is constructed through linguistic discourse (Lo 1999: 461).

Hence, knowing more than one language does not just enable speakers to communicate successfully with a broader range of people but it also influences their personal identity. More specifically, multilingual speakers have the opportunity to feel related to more than one ‘group’ and, as a consequence, they are influenced by various cultures. This also implies that they get a better sense of how to engage with people from different cultural backgrounds and thereby makes them competent speakers in various situations.

1.5 A historical perspective on multilingualism

After introducing the term multilingualism and its meaning, the concept of multilingualism will be viewed from a historical perspective in order to explain why linguistic diversity cannot be regarded as a new phenomenon. Also, the chapter presents the negative side effects that the introduction of new languages in a country entails. Hence, the chapter observes ‘multilingualism’ on a macro-level.

From a historical point of view, it soon becomes evident that multilingualism has existed ever since and is not, as presented by the media nowadays, a modern phenomenon. As soon as different groups of people have started searching for food and for new places to inhabit, and especially with the increase of trade units

between tribes and later on nations, different forms of “cross-language communication” have developed (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 11).

Today, migration does not only take place when social groups are in search of new fertile areas but is primarily “ideologically motivated also by socio-political and ethnic identity” (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 11). When looking at the history of “political units such as states” it becomes clear that a major reason for countries’ multilingual rather than monolingual identities is the expansion or shift of country borders over the years of conquest and colonialization (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 11).

1.5.1 Multilingualism and conquest

Any ‘new’ country that has ever been founded has in the first place always been made up of different regions, which were then aligned to one country. In most cases, those regions were inhabited by people who spoke different first languages and, hence, had to adopt a new official language as soon as the country was founded. Amongst many examples of this, Stavans and Hoffmann (2015: 12ff.) give great empires, such as the Babylonian, the Greek or the Roman Empire, which were all “multiethnic and multicultural” empires, as examples. Groups of people who spoke different languages and followed different cultural traditions became part of the same empire and, thus, had to adopt new languages in order to facilitate communication but primarily instructions.

Conquest and occupation can, thus, be regarded as major (albeit at the one hand positive, at the other hand, negative) cornerstones for multilingualism. While new administrative languages were introduced by conquerors, local people continued to speak their first languages and, thus, “local and regional languages continued to be used”, while the dominant or the victor’s language was launched as a sort of “lingua franca” in occupied areas (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 13). Every language a person spoke, hence, served a different purpose since it was used in distinct contexts (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 13). Without any doubt, various languages were linked to a certain prestige in terms of contexts, in which they were used as well as the prestige accorded to the very speaker of each language.

Even though colonialization is often mentioned as the start of multilingualism, it, nevertheless, has to be mentioned that the rise of one language, in course of a conquest, often brought and still brings about the decline in the use of another, usually less prestigious language (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 15). An example for this is the Greek language, which enjoyed an excellent reputation until it was replaced by Latin in the course of history. However, also military conquests gave rise to new official languages and, thus, this form of multilingualism, which forced indigenous people to “adapt to new linguistic and cultural norms”, often had an effect on the prestige as well as the frequency of the language use of indigenous languages (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 35). Hence, conquests brought about multilingualism but have to be viewed from a critical perspective, as they have contributed to a clear hierarchy between languages and the development of language prestige.

However, not just political power has had an influence on the rise and decline of languages but also religion is a “consistent and powerful determinant of language contact and language spread” (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 15). Nonetheless, the latter was usually always linked to military actions that resulted in political dominance and the “imposition of cultural and religious customs” of a certain group (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 16). It should, therefore, not be seen as a cultural and linguistic enrichment, but rather the imposition of prestigious languages and religions with the result of a decline of regional languages and traditions.

To conclude, multilingualism as well as the related spread of literacy has led to a multilingual society but at the same time also “uneven power relations” between those people who spoke the official language as a first or second language and those who had to acquire the latter (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 36). Otherwise, those speakers of minority languages were not even able to take part in any educational programs. Also, centralized governments that used only one official language, which often was not the language spoken amongst major parts of the population also resulted in a dependent relationship due to centralisation (Stavans & Hoffmann

2015: 39). Thus, these new political unities brought about new linguistic hierarchies instead of creating national unity (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 39).

1.5.2 The power of literacy

Apart from political and religious power attached to a language, another factor played an important role in the spread of languages. Important languages, such as Aramaic, Greek or Arabic all had “written systems” which facilitated their linguistic spread (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 19). What is more, those written languages also enjoyed higher prestige of both the people who were able to speak the language as well as the language itself (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 20). This is also linked to the fact that any official or administrative documents were published in those prestigious and official languages, facilitating the centralisation of colonial administration and at the same time enabling a spread of these very languages across the whole geographical region (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 20).

Obviously, also the invention of the printing press had a positive influence on the “power of the written language”, which served as an important instrument of colonialization (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 20). An example of this spread of multilingualism is the Habsburg Empire, in which three languages were spoken for three different purposes (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 21). While Latin was referred to as THE official language of the government, German was used for educational and scientific purposes as well as in trade. Languages such as Romanian, Hungarian or Slovakian, on the other hand, were the first languages of many citizens but were excluded in any official contexts (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 21). The type of multilingualism that was predominant in the Habsburgian Era thereby created unequal opportunities, since education promoted individual multilingualism. However, educational institutions could only be attended by students who understood German in the first place (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 21).

In these contexts, access to literacy and multilingualism afforded power to those who possessed it while excluding those who did not from having influence in society (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 21).

Hence, multilingualism has always been associated with power, since only those who had access to education grew up bi- or multilingually and could then benefit

from their ability to communicate with different people in various contexts appropriately (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 21). Without a doubt, the change in political power and rule entailed a change in the linguistic landscape of various countries. The indigenous population of recently conquered territories had to either adapt a new language as well as culture or flee from their country (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 35).

Another factor that facilitated the spread of multilingualism but especially the official languages, during times of colonization, was the printing press (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 35). With the introduction of a certain languages in solely official or administrative contexts and the use of the latter also in written form, a clear hierarchy was created between official and indigenous languages as well as a „linguistic dependency on the colonising powers“ (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 35).

Thus, multilingualism definitely existed also at times of colonialization and even earlier when the world was ruled by big empires. On the one hand, introducing an official language seemed to bring political unity, and the use of several different languages in one unified country could be regarded as the beginning of multilingualism. On the other hand, however, it was not always the case that all social classes could benefit from the newly existing multilingualism which did not only unify the society but at the same time led to clear hierarchical structures (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 36). Due to the increasing importance of education and the power attributed to literacy, multilingualism, hence, only developed among privileged parts of the society who, firstly, spoke the official language and, secondly, had the chance to go to school (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 36). Nonetheless, it is a fact that societies have been multilingual throughout history.

As is suggested by the previous chapter, which views multilingualism from a historical perspective, multilingualism often provokes opposite opinions. These various views on multilingualism that still exist nowadays will be presented in the following chapter.

1.6 Various views on multilingualism

The following chapter presents various views on individual multilingualism in order to put the discussion of multilingualism at school into context. Unfortunately, multilingual students are often not sufficiently supported in Austrian schools.

1.6.1 A growing popularity of multilingualism

These days, the number of multilingual European citizens increases steadily. Slowly but surely, people's attitudes towards multilingualism are changing and also schools promote language learning classes, since people have understood that an additional language competence often leads to professional success in a world, where language competence is increasingly perceived as a resource (Cenoz 2013: 4). Even though studies show that most Europeans view foreign languages and a multilingual language competence in today's society as positive, people still often have a restrictive and biased view on language prestige.

The growing popularity of multilingualism can be attributed to globalisation, mobility and technology (Cenoz 2013: 4). As the web and mobile devices facilitate instant communication, languages are no longer bound to borders and language learning is no longer restricted to classrooms or other educational institutions (Cenoz 2013: 4). As people speak about 7000 different languages but there are only 200 countries, it becomes clear that multilingual speakers, who speak various different languages next to the official one are predominant on this planet (Cenoz 2013: 3).

Over the last few years a growing interest in the study of multilingualism has emerged. From a global view, this is not surprising since multilingualism does not present an exception but the rule (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 121).

1.6.2 Retrospective vs. prospective multilingualism

This paper addresses retrospective-prospective multilinguals, who are the target audience in any remedial German class. The following paragraph, therefore, defines the terms retrospective and prospective multilingualism in detail.

Szubko-Sitarek (2015:27) takes a closer look at students' multilingualism and distinguishes between retrospective, prospective and retrospective-prospective multilingualism. A retrospectively multilingual student was brought up bi- or multilingually and knows both the target language as well as the language spoken in the respective country, a prospectively multilingual student speaks only one language at home and learns his/her first foreign language at school and finally a retrospective-prospective multilingual student is bi- or multilingual but is not acquainted with the target language (Szubko-Sitarek 2015: 27).

Unfortunately, retrospective-prospective multilingual students' potential is very often not exploited in Austrian schools. Pupils are neither aware of their linguistic potential nor can they make full use of their knowledge since they are always compared to German-speaking monolinguals and classrooms are often still considered as ideally monolingual areas (Szubko-Sitarek 2015: 27f.). It is about time that those retrospective-prospective multilinguals are regarded as proficient multilinguals instead of comparing them to their monolingual colleagues.

1.7 Language prestige

The previous paragraphs already gave rise to the thought of an existing language prestige in Austrian schools. In order to avoid a hierarchical view on languages and their speakers, a clear understanding of present language prestige crucial. The following sub-chapter will, therefore, give an introduction to the concept of language prestige and then present the continuous diglossia in schools.

With the rise of the internet and the process of globalization, it has become increasingly important to communicate with people from all over the world and, therefore, have a good command of several languages. This has had a large impact on the importance of language learning in general and, consequently, also on the prestige of the English language (García & Sylvan 2011: 385). Since English was used as THE lingua franca in any context, people were suddenly obliged to learn the language of international communication in order to be able to communicate on an international basis (García & Sylvan 2011: 385).

On the one hand, the European Union does not want to interfere with students' existing language competence, since they pursue the object of multilingualism. On the other hand, however, they encourage the rise of English as a lingua franca (Jessner 2008: 28). Thus, English is seen as the language with the highest prestige in European countries but at the same time, the European Union is working on the continuation or implementation of a multilingual language context. The fact that the European Union has started encouraging people to learn languages, which are important for international communication, has drawn criticism since some people argue that European citizens are now less motivated to learn any other languages apart from English, which they can speak to anyone (Krumm 2005). The supporters of English as a lingua franca, however, argue that learning English as a first foreign language can motivate students and awaken their interest in the process of language learning itself (Vollmer 2001). Another important thought that will be further developed in the course of this paper is that English is a language that can facilitate communication in any language classroom, since a large number of students speak English before learning any other languages.

Before further developing the advantages of the use of English as a lingua franca in the language classroom in the chapter 2 on multilingual learning strategies, the following part of the chapter further evaluates the concept of language prestige and diglossia.

1.7.1 Subtractive vs. additive multilingualism

The fact that minority languages are in most cases not taught in Austrian schools, clearly shows the prestige that some languages, such as French or Russian, enjoy in the Austrian educational contexts as opposed to minority languages (Rösch 2011: 164). Minority languages are spoken in autochthonous settlements, such as Slovene in Carinthia or Hungarian in Burgenland. Rösch (2011: 241) distinguished between *élite* and minority multilingualism, also called subtractive and additive multilingualism. As the name already suggests, *élite* multilingualism describes an educational institution in which minority languages are taught as well.

Instead of analyzing and learning languages separately and repressing students' L1 knowledge, additive multilingualism draws from students' existing language competence and uses it as a resource and a "linguistic advantage" as opposed to their monolingual colleagues (Cenoz & Genesee 1998:24). Additive multilingualism should be viewed as the ultimate goal in any Austrian classroom, as it encourages students to develop their L1 proficiency as well as learn a new language with the help of their multilingual background and thereby facilitates the language learning process (Cenoz & Genesee 1998: 24; Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 233).

Language prestige and monolingual teaching strategies, however, still remain a problem in institutional contexts. Given that languages are sometimes even defined as weak or strong, which can synonymously be used with the word 'prestigious', many students are often still advised to focus on the target language instead of exploring their real linguistic potential, which should be the goal of any language teacher (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 233). García & Kleifgen (2010) illustrate this difference by comparing subtractive multilingualism to a unicycle and additive bilingualism to a bicycle. The latter allows speakers to progress in any communication because students can adapt better to their environment and the context, while riding on a unicycle can pose problems from times to times, depending on the situation a speaker finds oneself in.

From a macro-level, the present research tries to operate against subtractive and in favor of additive multilingualism. Also, it tries to empower multilingual language learners to utilize their multilingualism and ride their multilingual bicycle with skill and pride.

1.7.2 Diglossia at school

At the beginning of the chapter, the concept of language prestige was introduced on a macro-level. The focus now switches to a meso-level and gives examples of language prestige in educational institutions.

As regards learning foreign languages at school, language prestige unfortunately still plays an important role in European schools (Jessner 2008: 28). In this context,

Jessner (2008: 34) distinguishes between “élite multilingualism and minority-context multilingualism”. If different languages are spoken in a particular country, very often a state of diglossia arises, as languages are used in very different contexts (Rösch 2011: 160). While those languages that are used in culturally relevant or official contexts have high prestige, languages that are ‘just’ spoken at home have low prestige (Rösch 2011: 160). This is also linked to the fact that languages raise different kinds of “symbolic capital” because the latter is continuously “legitimated by the social groups in power”, which is also reflected in the number of working languages of the European Union (Cenoz 2013: 9). Even though the number of different languages spoken by European citizens exceeds the recognised 23 official languages, the only three working languages are English, German and French (Rösch 2011: 161).

Influenced by the choice of official languages and languages learnt at school, people unfortunately still distinguish between speakers who are multilingual due to their migrational background and speak languages, such as Arabic or Bosnian, and speakers of prestigious languages, for instance English or French (Volgger 2014/15: 48). Changing people’s attitudes towards multilingualism at school is, therefore, an important step into the future since it influences students’ language development in a negative way (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 124). Language prestige can, thus, affect a person’s language acquisition process if speakers develop a negative attitude towards their first language since self-esteem and language development are interrelated (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 124).

1.7.3 Reconsidering language prestige

As everywhere, multilingualism can either constitute an advantage or a disadvantage for students at school, depending on whether their first language is regarded as prestigious or not. To create a productive learning environment, it is essential for teachers, firstly, to include all existing languages and, secondly, to convey and spread tolerance and respect towards all languages (Volgger 2014/15: 49). If all languages are regarded as equally important, and students are encouraged to use them self-confidently, multilingualism can finally be used as a resource in the classroom because students can, for instance, make language transfers (Jessner

2008b: 31). Thereby students can be encouraged to reflect on their linguistic potential and thoroughly reconsider language prestige (Cummins 2009: 320).

The concept of language prestige in connection to the present paper, on the one hand, serves as a good example of a reconsideration of language prestige by including students' various first languages, regardless of their previous language prestige. On the other hand, it uses the language, which is probably associated with the highest prestige, as the working language, but still shows a disregard for hierarchies between languages by allowing students to use any language at their disposal.

1.8 Multilingualism in education

As the present research project was carried out in a grammar school, the following chapter will firstly give an overview of multilingualism in education, it will then explain how we can view multilingualism holistically and finally explain the term multicompetence and its importance of the language classroom.

Rapid changes in geopolitical situations in the world have created the need for multilingual education as a dynamic enterprise. (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 262)

Even though an increasing number of the workforce is required to speak several languages, Austrian schools are often still said to provide a homogeneous learning environment and sometimes monolingualism is even demanded in classrooms (Volgger 2014/15: 42). Students' language backgrounds are rather ignored than appreciated, and instead migration-related multilingualism is often either neglected or degraded as a challenge for children's education. Hence, the monolingual habitus is often still prevalent in Austrian schools and students' innate language resources are neglected.

In the past, more specifically until the 21st century, scientists agreed that languages are "monolithic" units and that growing up bilingually or even multilingually gives rise to problems and difficulties because, firstly, the language learning process takes longer and, secondly, the languages influence each other in a negative way (Blocher 1910: 669). For years, multilingual speakers' language competence was compared to

their monolingual counterparts, with the result that the focus was put on their deficit in both languages rather than looking at their benefits (Baker & Prys Jones 1998: 14). Cook (2001: 407) even defines those second language learners as “shadows of native speakers”, who will never reach the same level of proficiency as their monolingual colleagues. Consequently, teachers tried to avoid any influence of other languages apart from the target language in a classroom. This “One Language Only”-hypothesis was initiated by supporters of the Contrastive Analysis (Li Wei 2011: 371). Supporters of this hypothesis claims that two languages might influence one another negatively, which is why languages were kept separate (Li Wei 2011: 371). In order to avoid confusion or negative inferences, the “monolingual principle” encouraged language teachers to exclude any L1s in the language classroom (Howatt 1984).

1.8.1 Taking on a holistic view

As mentioned above, research has, in the past, taken on an atomistic view on multilingualism, arguing that multilingual speakers will never come close to reaching the language competence level of monolingual speakers (Cenoz 2013: 10). In line with this thought, strategies such as code-switching were seen as further evidence for a lack of language competence, given that languages were seen as “independent entities” (Cenoz 2013: 10).

For some years now, scholars have changed their perspective on language competence as well as language learning, and now put on a holistic perspective. The latter suggests that multilinguals are ahead of their monolingual colleagues because they can draw from their unique multilingual potential, also called ‘multicompetence’ (Cenoz 2013: 10). As a consequence, the objective of language teaching has changed, placing special emphasis on the ultimate goal of communication between individuals.

Students’ first languages are now said to be included and used as a resource for language learning, which no longer aims at native like proficiency, but rather fluency and successful communication (Volgger 2014/15: 45). Instead of comparing their language proficiency to that of native speakers and being reduced to their deficits,

since also foreign languages are taught with the help of German, they should be made aware of the advantages and benefits of their multilingual competence (Alläuger-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 121). The latter in fact facilitates further language learning, as bi- or multilingual speakers have already developed special language learning strategies in the process of their education (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 121).

Already in 1985 Grosjean (in Cenoz & Gorter 2011: 357) compares multilingual speakers to sportsmen who are not only trained in one field but who are competent in several areas. Thus, multilinguals should no longer be compared to monolingual learners who are solely trained in one type of sport but instead their “unique linguistic profile” should be valued (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 121). Summarizing the above, multilingual speakers should be encouraged to recognize and realize their linguistic potential by focusing on their multilingual competence, as opposed to the past, when their language competence were constantly compared to proficient monolinguals.

A fundamental change in multilingual students’ perspective on their language competence can solely be achieved, if they develop a certain multicompetence. A historic introduction, the advantages of multilingualism, as well as an explanation of what ‘multicompetence’ means are included in the following sub-chapter.

1.8.2 Multicompetence: advantages of multilingualism

After taking on a holistic view on multilingualism, research has tried to find out whether multilingual language learners really have advantages compared to their monolingual peers (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 126). In 1962, Lambert (in García & Sylvan 2011: 386) was one of the first to explore the advantages of being bilingual. As a consequence, the first bilingual teaching programs were introduced in European and Canadian schools because parents suddenly wanted their children to be proficient in more languages than just their L1 and to communicate internationally (García & Sylvan 2011: 387f.).

In the 1990s the concept of third language acquisition appeared for the first time, when Ringbom (1987) published a study showing that multilingual speakers

outperform their monolingual classmates when learning another language. The first studies on third language acquisition were carried out in Catalonia and the Basque Country and have, thus, revealed decisive advantages for students who grew up speaking several languages over monolingual language learners (Jessner 2008: 39). The following paragraphs give an explanation of the advantages of multilingual learners.

If multilinguals are made aware of their linguistic potential, they have clear advantages when learning a new language because they draw from a number of language learning strategies, which they have already applied when learning other languages they also speak (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 127). Cenoz (2013: 72f.), therefore, argues that learners of a third language can build on their knowledge and can utilize their “broader linguistic repertoire” when, for example, learning new vocabulary.

Learners who have gone through the process of learning a second language are also more experienced language learners and it is likely that they have developed certain skills and strategies for achieving the language-learning task. When facing the task of learning a third language, these skills and strategies can be reactivated and adapted to the new challenge (Cenoz 2013: 72).

Cenoz further compares language learning to the process of learning how to walk (L1 acquisition), learning how to drive a car (L2 acquisition) and learning how to drive a bus (L3 acquisition) (Cenoz 2013: 73). Even though the experience of driving a bus cannot really be compared to driving a car, it can be highly beneficial to know how to drive another vehicle and, therefore, the “starting point” is not the same for L3 learners and for complete ‘novice drivers’ (Cenoz 2013: 73). This could be an illustration of the advantages of being multilingual that could be used in any language classroom and could make students aware of their multicompetence.

Block (2007: 72) goes on to say that bi- or multilingual speakers are no longer to be regarded as semilinguals, who have deficits in both first languages, but instead they are hyperlinguals, who can make use of their diverse language competence. Moreover, research has shown that a speaker can keep his or her language proficiency in one language and still build on the language level in another language and use the process of translanguaging to widen his or her linguistic knowledge

(Tracy 2014: 30). The latter process of translanguaging will be further explained in chapter 3 as a useful method in multilingual writing.

1.9 Multilingualism in Austria

After indicating clear advantages of multilingualism in the previous chapter, the following will firstly summarize current trends with regards to multilingualism and the spread of languages in Austria. After that the situation of multilingualism in Austria will be described. All research participants of the project that will also be introduced in this chapter come from different parts of Europe and even the world. Hence, this chapter tries to answer the question, why Austria has become multilingual.

1.9.1 Current trends

In the present days, especially the processes of immigration and globalization have rendered our societies multilingual (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 43). In course of the 20th and with the start of the 21st century, countries have become increasingly diverse and multilingual through immigration, since people have started moving away from the places, in which they were born (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 44). Countries that had previously regarded themselves as “one country one nation” have been involved in migration and immigration movements, during which immigrants have ‘imported’ new languages and cultures, while migrants have spread the latter two world-wide (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 43). Subsequently, several languages and cultures have been present in European countries, which have, consequently, become multilingual (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 43).

A rise of migration has started in various European centers in the 1960s. Numerous people decided to move to metropolitan areas, and started creating their own areas in their new hometowns, which enabled them to keep using their languages and create cultural centers within a different country (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 44). Stavans and Hoffmann (2015: 44) give the example of Hispanics in the United States, who continue speaking Spanish to date even though they have lived in America for years and make up over 16 per cent of the American population (number from

2010). Migrant Hispanic children, nonetheless, grow up bilingually since they speak a different language at home than at school. Some countries, such as Canada, for instance, where French was adopted as an official language in 1969, have even had to reconsider their official languages (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 44). Also, countries who have regained their independency, after being ruled by colonization, had to decide on one means of communication that was thereafter used for official purposes (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 44).

However, not just immigration has had an impact on today's linguistic landscape but also internationalization, globalization, as well as a general "revolution in communications" have influenced people's linguistic competence likewise (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 45). The evolution of technology as well as the acceleration of mobility, trade and social services in general has facilitated but also demanded "interlingual contact" (Stavans & Hoffmann 2015: 45). People are required to speak more languages than before, since technical progress has facilitated international communication. Also trade links and globalization in general require people to negotiate with speakers of other languages.

1.9.2 Current trends in Austria

Students' success at school is often related to their linguistic background and whether they speak the language of education as their first language or not (Rechnungshof 2013: 257). When those multilingual students start learning a new language, the situation suddenly reverses. On the one hand, all students usually start at the same level, but, on the other hand, those students who grew up as bi- or multilinguals are more experienced and possess a variety of language learning strategies that they can use when learning the new language.

In August 2018, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture published an analysis of the number L1 classes and L1 teachers as well as multilingual students in Austrian schools in the school year 2016/17. The paper clearly states that Austria is a plurilingual country, in which several languages next to the official language German play an important role (Garnitschnig 2018: 4). The evaluation of the following year gives clear numbers and states that in the school

year 2017/18, 289.652 students with other first languages than German went to school in Austria. 223.507 of those multilingual students went to an 'Allgemein Bildende Höhere Schule' (short: AHS), which could be translated as grammar school (Garnitschnig 2019: 5). Thus, 28.3% of all students in Austrian classrooms spoke a different language than the educational language German as their first language (Garnitschnig 2019: 5). This very number differs in the different states of Austria with a percentage of 55% in the most diverse state, which is Vienna, followed by Vorarlberg with a percentage of 30,2% (Garnitschnig 2019:6).

Moreover, Garnitschnig (2019: 37) criticizes that while the number of multilingual students constantly rises, the percentage of students who participate in L1 classes continues to fall. Only 14,5% of all students with a different L1 than German take part in L1 classes, even though 26 different languages are offered in Austrian AHS (Garnitschnig 2019: 37). When comparing the different first languages spoken by Austrian students, it becomes apparent that Turkish is the language that is spoken by the biggest number of students in Austria as their L1 (Garnitschnig 2019: 17). 13.724 students, who speak Turkish as their L1, are followed by 9.436 speakers of Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian, 2.724 speakers of Arabic and 1.893 speakers of Albanian as their first language (Garnitschnig 2019: 17). Other languages such as Polish, Russian, Chechen or Persian are spoken by less than 1.000 students in Austria (Garnitschnig 2019: 17).

The problem that arises, however, is not that the students do not participate in L1 classes, which are limited to 3% of all multilingual AHS students, but rather that their first languages and migrational background is often associated with their success in school. The national educational report of 2018 clearly states that the migrational status and the use of other languages than German at home have a negative influence on students' acquisition of important skills, such as reading or mathematics (Oberwimmer et al. 2019: 250). Research shows that half of all second-generation migrants and, thus, a higher number compared to students that speak German as a first language, do not achieve the educational standards in reading and mathematics at the end of eighth grade (Oberwimmer et al. 2019: 250). With regards to second-generation migrants or students, who use other languages than

German as their everyday language, even more than two thirds do not achieve the prescribed standards at the age of 14 (Oberwimmer 2019: 252). In fact, even half of all first-generation migrants moved to Austria before the start of their compulsory education (Oberwimmer 2019: 252). The educational report, thus, concludes that schools still do not compensate for the unfavorable conditions of the latter students (Oberwimmer 2019: 252). The paper is, therefore, meant to contribute a small part to the change of teaching strategies in favor of multilingualism as well as people's perception on multilingual learners' capabilities.

1.9.3 A response to linguistic diversity

After taking a closer look at the linguistic landscapes in Austria, it becomes apparent that multilingualism is an ever-present topic. The following part of this chapter now focuses on measures that have been taken to respond to the present situation of linguistic diversity.

Some students in Austrian kindergartens get in contact with the German language for the first time, when entering this educational institution. In fact, 27,9 per cent and, thus, a number of 61.000 of all children in kindergartens spoke a different first language than German in the school year 2016/17 (Statistik Austria 2017: 79). As a consequence, diverse languages are used as means of communication, also in primary as well as secondary schools, since some students acquire German only as their third language, when they enter school or shortly before that during their compulsory year at an Austrian kindergarten.

The present study focuses on the linguistic diversity in Austrian AHS, where nearly a third of all students speak a different first language than German (Garnitschnig 2019: 5). In response to the growing linguistic diversity in grammar schools, the Austrian government introduced different measures, one of them being so-called 'Sprachstartgruppen'. These remedial language classes are directed at students who have just started to learn and speak German since they have either moved, or even fled to Austria recently. Those students "with first languages other than German may be exempted from assessment for twelve months, if necessary up to 24 months maximum" and are defined as "außerordentliche SchülerInnen", which can be

translated to ‘extraordinary students’ (Fellner et al 2017). This entails that the students have twelve to 24 months to learn the German language sufficiently well to be able to participate in regular classes. During that time, students are usually present in all lessons except for additive remedial German as a second language courses.

Apart from those measures that have been introduced to support students with different first languages than German, ‘mother tongue lessons’ have been offered in different Austrian schools since 2014 (Fellner et al 2017). However, not just language classes have been introduced as a reaction to the growing multilingualism in Austrian schools. Generally, all teachers have been advised to include “intercultural learning” as well as “language-sensitive subject-teaching” in their normal lessons according to the ‘The Federal Center for Interculturality, Migration and Multilinguality’ (short BIMM) following the growing multilinguality in Austria’s classrooms (Fellner et al 2017).

1.9.4 Sprachstartgruppen/Remedial language courses

The present study has been carried out within a group of German language learners, who all participated in a remedial course. This very form of German language class was named ‘Sprachstartgruppe’ by the Austrian government and will be defined and explained in the following chapter.

Remedial courses were offered for the first time in the school year 2017/18 for a maximum of eleven hours per week. Every school that communicated its need for additional support for students who speak German as a second language, hence, received eleven hours of additive German classes or less. They were introduced for those students who have just started learning German or have started to learn German shortly before arriving in Austria (Fellner et al 2017). The present study was conducted in an Austrian Gymnasium, situated at the Northern city borders of Vienna, which introduced its first German as a second language remedial classes in October 2016.

Any 'extraordinary' student who had not visited an Austrian school in the last years and did not speak sufficient German to follow normal classes, was requested to attend those additional German classes. While their classmates followed their usual timetable and had classes like Geography or French, the students of the German classes came to a different room and were supported in their German grammar and vocabulary competence "instead of [attending] the compulsory subjects" in order to prepare them for the regular participation in class (Fellner et al 2017). In the year 2017/18 a total number of 56 students attended those additional German lessons in the Viennese grammar school, where the research project was realized. A total number of 1755 'extraordinary students' attended an Austrian AHS in the same school year (Faßmann 2018: 6).

The aim of those additional classes was to support 'extraordinary students' in their language learning process and to prepare them for taking part in regular classes. German as a second language students could achieve their regular status either by improving their language competence or by staying in an Austrian school for more than 24 months. Regular or 'ordentliche' students were no longer entitled to participate in those 'Sprachstartgruppen' and were graded just like their classmates. Any student whose level of German language competence was sufficient but still needed practice in some areas, had the opportunity to attend one of four additional German classes in the afternoon after normal, compulsory subjects.

As mentioned above, the school was offered a total number of eleven hours of additional German classes by the Vienna Board of Education in 2017/18. Since the 56 students had a varying command of the German language due to their different educational backgrounds, the language students were split into four different groups according to their language competence level. At the beginning of the school year, each student was observed during some introductory German classes and was thereafter tested in an individual setting. Their language levels were graded with the help of the assessment tool USB-DaZ. USB-DaZ, short for Unterrichtsbegleitende Sprachstandsbeobachtung Deutsch als Zweitsprache, is a scientifically sound diagnostic tool that assesses German as a second language students' language skills and was introduced as a tool for language competence assessment in 2016 (Bifie

2016). Based on the observations made during the first three weeks during which the students were put into groups according to their age, and the introductory, individual talk, the language learners were then assigned to either of four language groups.

The first group consisted of students who have just started learning German and had an average level of A1. The A2-class supported students that have moved to Austria recently but have already had some linguistic training. The third group was attended by students who have already reached a level of B1 and the fourth group consisted of proficient speakers of German who have been learning the language for at least two years and could be defined as B2. The group of German language learners was divided into equal parts and each group was taught for either three or two lessons (as it was the case for the more proficient speakers) a week. The study was conducted at the end of the school year, in June 2018 in the fourth group.

The primary goal of any of the German classes was the improvement of students' language competence in order to enable them to participate in regular lessons and acquire the 'ordinary'-status. However, the students did not only participate in the classes because they wanted to go to school in Austria on a regular basis, but the majority of them also had to prove their improved language proficiency in German in order to receive a visa or residence permit. Hence, the language learners needed to bring evidence, proving that they have been continuously working on their German language competence. Therefore, the students were on the one hand prepared for regular lessons and on the other hand for the ÖSD (short for: Österreichisches Sprachdiplom) exam, in which they should either pass the B2 or C1 level at the end of the school year. The lessons were competence-oriented with the aim of a balanced training of all skills, which are 'reading and language in use', 'listening', 'writing' and 'speaking'.

2 Multilingual teaching strategies

After presenting current trends of multilingualism in Austrian educational institutions as well as presenting a historical background to the latter, the following chapter now turns to teaching strategies that can be used in German as a second language classrooms in order to support language learners in their development of a multicompetence and multilingual awareness.

As elaborated in section 1.8., research has shown the potential of multilingualism in the language classroom. Moreover, the fact that students in Austrian classrooms have become increasingly multilingual these days has been explained in detail in section 1.9. Therefore, language teachers are encouraged to make students realize that speaking several languages can be used as a resource when learning other languages. Moreover, teachers should obviously also apply teaching strategies that build on multilingualism and enable students to use their multicompetence. The writing project, which will be further explained in chapter 3, attempts to create a lesson sequence that focuses on exactly those multilingual strategies and encourages students to benefit from their multicompetence.

In the following, teaching strategies that focus on a multilingual learning process and facilitate the development of multicompetence are introduced. Any strategy that is outlined will also be referred to in the analysis of the study of this paper. Therefore, a clear understanding of each technique is needed to be able to identify and analyze instances of the following techniques in the lesson of the writing process.

2.1 Translanguaging and multilingual awareness

The most common and most effective strategy allows students to use translanguaging techniques by “creating connections between” the languages they already know in order to facilitate their language learning process (Gorter et al 2013: 218). While this strategy is, in fact, constantly used by multilinguals when they speak in natural contexts, it is unfortunately often not regarded as beneficial in the language classroom.

As research has proven a clear positive impact of translanguaging on language learning, students should, as a first step, develop a metalinguistic awareness in order to become “competent multilingual speakers” in the end (Gorter et al 2013: 2018). Therefore, the overall goal of any language teacher should be to make learners realize what potential is hidden behind their multilingual competence and offer scope for translanguaging at school. Moreover, existing language skills can also be used when learning new vocabulary.

García (2009: 151) summarizes the advantages of translanguaging as follows

It is impossible to live in bilingual communities and communicate among multilinguals without translanguaging. In fact, it is translanguaging itself that enables us to make sense of the multilingual worlds we live in. It enables us to understand our multilingual linguistic landscape [...]

García, hence, states that in today’s communication it is necessary to make use of any language that we know when decoding signs, and to constantly access different languages when communicating as a multilingual speaker (García 2009: 151).

Besides, also the goals of language teaching have changed, given that students are no longer asked to become proficient in one language only, but are required to learn several languages in order to be able to communicate on an international market. A multilingual competence has, thereafter, become the ultimate goal for the foreign language classroom (Gorter et al 2013: 218).

However, another important advantage of encouraging students to reflect on their multilingual potential is that they thereby develop multilingual awareness and simultaneously learn to value their multicompetence and multilingual background (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 127). Different methods, which activate students’ multilingual skills and keep the diversity of a multilingual classroom in mind, are necessary to promote a multilingual learning process and create a positive learning experience (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 127). Only then, multilingual learning can become beneficial and facilitate students’ learning processes (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 127).

2.2 Focus on multilingualism

“[F]ocus on multilingualism” is one possible teaching method and was presented by Cenoz & Gorter in 2011 (360). By looking at students’ multilingual potential and making them aware of their competence, students can develop their language competence in several languages at the same time according to the two linguists (Cenoz & Gorter 2011: 360).

This can be done by comparing languages and looking at familiarities between them. Students’ metalinguistic awareness is raised, given that students are encouraged to compare and contrast all language systems that are at their disposal (Cenoz & Gorter 2011: 360). By encouraging people to reflect on their language skills, which they have already acquired in the past, they, firstly, start to understand that, in contrast to what our society often promotes, it can definitely be beneficial to speak several languages if used for one’s advantage. Moreover, multilingual speakers might also understand that methods, such as code-switching, that are often criticized in educational institutions, are actually valuable techniques that facilitate the language learning process and are natural for competent speakers of multiple languages.

Speakers of several languages usually use techniques, such as code-switching or translanguaging on a daily basis and should, therefore, be encouraged to profit from them and regard language boundaries as soft (Cenoz & Gorter 2011: 360). Cenoz & Gorter (2011: 369), moreover, stress that multilingual language learners cannot only use their multicompetence as a resource, but can also talk to other multilingual learners to exchange methods and ideas. The overall goal of the method “focus on multilingualism” is to make students aware of the interconnections between languages and that the “different subsystems are connected across the languages in their development” (Cenoz & Gorter 2011: 360). Thus, a writing technique a learner encountered in one language, can be applied in any other language as well. In brief summary, raising awareness promotes the positive aspects of multilingualism. In fact, this very method can be regarded as the starting point of the research interest of the present study.

2.3 Using first languages

The following chapter gives an overview of all possible forms of how first languages but a lingua franca can be included in the German as a second language classroom.

2.3.1 Scaffolding

As the term indicates, “scaffolding” refers to the support given to a language learner (Hahn & Schöler 2013: 584). In a linguistic context, the language learner is compared to a house that is being built, and the scaffolding that is used around a construction site depicts linguistic support through vocabulary lists. In a multilingual setting, also the use of other languages apart from the target language can serve as scaffolding. The term was first used as a metaphor by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976: 90) to describe language learners’ support which enables them to complete demanding linguistic tasks, which would otherwise be too difficult since it is “beyond his [or her] unassisted efforts”.

Scaffolding allows a constructivist approach to language learning, based on Vygotski’s zone of proximal development (Vygotski 1978, in Gibbons 2002: 10). As a consequence, language learners are constantly challenged and can move to the next level more quickly. Moreover, a scaffold is also limited in that assistance is only provided if it is still necessary for the learners, who can then apply the new knowledge by themselves (Gibbons 2002: 10). Hence, an expansion of students’ cognitive abilities is paramount, because learners “move toward new skills, concepts or levels of understanding” (Gibbons 2002: 10). Scaffolding is extremely important in the multilingual development of students’ technical vocabulary since they can refer to all languages to describe something in scientific terms (Hahn & Schöler 2013: 608). It can, thus, also be used in the process of translanguaging and facilitates the development of a multilingual awareness as well as a deeper cognitive understanding of content (Hahn & Schöler: 608).

2.3.2 First languages as scaffolds

In the past, research suggested that including students’ first languages in the foreign language classroom can have a negative influence on the language acquisition process (Polio & Duff 1994: 324; Howatt 1984: 289). Therefore, teachers tried to

stick to the target language in order not to confuse students in their language learning. The 'One Language Only' hypothesis was predominant throughout the 20th century and encouraged teachers to exclude any instances of students' L1 in the foreign language classroom (Polio & Duff 1994: 324). Thus, languages were seen as separate units that should not be mixed and students were exposed to the sound and the grammar of the target language as often as possible (Polio & Duff 1994: 324).

Cook (2001: 402), however, argues that allowing the use of the L1 in a language classroom facilitates grammar explanations, and enables students to use it as scaffolding. He, moreover, states that the use of the L1 can help teachers when trying to "convey meaning" or "organize the class" (Cook 2001: 402). The above mentioned advantages, however, can only be applied if all students share one first language, which does not reflect today's classroom reality. Hence, his reflections presuppose a similar linguistic background for all students so that a teacher might use their common L1 as a resource. This, however, is not the case in today's multilingual classrooms.

Nonetheless, his ideas can still be applied if students use their individual first language as a resource when talking to classmates or when writing texts by themselves, even though the teacher might not be able to speak or understand this very language (Cook 2001: 417). As a consequence, the language learners can use their L1 and the target language at the same time and are no longer regarded as monolinguals in both languages, but instead they can benefit from their multilingual language skills that enable languages to "co-exist in the same mind" (Cook 2001: 417). Another way to bridge language barriers is the use of English as a working language, which will be further elaborated in the following chapter.

During group activities, teachers often have troubles controlling whether students use the target language. Instead of insisting on one language, teachers should rather remind students to try and use the target language as often as possible during language classes. At the same time, they should also point out that features, such as code-switching, occur naturally and can be used to as a form of scaffolding, to help

them in their language learning discourse (Cook 2001: 418). In this context, Brooks & Donato (1994: 268) state that including students' L1 in the language learning process is "a normal psycholinguistic process that facilitates L2 production and allows the learner both to initiate and sustain verbal interaction with one another". Language teachers should, hence, be aware of the advantages of including one's L1 when learning a new language and encourage students to use it as a resource (Cummins 2008: 67).

Donovan and Bransford (2005: 4) compare the students' L1 to "existing experiences" that are used as a "foundation" for "new understandings". Cummins (2008: 67), firstly, states that learners can build on their existing language competence and thereby use their L1 as a scaffold. Secondly, Cummins (2008: 67) explains that students develop "an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency" and, thus, a "deeper conceptional and linguistic proficiency" when examining interdependences across languages. This linguistic proficiency allows multilingual speaker to transfer one phenomenon or skill to different languages at any times even though vocabulary or grammar might differ (Cummins 2008: 67). By fostering transfers between languages and activating and building on existing linguistic knowledge, students can arrive at a higher level of proficiency in contrast to students who make use of a monolingual approach when learning a new language (Cummins et al 2005: 38).

Besides, a "pedagogy of respect" is thereby introduced in the foreign language classroom, since students see that their multilingual competence is renowned and their L1 is respected as a valuable resource when learning a new language (Cummins et al 2005: 39ff.). As a consequence, the students actively participate in the language learning process and "invest their identities in learning outcomes" (Cummins et al 2005: 39ff.).

2.4 English as THE lingua franca

The term lingua franca used to refer to a pidgin in the Mediterranean and went on to describe pidgins in general and later on "all kinds of vehicular languages" (Brosch

2015: 71). A so-called 'vehicular language' is used any time two individuals that do not "share a common language" communicate (Brosch 2015: 71). Brosch (2015: 72) defines the "original" lingua franca" as a "stabilized pidgin" or "contact language" that came into being in trading negotiations between merchants who spoke different languages and used to sell their goods between the 14th and 19th century around the Mediterranean. As soon as national languages, such as French developed, this form of a lingua franca used quickly disappeared (Brosch 2015: 72). Nowadays the term 'lingua franca' is in most cases used to refer to the English language and has even developed into a field of study, "English as a lingua franca" (short: ELF) (Brosch 2015: 76).

Even though some critics claim that the emerge of English as a lingua franca has influenced the spread of multilingualism since people are not motivated to learn other languages anymore, influential linguists have proved the opposite (Seidlhofer 2011). Others even argue that the English language is influenced in a negative way by ELF, which is spoken mostly by non-native speakers, who focus on communicating their message rather than using the right grammar. Nonetheless, it has been proven that the advantages outweigh since its general purpose is to "facilitate communication between people with different first languages" (Brosch 2015: 80).

Even though language classrooms are linguistically extremely diverse these days and the goal of any language teacher should be to include any of students' first languages in order to facilitate the language learning process, it can be helpful to have one common language that is used as a point of reference. In this context, English is often regarded as THE lingua franca that establishes and maintains links between languages and people (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 131).

To put the challenge into context: A student grows up speaking Turkish and moves to Austria at the age of nine. He attends an additional German class in which there are students with various different first languages. When he has to write a text in German, he can always exchange his ideas with other students of the class using English, since they have all started learning English at a very young age. The

language gives them common grounds and allows them to discuss at a higher linguistic level and to eventually arrive at a higher level of proficiency in German as well, as they are encouraged to use any language they speak without feeling inferior to others.

The use of English as a working language should, hence, be utilized as an essential tool in any foreign as a second language classroom. Instead of regarding other languages such as English as some form of threat to the acquisition of German, they should be included at all times. Since English provides common ground for speakers of all languages, it can provide scaffolding in situations, where German cannot yet be regarded as the one and only working language for students who are multilingual after migrating to Austria. A common lingua franca can serve as an important tool and facilitate students' language acquisition process. As a first step, it enables language learners to express their ideas more easily and thereby shows fundamental appreciation for students' language resources.

Most migrants do not only speak their own first language but have acquired English either at school or on their way to Austria. Nonetheless, their English language competence is often disregarded or not valued enough in German as a second language classes. Instead of excluding English from language courses, it can be used as an important linguistic resource for teaching purposes in the German as a second language classroom.

2.5 Training the multilingual and metalinguistic awareness

Multilingual speakers can only make use of their multilingual knowledge if they are supported in their development of an awareness for their linguistic and crosslinguistic potential (Jessner 2006: 42). Metalinguistic awareness can be developed when students reflect on the concept of language and thereby develop a linguistic sensibility (Jessner 2006: 42). Jessner (2006: 42) defines it as the "ability to focus attention on language as an object in itself or to think abstractly about language". If language learners reflect critically on their language skills, they can in the end use their linguistic skills as a resource that helps them adapt to any given

communicative need (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 126). Thus, a speaker benefits from past linguistic experiences and, therefore, can achieve communicative goals more easily. Török and Jessner (2017: 3) explain that

metalinguistic awareness as a consequence of prior knowledge and language learning experience offers a wide range of resources regarding different linguistic structures, configurations and organisation, which enables the foreign language learner to have a heightened perception and cognitive flexibility when encountering a new, unknown language system.

It should, thus, be the ultimate goal of any language teaching to encourage students to develop a multilingual awareness in order to enable them to make use of their multicompetence (Cenoz & Jessner 2000: 133f.). When developing a multilingual awareness, students start reflecting on language similarities and differences, which can then be transferred into strategies of language transfer when learning foreign languages (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 131).

One way of developing language awareness and using existing linguistic knowledge is by comparing languages. Students are firstly asked to analyze a certain structure in the foreign language and then to find linguistic similarities or differences to the languages they speak (Allgäuer Hackl & Jessner 2013: 130). Thereby they apply language transfers and interferences while referring back to the languages at their disposal, which can help them in their linguistic development (Allgäuer-Hackl & Jessner 2013: 130).

2.6 Translation

The fundamental difference between mono- and multilingual speakers is that monolinguals can only use one language and that multilinguals can make use of several languages and are, moreover, able to switch between them (Malakoff & Hakuta 1991: 142). Thus, research has shown that people, who speak more than one language, possess better translational skills, which they can use to their benefit since translations can serve as useful scaffolding for language learners (Cummins 2009: 39). Given that translations are a natural activity that any multilingual speaker uses and serve numerous purposes when trying to achieve communicative goals,

students should be encouraged to use this very technique and thereby work on language transfers (Cummins 2008: 65; Malakoff & Hakuta 1991: 142).

One problem in this context is that translations are often avoided especially in teaching contexts, since they remind of a former language learning method, known as the 'Grammar-Translation-method' (Cook 2001: 417). Malakoff & Hakuta (1991: 149), however, argue that the "translation strategy is a learned strategy that helps improve performance". Hence, they differentiate between natural translation, which multilingual speakers use in any context when communicating with parents or friends, and the learned strategy that can be used in the language classroom (Malakoff & Hakuta 1991: 143ff.).

In any case, translating from one language to another, firstly, enhances students' metalinguistic awareness and it, secondly, teaches them the benefits of being multilingual, as they realise that they can communicate successfully with multiple audiences (Cummins 2008: 65). Moreover, students use both their L1 and their L2 and thereby develop their language skills in both languages simultaneously (Verhoeven 1991: 72). On the whole, the students' perception of their L1 changes if their knowledge in their L1 is acknowledged and they finally start using it as a resource for foreign language learning (Cummins 2008: 70).

If one takes a closer look at translations in the language classroom, it becomes clear that the translation method can be applied beneficially when writing texts. Writing texts always serves two purposes: firstly, language learners try to improve their language competence and secondly, they work on their writing skills (Dengscherz 2012: 67). As a first step, students need to understand that they can use their existing knowledge of writing skills in any other language, which, consequently, leads to a higher level of language competence (Dengscherz 2012: 68). Thus, language learners can benefit from using translations also in their writing process, as they are able to apply different strategies and use various language systems at the same time (Dengscherz 2012: 71).

2.7 Multilingual writing in peer groups

The previous chapter have stated numerous advantages of using language learners' first languages as a resource in the German as a second language classroom. The goal of the present research project was to create a lesson, in which multilingual language learners are supported in the best possible way. Hence, it was decided that they will be engaged in a cooperative writing process and should, in the end, write one opinion comment as a group. The reason, why the skill 'writing' was chosen to be trained in the teaching sequence and why the learners are encouraged to work as a group will be explained in the following paragraphs.

2.7.1 Writing as a skill

Already in 1997, Renate Faistauer mentioned that the linguistic skill 'writing' is often underestimated and is not trained sufficiently enough in foreign language classes. It is often seen as a functional instrument or a means to an end, rather than a skill by itself. When looking at the action of writing in a foreign language classroom, one can detect two different purposes. Firstly, it is used to further improve students' language competence when learners write down what the teacher says and, secondly, it is trained as one of the five skills of foreign language learning itself (Dengscherz 2012: 67). Thereby the use of the very skill is often limited to training activities when students are preparing for language certificates or other written exams.

Hadfield and Hadfield (1990: 30) actually state that as opposed to speaking, which is acquired naturally, writing has to be learned. Thus, teachers need to come up with a plan to engage students in writing activities and thereby develop and foster their writing skills. Writing, however, is often accompanied by linguistic, psychological or cognitive problems, since students do not only have to have a very high command of the English language but they also need to produce language in written form all by themselves (Byrne 1998: 50). Brown (2001: 343) defines writing as the activity of encoding a message into a written language. Moreover, ideas have to be structured and expressed in a linguistically correct way (Brown 2001: 343). In this context, Brown (2001: 343) refers to several micro skills that language learners have to acquire when writing in a foreign or second language. They need to be able to write and

produce language quickly, be proficient in the grammar and vocabulary of the target language, structure writing appropriately, convey appropriate meaning, stick to a cultural norm and develop writing strategies at the same time (Brown 2001: 343).

The research interest of this paper, therefore, chooses the skill 'writing' for the study and thereby wants to stress the importance of a continuous training of the written language skill as well as the following benefits of multilingual writing.

2.7.2 Writing in peer groups

When writing in a foreign or second language, learners easily reach their limits and are often frustrated and demotivated since they cannot express things they wish to but have to come up with easier phrasings that do not express their general level of proficiency. Therefore, writer's blocks often occur if learners stick to the target language and do not use strategies allowing them to make use of their existing linguistic knowledge. As a consequence, it is firstly of greatest importance to teach students multilingual writing strategies that help them when producing a text in the target language and point out that they can apply them when writing in whatever given language (Cenoz 2013: 13; Dengscherz 2012: 77f.).

Cooperative writing is an important form of writing and brings along a lot of benefits for language learners. Firstly, it facilitates the writing process for all group members since the team members can benefit from one another, everybody can bring in new ideas, which can render a text more interesting and linguistically speaking more appealing (Benö 2011: 79). Language learners can bring in new ideas, exchange knowledge when formulating sentences together and thereby develop their confidence as well as their language proficiency (Benö 2011: 79). As a consequence, they feel more secure and also have the possibility to discuss the grammatical structures as well as suitable expressions (Benö 2011: 79). In doing so, they not only support each other mutually but they also develop a deeper understanding of language and further develop a multilingual awareness.

In fact, linguistic support cannot only be offered by teachers who constantly serve as sources of information. Quite on the contrary, also language learners themselves

might be able to help one another (Dengscherz 2012: 78). When encouraging students to work autonomously in groups, they, firstly, learn to take advice from one other, secondly, they use their resources by providing assistance themselves and, thirdly, the lesson becomes less teacher centred (Dengscherz 2012: 78). Writing in peer groups are, thus, refers to a cooperative writing process among students in a foreign or second language classroom.

Moreover, working in a team is an important skill one has to acquire in order to be able to participate in modern everyday working life (Storch 2005: 153ff.). Hence, students activate their own multicompetence and benefit from each other's linguistic skills, while at the same time developing problem-solving skills in a group. By talking to one another and giving each other feedback on their ideas, they can also use technique of peer-correction and avoid mistakes (Storch 2005: 153f.).

Cummins (2009: 319) summarizes that students who work in peer groups using their L1 or a lingua franca are provided with a higher level of assistance than if they just write in the target language, since multilingual group discussions encourage them to reflect on languages and, consequently, allow them to arrive at a higher level of proficiency. Hence, they can, on the one hand, work cross-linguistically, because they either write in several different languages or translate phrases into one target language and, on the other hand, they can apply different writing strategies they have acquired in their language learning processes (Cenoz 2013: 13). Moreover, they come up with more ideas and, furthermore, they also use their multilingual competence, meaning that they help each other when trying to find a specific word. To put it in a nutshell, students benefit constantly from one another when trying to find new ideas, when looking for words, when using existing writing strategies and, as a consequence, they are also more motivated.

2.8 Being a teacher in a multilingual classroom

In today's media, the recent rise in linguistic heterogeneity in classrooms is often presented as a challenge for teachers. This, however, is only the case for those teachers who do not value multilingual students' background and regard

multicompetence as a disadvantage rather than a resource (Volgger 2014/15: 52f.). If teachers, however, are made familiar with the advantages of multilingualism in the language classroom, they can also be made aware of possible teaching strategies and didactic ideas (Volgger 2014/15: 52). In the best case, they promote students' multicompetence by encouraging them to use any language at their disposal and to build on their existing knowledge (Volgger 2014/15: 52).

In fact, researchers are arguing that teachers who speak the target language as their L1 and in most cases also grew up monolingual are at a disadvantage to those teachers who had to learn the respective language they are teaching themselves (Jessner 2008: 41). If teachers went through the language learning process themselves, they could firstly share their experiences but they could also use their heightened multilingual awareness when comparing languages (Jessner 2008: 41). Nonetheless, all teachers can create an enriching atmosphere in the language classroom if they value students' linguistic background and encourage them to use it as a resource (García & Sylvan 2011: 386). The only challenge that teachers face in today's language classroom is that, on the one hand, they have to be aware of the existing plurality of the linguistic landscape and, on the other hand, they should respond to students' individual needs and backgrounds.

To put it in a nutshell, it is no longer neither sufficient nor adequate to teach one language at a time and to exclude other languages from the classroom. Quite on the contrary, a teacher's goals should be to foster students' multicompetence by promoting language transfers as well as the use of different languages when learning a new language. In order to facilitate multilingual learning, teachers should, hence, build on existing knowledge and value any instance of multilingualism and thereby encourage students to build their multicompetence.

3. Methods: A multilingual cooperative writing project

As mentioned in the introduction, this paper seeks to address the question whether German as a second language learners utilize their multicompetence when participating in a cooperative writing task by using English as their working language and by including other multilingual strategies such as translations from and into their first languages. Moreover, it attempts to show how a multilingual, cooperative writing project evolves within a group of multilingual learners, who take part in remedial German classes, which is explained in the sub-chapter 1.9.3 on remedial language courses. The research context, the lesson plan as well as the method of analysis are outlined in the following paragraphs.

3.1 Research Context

As mentioned in chapter 1.9.3, the growing number of ‘extraordinary students’ in Austrian classrooms and, hence, the rise in linguistic diversity in Austrian AHS, in which one in three children speak a different first language than German, resulted in the introduction of remedial German classes. The latter were chosen as the research context for the writing project of this master’s thesis, which contents the English is constantly used as a working language during a cooperative writing project in a German as a second language learning.

The research project was carried out in a group of six German students. Eight students were enrolled in the B2 group. On the day of implementation of the research project, however, only six students were present. The six participants had various different first languages, and personal backgrounds. They have been chosen as the research group, since they, firstly, speak different first languages and, secondly, they turned out to be a very communicative group of eager language students who were always very interested in learning more about my studies at the University of Vienna. Finally, they volunteered immediately when I told them that I was planning to carry out a study in one of my four remedial language classes.

The following paragraph describes the students in detail. The students have been given new names and will thereafter be referred to by their first names. In the beginning, I wanted to name them “the Russian student” or “the Slovak student”, but

finally, I decided that I did not want to limit them to their nationality or first language, but rather address them as a multilingual person who has a name.

Three of them are from Slovakia and have been learning German since they were ten years old. At the time of the research project, one of them, Sonia, was 16 and two of them, Monika and Veronika, were 17 years old. They have started learning German in secondary school and decided to come to Austria to improve their oral skills. They all speak Slovakian as their first language and have started learning English as their first foreign language at the age of six. Helena is originally from South America and speaks Spanish as her first language. When she started primary school, her family moved to the United States. Thus, she speaks both English and Spanish fluently. She decided to move to Austria for her final years of high school and to finish her final exams in Austria, simply because she wanted to learn a new language. The student was 16 at the time and has been learning German for two years. The fifth student of the group was a Russian girl, called Anna, who has been learning German for two years as well. She grew up in Russia and speaks English as her first foreign language. She moved to Austria one year ago at the age of 15 and started off as a beginner. The last student has been living in Austria for two years, but his personal background cannot be compared to those of the other five students because he fled to Austria from Iran. His name is Alireza and his parents grew up in Afghanistan but decided to flee from the country when the situation got too dangerous. The student was already born in Iran and speaks Persian as well as Arabic. He does not speak English as well as the other students and started learning German at the age of 15 when he arrived in Austria.

All in all, the group could be described as linguistically as well as personally heterogenous and could benefit from a range of linguistic skills. Usually the English language was used as a lingua franca in class, since all students had a very high command of the English language compared to their German language competence. Especially when the students discussed a complex grammatical topic or could not come up with a German question, they often switched to English in order to be able to express themselves precisely or get their points across. In general, the inclusion of English as a working language facilitated discussions on a meta level, and generally

raised students' self-confidence when expressing themselves. Slovakian was obviously also present when students of the same first languages tried to figure out the meaning of a certain German saying. The students' willingness to include English as our working language has in fact driven this research, and encouraged me to develop my hypothesis on the beneficial influence of the lingua franca English on the German as a second language classroom. Besides, the teenagers also used Russian and Arabic as their languages of communication since the missing students were speakers of the latter languages. The language learners have always been allowed to use any of their languages in class, even though the general language of communication was German.

3.2 Lesson plan

Since the students were all prepared for receiving an 'ordinary' status after their two years as 'extraordinary' students, the students were constantly trained in all four skills. It has often been reported that 'writing' as a skill is not as present in today's language classroom as are other skills, since teachers predominantly focus on spoken communicative skills. This may be attributable to the fact that the most language classes are based on the CLT approach, short for 'Communicative Language Teaching'. Without a doubt, the written language competence makes up an important part of any language competence.

Nonetheless, this is not the only reason why the skill 'writing' was chosen as the key competence of this research project. Firstly, students' writing competence is tested in any language competence exams as well as regular written school exams. Hence, the students are required to be proficient in writing in the German language and have to prove it on a regular basis. Secondly, the ultimate goal of any student in an Austrian grammar school is to pass the final exam, known as 'Matura'. An obligatory part of this exam is the written German exam, in which students have to create two written productions. Further reasons promoting the training of writing in the language classroom are explained in chapter 2.6.1.

This thesis, as a consequence, focuses on the skill 'writing' and asks the research group to write a German text. The task should be done in peer groups that follow the method of cooperative writing. This method was first and foremost chosen since it has proven to be highly successful among second language learners (for further details return to chapter 2.6.3 'Cooperative writing as a form of creative writing'). Also, this student-centered teaching method allows the teacher to step back and let the students work by themselves. This was of vital importance during the research project since I was both the students' language teacher as well as the director of the research project at the same time. The fact that the students wrote the text without my help enabled me to put on the role of a researcher and supervisor as soon as I have explained the writing prompt and task itself.

At the beginning of the lesson the students should, firstly, be asked to sit around a table forming a circle and facing each other. Secondly, they receive the writing prompt, which was taken from an ÖSD B2 preparatory exam. The prompt was published on the website klett-sprachen.de, where a free sample of every level of the ÖSD language exam is offered for teaching purposes. The students are instructed to write a text together with their peers focusing on the three content points of the text prompt. The text prompt was taken from the second part of an ÖSD exam, which tests 'free productive writing' and includes the draft of an argument ('Argumentation') or opinion writing ('Meinungsäußerung'). The writing task asks students to reflect on the topic of success, pressure and performance at school and at work. They should reflect on the given statements saying, firstly, that competition promotes performance, secondly, that teenagers cannot deal with performance-related pressure and, thirdly, that creativity improves efficiency. As a first step, they have to give their opinion on the quotes and explain the reason why they think so. Also, they have to include personal experiences with regards to the topic and, lastly, describe the current situation in their country. The final text should be a German opinion writing of 120 words based on three headlines.

This prompt was chosen as it firstly refers to a topic that has partly been discussed in class before, when students had to reflect on their lives and the concept of success as well as their idea of the latter. Also, the students have talked about their hobbies

and their attitude towards school in previous lessons. Secondly, it does not only include their personal experience but it also brings in an intercultural aspect when the students have to talk about the situation in their country of origin. Thirdly, the prompt was taken from a previous ÖSD exam, which the students all passed a week after the research project. Also, the language learners were used to the exercise format. The exact prompt can be seen on the following page.

All in all, the students have 40 minutes to write the text. They all receive both a text prompt as well as a paper for taking notes. They are allowed to use any languages at their disposal but they are not allowed to use dictionaries or mobile phones. The students are encouraged to create a first draft or an outline before writing the whole text. After explaining the writing task and giving clear instructions in German, the teacher acts as an observer of the writing process and should only intervene if students cannot come up with an important translation, which they need for understanding the text prompt or that hinders their writing process. The whole task can be described as a cooperative, multilingual, student-centered writing process that supports and focuses on students' multilingual competence.

Variante C

Sie haben in verschiedenen Zeitungen folgende Schlagzeilen gelesen:

Konkurrenz fördert die Leistung

Statistiken bestätigen: Mehr Erfolge durch positiven Konkurrenzgeist

Jugend zerbricht am Leistungsdruck

Immer mehr Kinder und Jugendliche erkranken an Stresssymptomen

Abschied vom Ideal der Hochleistungen in Schule und Berufswelt

Weniger Druck erlaubt mehr Kreativität und führt zu verbesserten Leistungen

Schreiben Sie nun Ihre Meinung dazu und gehen Sie dabei auf die folgenden Punkte ein:

- 1) Wie denken Sie über diese Schlagzeilen? Begründen Sie Ihre persönliche Meinung.
- 2) Beschreiben Sie eigene Erfahrungen (oder Erfahrungen von Freunden) zum Thema.
- 3) Wie ist die Situation in Ihrem Land?



© Ernst Klett Sprachen GmbH, Stuttgart | www.klett-sprachen.de |
Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Von dieser Druckvorlage ist die Vervielfältigung für den
eigenen Unterrichtsgebrauch gestattet. Die Kopiergebühren sind abgegolten.

Seite

Source: <https://www.klett-sprachen.de/digitales/oesd-zertifikat-b2-oesd-zb2-modelltest/c-942>

3.3 Method of analysis

The following chapter presents the method of analysis that was applied after carrying out the research project. In general, all student-teacher or student-student talks can be analyzed with the help of discourse analysis (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 281). This discourse analytical research method is suitable for a deeper understanding of students' speech actions and, hence, suitable for the analysis of the present teaching project, which tries to investigate the process of a cooperative multilingual writing process (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 281). The following chapter describes the method, which has been applied when analyzing transcript sequences of the cooperative writing process described in chapter 3 'method'. The transcription is based on a video recording as well as an audio recording of the teaching sequence and will be analyzed in chapter 5 'results'. The video recording was solely used to facilitate the transcription process, as it clearly shows what a speaker said which sentence and will not be evaluated in the course of this paper.

3.3.1 Interactional Analysis

Any methods of speech analysis can be regarded as supplements to the traditional conversational analysis (Deppermann 1999: 10). Both traditional functional pragmatics as well as interactional analysis, which is a subtype of general conversation analysis, try to use procedures of interactional sociolinguistics, discourse psychology and the grounded theory to assess sequences of interactions. The basic form of interactional analysis was formed by Krummheuer and is based on Garfinkel's (1967) conversation analysis, which has been developed further for the analysis of separate speech sequences in educational contexts (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68ff. In: Deurer 2018: 104). This very form of sequential analysis technique is based on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (EMCA) and tries to reconstruct the detailed, contingent nature of human interactions (Perit Çakır, Zemel & Stahl 2009). It analyses separate speech sequences in order to reconstruct the organization and theme development of any speech utterance (Krummheuer & Brandt 2001: 90). For the purpose of this research project it reconstructs the nature of a cooperative writing process and was, therefore, chosen as the method of analysis.

Most English research summarizes interactional analysis, conversation analysis and any further subcategories as discourse analysis (Nunan 1993 in Schwab & Schramm 2016: 282). Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) distinguish between ‘interactional’, which can be compared to the German ‘Interaktionsanalyse’, and ‘interaction’ analysis, which uses prewritten observation grids to analyse teacher-student interactions (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 282). The following chapter describes the method ‘Interaktionsanalyse’ which is subsequently referred to as ‘interactional analysis’.

Before giving a detailed description of an interactional analysis, the name itself will be used to explain what it contains. Schwab and Schramm (2016: 280f.) define the word ‘interaction’ by splitting it into its two Latin components ‘inter’, meaning *between* and ‘action’, which defines the process of an *act* in English. An interaction is, hence, a speech act or a non-verbal action between at least two people that involves at least one speech turn, which relates to another turn in terms of content (Henrici 1995: 25). This statement also implies that an interaction is always an encounter and, thus, a mutual influence of two individuals or a group on one another (Goffman 1981 in: Schwab & Schramm 2016: 281). This also implies that putting focus on simply two speakers of a whole class or a group of students is not sufficient but that the whole group has to be included in the analytical process (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 181). Discourse analysis supports the fact that learning a language in itself cannot be seen as a solely mental process of an individual but rather as an interactive development in which all participants influence the whole process fundamentally (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 282).

Interactional analysis can be carried out for two main reasons, firstly, so that sequences can be described in detail, and, secondly, in order to allow an analysis of the language learning process in the context of an interaction in order to draw conclusion for language teaching (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 280f.). Certain characteristics have to be considered in order to guarantee a proper analysis of interactions in language learning processes. Those principles have been summarized by Schwab & Schramm (2016: 282): Firstly, empirical data has to be obtained in natural settings. These data are usually comprised of video- or audio recordings, in which a natural learning environment is created. In most cases, the researcher does

not take part in the project. The goal of any research should be an emic or 'insider' perspective that does not view actions from a researcher's but rather from the participants' perspective in order to reconstruct their logic of action. Thirdly, any interpretations always need to be based on the data material and are fourthly always to be regarded as part of a whole sequence that is then analysed turn by turn. Any speech utterance has to be regarded from its individual context and it has to be kept in mind that any turn creates another context for the following turn. While the data analysis is based on Krummheuer's interactional analysis Also, Schwab and Schramm's principles have been followed in the process of data collection. Both texts suggest stages of an interactional analysis, which have both been followed during the research project and will be presented in the subsequent chapter.

3.3.2 The different stages of an interactional analysis

In general, the interactional analysis describes a multistep procedure that reconstructs the thematic development of conversational situations in institutional contexts and is based on the analysis of transcripts (Höck 2015: 189). It uses passages of transcriptions that were created of recorded teaching sessions to reconstruct the thematic development of a sequence of a conversation between two or more speakers or learners (Höck 2015: 189).

Thematic developments emerge from the continuous process of interrelated speech utterances and actions in interactions (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). Krummheuer's interactional analysis is then used to reconstruct negotiation processes and the subsequent thematic developments (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). This form of speech analysis does not reconstruct students' cognitive processes of comprehension, as interviews or written tests do (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). In short, Krummheuer's interactional analysis tries to reconstruct the development of themes in the progress of interactions and has been developed for the analysis of specific sequences in class discussions (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). It was, therefore, chosen as the method of analysis of the existing teaching sequence, as it allows a reconstruction of any metalinguistic strategies as well as the development of what languages are used at what time of the process.

Discourse analytical processes do not follow any certain order but instead they are based on the data material and often require a circular process (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 283). Schwab and Schramm (2016: 282) split any discourse analysis into four different steps: 1. data collection, 2. preparation of the data, 3. data analysis and 4. theory formation. The same steps were applied in the data collection and analysis of this paper. Hence, data were collected in an educational setting, as a next step the recording was transcribed with the help of a transcription system and finally certain passages of the transcriptions were used as a basis for a data-driven interpretation of the data. Finally, the data analysis serves as a basis for the formation of theories and is then founded by existing theoretical assumptions (Schwab & Schramm 2016: 282f.).

Krummheuer further divides Schwab and Schramm's stage of the 'data analysis' process into different steps. According to him, the interactional analysis is comprised of five different steps, which have to be followed even though the order of every single step of analysis is irrelevant (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). In Krummheuer's interactional analysis, firstly, the interaction unit has to be structured, secondly, it has to be described on a general level, thirdly, the single utterance is analyzed in detail and various interpretations are presented, fourthly, a turn-by-turn analysis is presented and, lastly, the interpretation is briefly summarized.

As mentioned above, the interactional analysis is based on the transcription of video sequences that show parts of authentic teaching settings. The principles of this form of conversation analysis will be presented in the following subchapters. The order of each maxim is variable and, hence, one may return to one or skip another step in the course of an interactional analysis.

Classifying the interaction unit

Before starting an analysis, a certain sequence of a video recording has to be selected and is thereafter referred to as 'interaction unit' (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). The selection of a specific unit is performed according to certain

research criteria and following research interests. The classification criteria can reflect topic related, subject-specific, interactionist or linguistic research interests (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.).

General description

The general description is a spontaneous, superficial portrayal and depiction that describes the immanent semantic meaning of a speech unit. It addresses a competent audience that is interested in the topic is used to the cultural background of a specific speech situation. (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). Hence, a situation is analyzed on a very general level and the situation is assessed in general terms (Höck 2015: 189).

Detailed analysis of single utterances

Following a general description, the speech unit is analyzed in depth and on a sequential level. The final goal is to compile a number of alternative interpretations based on the organization and development of an interaction. It is essential to avoid everyday interpretations and allow several alternative interpretations that may differ from one another. The aim of this step is to develop various plausible interpretations of an utterance that can be based on different theoretical claims and, consequently, their plausibility is examined (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). This detailed analysis is not done in order to come up with a maximum number of possible interpretations but rather to compile a number of plausible interpretive approaches, which are assessed in the following step, in order to grasp the semantic content of a speech sequence (Brandt 2004: 52).

Turn-by-turn analysis

Following the principles of conversation analysis, a sequence of utterances of an interaction, also called the 'turns', are then analyzed in detail. A 'turn' defines one part of an interaction, which is hence examined precisely. A turn-by-turn analysis helps eliminate possible variants of interpretation, since one regards one speech turn and analyses speaker's reaction to one turn and the following evolution of topics in a conversation (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999: 68f.). Various

interpretations are, hence, tested in their plausibility after analyzing the interrelatedness of each turn with another turn (Höck 2015: 189).

Interpretive summary

The final step of an interactional analysis is comprised of a final summary of a all possible and most valid interpretation of a scene. The goal is to offer an overview of all ideas and to allow a development of theories afterwards.

The qualitative data analysis of the following part is based on Krummheuer's interactional analysis, since Krummheuer proposes a well-structured way how teaching sequences can be analyzed, which still leaves enough room, and also because he brings in aspects of various forms of conversation analysis and uses suitable. The data analysis focuses on four major points, which are the use of English as a lingua franca, the use of translations, the inclusion of first languages and the work in peer groups.

3.3 Possibilities and limitations

Even if the writing project sheds a new and positive light on the discussion of first languages and a working language in the German as a foreign language classroom, there are still some restrictions to it. Those limitations but also potential possibilities are presented in the following chapter.

The teaching sequence was carried out in a group of 6 students. In fact, it might have been advantageous to split the group and divide the students into two smaller groups, in which some language learners could have participated more and maybe could have given more input. It was evident that some group members were slightly intimidated by others, who could express themselves more fluently in German and were not scared of making any mistakes. Nevertheless, those students, who spoke more in the peer group, were also those who were more active in class and were always prepared to share their thoughts on a topic. Hence, the students all played different roles, as one student served as the time keeper, the other took notes, while another student brought in new ideas. Even though a peer writing project is usually

done by no more than three students at a time and the learners were, hence, not used to working on a long text with more than two other people, the group members cooperated well.

Moreover, the group took a lot longer to complete the text than expected. Actually, the task was taken from an ÖSD exam and the participants would have had 45 minutes in the best case to finish the complete text. The problem, however, was that the students were interrupted by the bell after about 40 minutes of intense group discussions. Also, I- as their language teacher- decided to intervene in order to inform the students that nearly half of their time had already passed, after the students had solely worked on the outline of their text. Hence, it would have been better to reserve more time for the task since the students could have spent more time discussing utterances and adding personal experiences. In fact, it was particularly difficult to find an appropriate moment to carry out the research project. In the end, I decided to use the opportunity as one final practice session for those students who were planning on doing the ÖSD exam the following week. All of the students appreciated the possibility to practice their writing skill together with their colleagues.

Nevertheless, the group did not seem to mind that the bell rang at the end of the writing process and they did not cease to have more and more ideas on the topic. In their peer group, they continuously wrote down more sentences, which they formulated as a group. Even at the end of the lesson, the students were engaged in a deep discussion on the topic. Hence, a possibility could be to give the students more time to finish the task, which would also result in a more data for analysis.

Since the present analysis does not consider the final text production, further research could focus on an analysis of the students' opinion comment. Moreover, it would be beneficial to have a parallel group of learners who have to stick to German and to then compare the results of the two groups. However, as a monolingual teaching setting would create an unnatural setting, it would be better to have various groups that participate in the writing process, which would in the end produce more comparable results. Also, the video material could be used for the purpose of analysis and presents interesting data.

Another problem that relates to the fact that six students participated in the group task, is that three students who speak the same first language, were participants in the research group. Additionally, they sat next to one another and, hence, switched to Slovakian more often than they might have done if they had sat apart. At the same time, it was actually the main goal of the whole teaching sequence to encourage a multilingual talk in the German as a second language classroom in order to facilitate the language learning process.

The fact that the students were not graded on their work proved to be advantageous on the one hand, as it created a rather relaxed atmosphere. On the other hand, some students were even more quiet than usual because they knew that their actions would not reflect on their grades. As a result, however, the language learners seemed to phrase their spontaneous thoughts immediately, focusing on fluency rather than accuracy.

Obviously, some students were not completely at ease since the camera was always present and they knew that they were recorded. In fact, the camera was placed in one corner at the back of the classroom in order to put focus on the writing task and not the fact that the camera was recording the whole writing process. From time to time, the students still looked at the technical device behind or in front of them. It was, nevertheless, stressed that the recording would solely be used for research purposes. Also, the students seemed to get more relaxed as time passed.

Another limitation was the fact that I myself was teaching the lesson. Without any doubt, it is difficult to get access to data of German as a second language classes. Hence, I was particularly lucky to have my own classes that I could use as my research groups. At the one hand, it was, hence, an advantage in that it facilitated my research, but on the other hand it was difficult to serve two roles at the same time: the teacher as well as the researcher. I have been teaching all German as a second language classes at my school ever since they were launched in 2016. I decided to carry out the study myself too, since I would have had to ask one of my colleagues, who the students do not know yet, to carry out the research project. As a consequence, there would have been even more observers in the room, as I would

have had to record the lesson nonetheless and would have been present both ways. Therefore, I decided to create a student-centered task, in which the language learners would work in their peer groups without needing any assistance. At the very beginning of the lesson, I explained my research project very briefly and also stressed that they would be working by themselves and should address me only if they could not come up with the answer themselves. In fact, I felt that the students felt, firstly, honored to be part of my research project and, secondly, in some ways responsible for the success of the writing project. Hence, they were all motivated to compile a good text and used English as well as some of their first languages automatically. They never asked whether they were allowed to use English during the task but they switched to their common lingua franca whenever it felt natural to them, which permitted them to advance further more quickly in their writing process.

3.4 Research ethics

The present research project follows the research ethical rules, which have been defined by Legutke and Schramm (2016: 109). Firstly, the research participants signed a consent form and agreed they will be filmed and that those video recordings will be solely used for research purposes. The students were informed about the research project and the general content of the study several weeks before the project was carried out. The school's headmaster was also informed and approved of the whole project.

Moreover, any names were anonymized in the data analysis. All participants of the research group were, as a first step, asked if they wanted to participate in the study and, finally, six of them volunteered to participate in the writing project. The corresponding data protection guidelines have been observed throughout the whole research project. Also, the study does not damage the participants in any ways and continuously considers the general rights of each participant (Schlömerkemper 2010: 51f.). After the approval of the headmaster as well as the participants and recording the writing process during a 'Sprachstartgruppe'-lesson, the recording was transcribed following the GAT conventions.

The data collection as well as the data analysis has been carried out by the same researcher to guarantee honesty and confidentiality (Dittmar 2009: 59f.). The data will not be published online to prevent unauthorized access.

Due to the fact that I have been teaching the research group for at least 8 months but I at the same time acted as the research director, I assumed a double role. It was, hence, particularly crucial for me to switch to the role of the researcher as soon as the writing process started in order to avoid an influence on the writing process. In order not to falsify the data, I did not communicate my research hypothesis or any other detailed information on my research project to my students, but instead I regarded them as my test subjects for the time of the experiment.

4 Results

The following chapter presents the results of the research project. This chapter is structured based on Schwab and Schramm's four steps of discourse analysis. It, hence, firstly, begins by presenting a description of the data collection process and, secondly, gives information on the data preparation. The third and most crucial part includes an interactional analysis, which is further divided into the five steps of Krummheuer's interactional analysis. As a first step, the classification of interaction units is presented and as a next step, it presents a detailed description of the writing process. It will then go on to analyze specific transcript extracts in detail. Finally, the interactional analysis includes an interpretive summary, which is combined with a theory formation, as it is called in Schwab and Schramm's discourse analysis.

Discourse analysis in general does not allow a strict differentiation between the presentation of results and their analysis, since the chosen transcription sequences are presented and at the same time analyzed. Hence, the following chapter proposes an analytical presentation of selected sequences of the writing project transcript.

4.1 The data collection process

The data was collected during a regular lesson of a remedial German as a second language classes at a Viennese AHS and consists of a transcription of an audio and video recording of a 46-minute teaching sequence. The research group is described in-depth in chapter 3.1 'Research context', followed by a description of the lesson sequence in chapter 3.2 'Lesson plan'.

In short, the research participants formed the B2 group of the remedial German classes, which were called 'Sprachstartgruppen' at that time. Those language classes were directed at any students who have just started learning German and should be prepared for participating in regular classes. For a detailed description of the concept, turn to chapter 3.1.1 'Sprachstartgruppen/Remedial language courses'. The language learners were, firstly, introduced to the idea of the planned research project, gave their consent to participate in the project on a voluntary basis and, in the end, six out of eight students came to class on June 14th 2018 when the research

project was carried out. The students agreed in advance that they would be recorded and filmed for research purposes only. Both the audio as well as the video recordings were used exclusively when creating a transcription of selected sequences. Within three quarters of an hour six German as a second language students created a German text. The final text production can be found in the attachment of the paper. It will, nevertheless, not be used as research data in the course of this paper, which solely relies on the lesson transcript and, hence, the writing process itself.

4.2 Data preparation

After realizing the writing project at school, the video as well as the audio recording of the teaching sequence served as a basis for the transcription of the conversation sequence. The video was used during the data preparation in order to identify who was speaking at what time and thereby facilitated the transcription process. It was, nevertheless, not analyzed in the course of this paper. In fact, the video was viewed several times before the students' utterances were finally transcribed. Thus, already the preparation of data includes some form of interpretation of the latter, since specific sequences were chosen in order to adapt the data preparation process to the research question and purpose (Langer 2010: 515).

After listening to the complete writing project, which lasted for 46 minutes, appropriate sequences were chosen for the ensuing transcription. The conversation was not transcribed as a whole, since the research tries to investigate instances of multilingualism, such as code-switching or the use of English as a lingua franca. As a consequence, occurrences of the previously mentioned multilingual strategies were chosen as suitable transcription sequences. The words were transcribed using the software EXMARaLDA, which was considered suitable for the purpose of the following analysis as it allows a detailed reconstruction of the conversation sequence.

A transcription of audio recordings has to follow certain rules in order to serve as valid data for further analysis and to guarantee equal readings of the same

transcription at different points in time (Mempel & Mehlhorn 2014: 148f.). Mempel and Mehlhorn (2014: 149) distinguish between minimal and fine transcriptions in this context. As the transcription serves as a basis for the analysis of a content analysis without examining phonetic phenomena, a minimal transcription was applied during the data preparation (Mempel & Mehlhorn 2014: 149). Moreover, it was chosen because of its simple usage, which also allows the reader to reconstruct and understand conversation sequences more easily.

The transcript follows GAT (short for Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem) conventions since GAT allows a detailed transcription of natural conversations and has been developed by “conversation analysts and interactional linguists” for the purpose of transcript compilations for linguistic research purposes (Selting et al. 2011: 1)

The basic transcription rules that have been applied during the transcription process follow GAT conventions and are summarized in the following table. One transcription symbol can only be related to one meaning in order to allow unambiguousness and a consistent analysis (Selting et al 2011: 5).

Any pauses are indicated using either ‘(.)’ for micro pauses, ‘(-)’ for short pauses, ‘(--)’ for intermediary pauses or ‘(---)’ for longer pauses. A description of non-verbal vocal actions is always indicated by two round brackets ‘(())’. An example of a non-verbal vocal action would be ‘((laughs))’ indicating that the person laughs out loud. The sign ‘(...)’ indicates that part of the transcript has been omitted. The final pitch movements are indicated by the following signs:

?	rising to high
,	rising to mid
-	level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low

If a word is stressed in particular the focus accent is presented using capital letters. An example would be the transcription of the word ‘*SYLLable*’, in which the accentuation lies on the first syllable and is indicated by capital letters. If a syllable

has an extra strong accent, it is indicated using two exclamation marks (e.g. '*!SYL!lable*'). If the word is lengthened, it is indicated by the sign ':' (e.g. '*ja:*'). Some utterances of the students' talk were unintelligible during the transcription process and are hence, either put in brackets if it was not clear whether the students said this particular word (e.g. *(calm)*) or specified as unintelligible passages by '*((unintelligible))*'.

Table 1: transcription conventions

((non-verbal action))	Non-verbal vocal action
(-)	short estimated pause
(--)	intermediary pause
(---)	longer pause
(())	description of any non-verbal vocal actions
(...)	omission of transcript
:	lengthening
=	fast intermediate continuation
?	rising to high
,	rising to mid
-	level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low
SYLlable	focus accent
!SYL!lable	extra strong accent
() or ((unintelligible))	unintelligible passage

In the transcription, the students' names are shortened and the speakers are named after their initial of their first name. Also, the turn by turn analysis includes sequences of the transcription as well as a line number. The complete transcription in text form as well as a detailed representation of the transcription made with EXMARaLDA, in which speech overlaps are represented, can be found in the appendix of this paper.

4.3 Interactional analysis

According to Schwab and Schramm (2016: 282) an interactional analysis of turns always has to be regarded from a holistic view and, hence, any line cannot be seen as an individual utterance but rather as part of a whole conversational context. For the purpose of analysis, specific interaction units of the students' conversation have been selected following the research interest. These sequences are, nevertheless, analyzed from a holistic perspective, taking the whole conversation into account. Therefore, a detailed lesson description is presented at the beginning of the following 'Results'. Thereafter the selected interaction units are analyzed following Krummheuer's interactional analysis.

4.3.1 Detailed lesson description

The following chapter presents a summary of the students' writing process on the basis of the audio recording of the teaching sequence. The text attempts to present the procedure in a neutral way. Any interpretations will be done in the subsequent chapters. The process description focuses on students' roles in the cooperative writing process and their use of multilingual strategies rather than a detailed rendering of the content of their communication.

The group of six German as a second language learners was instructed to write one text as a group and was also encouraged to use each other as resources and thereby cooperate with one another throughout the whole school year. The fact that they could use any language at their disposal has been clear to all of the students ever since and was, therefore, not mentioned explicitly. Any time the students created a writing production throughout the school year, they were also instructed to take no more than 45 minutes to write the text all in all and to take notes and create an outline before finally writing the text. The previous instructions were, hence, not given explicitly, since the students were familiar with the teaching method of cooperative writing. A clear explanation of the previous details is, however, of great importance to any students who write in groups for the first time. Shortly before the research project, the students were instructed that the whole writing process would

be filmed and recorded for research purposes only and would neither be published, nor did the result of the research project count into their grades.

On June 14th 2018 the students all gather in the 'German as a second language-room' of a Viennese AHS. The students then sit around two tables facing each other and, firstly, have a look at the writing prompt. At the beginning of the writing process the task is explained by the teacher. Then, the students read the text and the Slovakian students start speaking in their first language to one another. Soon Anna starts speaking in a mixture of Russian and Slovakian to the other girls. Before sitting down and returning to her observing role, the teacher asks what the students are talking about. The students laugh and explain that they have been translating the text prompt to Slovakian. Anna explains that she understands the Slovakian translation better than the German text prompt.

As a next step, Helena asks the others if they want to agree on one person who is going to take the role of the 'writer' during the whole project and volunteers to write the text herself. Her colleagues agree. Soon after, the students decide to compile an outline for the text before starting to write full sentences to gather ideas. One of the Slovakian students, Veronika, then volunteers to take notes for the whole group. The students then realize that they can use the knowledge they gained while watching another video in the previous German lesson and include the information they received in the text. They, firstly, revise everything they know about the topic and write it down.

Very soon three students evolve as the three main speakers in the discussion. One of those girls volunteered to be the writer of the final text and one of them was chosen as the note-taker. She notes down any interesting thoughts they have and helps the others to structure their ideas. The third 'main speaker' is also very active and continuously brings in new ideas. Throughout the whole process, I, as the students' teacher remain in the background and only answer one question at the very beginning of the writing process because the word is necessary to understand the whole writing prompt. The students do not know what the word 'Schlagzeile' means. They firstly ask one another but cannot come up with a translation and,

hence, ask me. I give them the translation, which Helena notes down on her text prompt.

As a next step, Anna reads the whole task to the whole group and they clarify all words. Then they decide that they will write the whole text from a group's perspective and realize that they all have to agree on one opinion. They agree that they want to compile a list of hard facts, which they will later use to weigh both advantages and disadvantages of their arguments.

Monika turns out to be the time keeper. She is the same student that comes up with the idea of a first brainstorming at the beginning of the writing process. After fifteen minutes of intense discussion and gathering ideas, she drops in and reminds the others that they do not have much time left. The notetaking student gives another example of when she feels stressed and the others agree with her. Helena student asks the others if they have any other experiences to share and they continue talking about their personal relation to stress and school. Helena also brings in a new aspect, which is malnutrition. As a next topic, they talk about lack of time, distractions and procrastination.

After that, the students turn to the third content point addressing their personal experiences, and Helena starts talking about her experience in relation to stress and after that the students start translating her ideas into German. Then she continues by asking the others if they have an opinion on the other two points. One of the Slovakian students repeats that she prefers to have an outline of the text first before phrasing the final sentences in German. Anna continues by talking about her own relation to the concept of stress and summarizes the situation in German, Alireza adds his thoughts. Veronika does not agree with them and gives reasons why she thinks differently. Monika talks about the situation in Slovakia as well. She switches to German at the end of her talk and summarizes everything in German. Helena encourages the others to summarize their views and mention advantages as well as disadvantages and, hence, including both views on the topic. The notetaker writes down a general version of their thoughts and the continue to give examples and phrase their sentence differently, using a mixture of English and German words.

After about 20 minutes, the teacher calls the students' attention to the fact that they should finish their planning phase in about 5 minutes to be able to finish the text. Until that point, the students have primarily worked on their text outline and have by now gathered numerous ideas and stated their attitudes towards the topic. Then they return to the idea that one of them is going to write the text while the others are going to phrase the sentences for her. From that point onwards, the group starts formulating full sentences, which the 'writer' writes down.

They phrase their first sentence and gather all the ideas they have been talking about previously. One student brings in a verb and then they all come up with the correct orthography of it. If they do not know a word in German, one of them provides the English translation. At one point, Anna says the word in Russian and the Slovakian students translate it to English for her. Then, they all come up with a German translation for it. One student seems to be the main creator of the text and the others add to her ideas. She gives most suggestions of how to phrase things and the others then reformulate things and correct her grammatical or vocabulary inaccuracies. Then the role of the main constructor of ideas switches from Anna to Veronika. She uses the notes, which she took during the first part of their writing process, to phrase the next sentences. They try to combine their thoughts and put in a lot of information in very short sentences. One of them repeatedly denies some of her colleagues' ideas because they are too long and they have to stick to their word limit of 120 words. Also, she repeats that they should address all three points in their text prompt.

They agree that they have been talking about the content point referring to their personal experience for too long and finally one student suggests that they could link their examples of stress they perceive to the consequences that are caused by stress in general and thereby link two points in order to save words. As a next step, they discuss on certain words that best express what they want to say and then construct their final text. The student's roles constantly change throughout the whole writing process. While one student serves as the translator at one point, the other one simultaneously gives input and summarizes previous thoughts. Yet

another student criticizes thoughts or mentions that things could be phrased differently, that one specific thought does not seem appropriate or does not express what the group is trying to say.

For the last 15 minutes, the group concentrates on formulating full sentences. One student repeats an idea that they had before, another student tries to formulate the idea in a full sentence, then translates the idea to English to be more explicit and finally they translate the whole sentence to German. They use primarily word chunks to compile their ideas. After about 35 minutes, the same student that played the role of the time keeper already at the beginning of the text production, counts the words and tells the others that they have just written 85 words all in all. After that they discuss the phrase 'from young age' and start making language transfers to come up with the correct formulation in German. The 'writer' of the text says everything she writes out loud before she writes it down, the others comment on her ideas and finally she writes the sentence. Meanwhile the others are quiet and give her time to finish the sentence. They are very productive in the last 10 minutes of the writing process and use all their notes and their text layout to bring in all ideas they talked about at the beginning.

35 minutes after they have finished reading their instructions, the bell rings. Even though the writing process exceeded the expected time that I thought would be appropriate for the students, I decided not to interrupt them at any point in their writing process but instead let them finish the whole text for the rest of the lesson. A rather quiet girl finally has a say and states that they should focus on one country instead of giving examples of each and every country they all come from. At the end of the writing process also those students who have been quiet before, bring in their final ideas and they all focus on giving an example of the situation in the United States. Finally, they decide on how they want to end their text and agree that they want to end their text with a recommendation on how people can avoid and counteract the current problems. They put their final thought into words and end the text as a group after a 45-minute writing process. At the end, they even apologize for the fact that it took them longer to write the text than expected but they all seem

content with the result. In fact, they even ask if they could have additional time in the following lesson to rewrite and finalize the text.

All in all, it can be said that the students constantly use the English language as a resource, by continuously switching from German to English. One student starts sharing an idea or an experience in English and switches to German while talking. In most cases, the students start speaking in German first, then switch to English, and finally they tend to summarize their thoughts in German in order to be able to use their ideas in their text outline. They share experiences concerning the topic that is addressed in the text prompt, they ask each other questions and they constantly switch from one language to another. If they stutter and do not know how to continue in German, they encourage each other to switch to another language.

In the end, the students write 130 words. The text as well as the students' first outline can be found in the appendix and will not be analyzed any further, since this paper's focus lies on the writing process itself rather than the final text production. In the subsequent part of the paper, the students' writing process will be analyzed with the help of an interaction and sequence analysis. Firstly, the method of analysis will be explained and as a next step the latter will be applied to key sequences in the students' dialogue.

4.3.2 The classification of interaction units

The first step of any interactional analysis involves a classification of suitable interaction units that will be further analyzed. Interaction units are classified according to criteria that are based on the research interest, which tries to investigate the use of English as a working language as well as students' first languages in a cooperative writing process.

For the purpose of analysis, three distinct criteria were created in order to facilitate the classification process. The first criterion addresses any instances, in which students use the English language as their working language during the writing process. The second category of instances that have been chosen for analysis are inclusions of students' first languages during the text production.

The following part of the interactional analysis will follow the steps of Krummheuer's interactional analysis and focuses on the detailed analysis as well as a turn-by-turn analysis of several chosen interaction units. After giving a detailed definition of where a certain multilingual strategy can be found, possible explanations are given with regards to why language learners chose a specific language at a particular moment in their conversation. Addressing one criterion at a time, firstly, incidents of English as a lingua franca are presented, and, secondly, examples of students' first language use are given.

4.3.3 An analysis: Instances of English as a lingua franca

At the very beginning of the school year, it became apparent that all learners, and especially those in the most advanced group were highly proficient speakers of English. Hence, the students have been encouraged to switch to English and use it as their working language whenever they felt the need to express something differently or whenever they could not phrase an utterance in German, which is their second language. Before the writing project, the students were shortly reminded that they did not have to stick to the German language just because they were filmed but that they should try to act similar to how they would if there was no camera and recording device. However, it was not stated explicitly that they should use English or any other language. In general, it can be said that the language learners switched to English on a regular basis during the writing process. The following analysis presents sequences, in which English is used as a lingua franca in the above-described cooperative writing process.

Do we know who's gonna write?

The first example of the use of English as a working language is taken from the initial discussion of who is going to be the writer during the writing process. Helena asks her colleagues who is going to be the writer and then volunteers to write the final lines because nobody else wants to do it.

Transcript extract line 18-27

- 18 H: **do we know who_s gonna write?**
19 M: **no.**
20 V: **I just don_t want to write.**
21 S: **I don_t too.**

22 H: **like (.) I can write. you can tell me what to say what to write.**
 23 S: okay.
 24 M: okay (.) **great.**
 25 V: ja.
 26 H: **my hand writing isn_t that pretty either. (.) so: (-)**
 27 V: **yeah- so: (.) mmmh:**

After figuring out the meaning of the text prompt, Helena immediately starts by organizing the cooperative writing project and each individual's task of the writing process, and does so in English. One interpretation of the present interaction unit could, hence, be that she chooses the English language when trying to put things into order.

The previous sequence of the writing process will be presented in the second part of the analysis, where instances, in which students use their first languages are presented. As a short summary: Before Helena asks her initial question, the three Slovakian students and Anna discuss the meaning of the text prompt in a mixture of Slovak and Russian. Since Helena does not speak any of the languages that are spoken by her colleagues, she contributes to the process by volunteering as the writer and switches to English so that everybody can participate in the discussion. Also the subsequent part of the conversation is performed in English. Helena, hence, addresses every group member of the group by starting to speak English, which is the only language they all speak fluently, and thereby opens up the discussion.

Do you think how to begin it?

After choosing the two people who are going to write, the students start gathering ideas. Helena comes up with the thought that they could actually use the content of a video they've seen recently as input for the text. Anna then asks her colleagues if they know a proper beginning for the text but Helena refers back to their initial thought of creating a text outline first.

Transcript extract line 34-51

34 H: **yeah- but maybe we can use the video that we watched before?**
 35 V: yeah.
 36 H: **we can use some information of the video.**
 37 V: **so (.) like connect this too.**

38 A: **do you think how to begin it? or:?**
 39 H: immer mehr kinder und jugendliche erkranken an atresssymptomen;
 40 V: ((thinks)) ja:. aha.
 41 A: **do you think how to begin it or?**
 42 V: yeah (.) **just just the notes.**
 43 H: yeah. **just like a gliederung sort of like a (.) so what_s that called?**
 44 V: yeah (.) **so I can do the (-)g l i e d e r u n g. (-) ah (.) so (.)**
 sch- schlechtes, schlechtes essen.
 45 H: a:hm- er: (.) er (.) ernährung?
 46 V: ah. ahja das.
 47 A: so, **are we allowed to use this one or not?**
 48 H: ja.
 49 A: okay, **we have that.**
 50 M: okay. (---)
 51 V: okay. da:nn (.) ah: (.) sie hat gesagt- dass fünf prozent von;

In this sequence, the students use English to organize themselves and to be able to get started. As soon as they turn to the content of the text, they switch to German immediately. Even though Helena expresses her first idea in German, Anna still switches back to English when trying to create an introduction to the text and to find out what their plan is. One reason for the predominant use of English at the beginning of the writing process might be that the students want to get to the main part of the exercise, writing a text in German, as quickly as possible and, therefore, perform organizational tasks in English because it requires less time.

Surprisingly, Helena switches back to German when she talks about the structure of the text. She does not refer to the word 'outline' in English but instead uses the German word for it, which is also taken up by Veronika who uses it naturally. This can be regarded as one of numerous examples of code-switching, which the students use on a regular basis. The mix of two languages is not even questioned by the students but they combine both languages to express their thoughts appropriately. Also, the use of German words in an English sentence shows students learn vocabulary that are common technical terms in normal classes very quickly. Hence, one explanation to why language learners switch from one language to another is that they know specific words in one language but others in another.

In short, they agree on specific tasks and organize themselves in English and switch to German when talking about the content of the text. Thereby they save time and make sure that everybody can follow the conversation. Also, code-switching is a natural phenomenon during the writing project. The language learners speak English and then code-switch to German naturally, and consciously speak German when referring to the final content of their text. Thus, they use the English language as a scaffold to, firstly, grasp the meaning of the writing task and, secondly, organize themselves, assign roles and develop a plan.

But in my land it's like this.

Another instance where English is used to plan how they are going to go about and what they are going to do is the following extract. Helena suddenly switches to English when she explains her plan of how they are going to include their personal experiences in the text. Anna continues Helena's thought in English and suddenly switches to German when she says that they are going to move from hard facts to personal opinions. Finally she switches back to English.

Transcription extract line 81-91

- 81 V: also, wollen wir das zuerst? also, (--)
82 H: zuerst- oder irgendwo in der (-)
83 V: ich weiß nicht.
84 M: das ist frage. ((laughs))
85 H: ahm, **we can use the facts to back up our opinions.**
86 V: yah:..
87 H: **yeah, I mean I was thinking that we have a couple of facts
written down (.) hard facts (.) and then we (.) we formulate our
opinion. and then (.) put that in our text to back up our opinion.**
88 V: yeah.
89 A: **on the one hand but on the other hand (.) and, and so on. and
then after that we could (.) we could take these facts but after
the facts we could tell about persönliche erfahrungen. and we
could (.) but in my land it_s like this. yeah?**
90 H: exactly.
91 V: yeah.

This example proves that the students are, in fact, perfectly fluent in English. Even though the participants speak German at the beginning of the interaction unit, Helena suddenly switches to English and also gets a spontaneous reaction from Anna who elaborates her thought. By using English, they come up with a detailed plan very quickly at the beginning of the writing process. The fact that they code-switch from English to German and not just from their first language to English or German also proves their heightened multilingual competence.

Leistungsdruck, was heißt das?

However, the English language is not solely used for the purpose of organizing the group and sharing personal experiences at the beginning of the writing process. The students' shared lingua franca is also utilized when students cannot come up with a definition of a word in German. Anna does not know the word 'Leistungsdruck' and, therefore, Monika tries to explain it to her in German. Apparently she has difficulties formulating a definition in German and, hence, switches to English to explain what the word means. Helena then provides the English translation to it.

Transcript extract line 97-103

- 97 M: okay (.) die zweite.
98 A: leistungsdruck (.) was heißt das?
99 V: ich weiß nicht. ((laughs))
100 M: das ist ahm, wenn ahm. **you have to do it, you have to do it, you have to do it.**
101 A: aha (.) okay.
102 H: **I don_t know what you_d call that in english but ahm but like pressure**
103 M: ja (.) **pressure. (.)and if you don_t will do it. you will fail. you (-) !so bad!**

It can be concluded that the inclusion of English as a working language also facilitates the explanation of new words that can easily be defined in the students' lingua franca. Instead of looking up the word in a dictionary, the communication is maintained by a definition in English, which does not seem to present a difficulty for any student. The opportunity to phrase things in English, enables the students to draw from their existing knowledge and thereby develop their multicompetence

further. The previous interaction unit can be defined as a prime example of translanguaging.

Another thing that is important to note is that Monika is usually very quiet and shy student but she still takes the stage when she has something to say and takes her time to do so. Also, she often switches between German, Slovak and English, and, hence, uses any languages at her disposal. This could be explained by the fact that she struggled a lot at the beginning of the school year because the other students were used to talk in German, while she was solely used to practicing German grammar and translating new words. The possibility of mixing languages, hence, gave her confidence and encouraged her that translations show multicompetence and do not have to be avoided in the language learning classroom.

I do have these Prüfungen in zwei Wochen.

Many instances of the use of English show that the students are perfectly capable of using the multilingual technique of code-switching. Veronika's short monologue might be regarded as a prime example of code-switching.

Sonia asks the other if they want to talk about their experiences. Helena goes in medias res by asking the others if they feel stressed at the moment and switches to English at that point. When Veronika then answers that she feels stressed constantly she switches from one language to another but does so in a very natural way. Anna then continues by saying that people do not take care of themselves and suddenly switches between English and German. She laughs and states that she has just created a 'denglisch' word. At the end of the interaction unit, the students discuss the verb 'leiden', its orthography as well as its meaning.

Transcript extract line 105-119

- 105 S: also? unsere erfahrungen?
106 H: **who here is stressed?**
107 V: **I am. (.) the last three months my hands are constantly shaking.**
108 A: **EVERYone.**
109 (...)
110 H: **are you stressed all the time or are you stressed at certain times?**

111 V: **like at certain times it_s worth but it_s constant. it_s still there. I still feel that yes (.) I do have** diese prüfungen in zwei wochen und deswegen ur **stressed** (.) also (,) ja. und schon sehr lange. aber wenn ich dazu etwas mache (.) also lerne oder so (.) dann geht es besser. (.) aber **when I procrastinate it_s like I_m SO stressed.**

112 (...)

113 A: **people** passen auf sich nicht auf. ((laughs)) denglisch.

114 (...)

115 A: heutzutage leisten viele leute unter stress

116 V: oder lei, lei, leiden

117 H: leiTen? (.) oder?

118 V: leiden. (.) **like to suffer.**

119 A: mhm.

While Sonia tries to stick to German at the beginning of the sequence and asks her colleagues if they wanted to talk about their experiences with regards to stress, Helena switches to English again. This might be explained by the fact that she wants to quickly exchange experiences, or that the topic of stress is emotionally important. The most interesting part of this extract is Veronika's monologue, in which she switches from English to German, uses an English word and then finally says her final thought in English. She does so in a very natural manner and everybody seems to understand her, since they all react to her thoughts. Anna, on the other hand, also uses an instance of code-switching but she immediately analyses what she said by referring to her utterance as 'Denglisch'.

Hence, code-switching is an established multilingual strategy, in which students switch from one language to another naturally and still continue their thoughts. Also, by including both English and German in one speech utterance, speakers make sure that they are understood by everyone. In line 118, Veronika translates the verb 'suffer' to German and thereby fosters mutual understanding. Further instances of code-switching will not be elaborated but can be found in the text transcript in the appendix. In line 97, 140, 153, 179, 187, 222, 274 and 278 one of the research participants uses the code-switching technique, to name just a few.

A summary

In short, the first part of the interactional analysis reveals that English is used as a lingua franca in numerous instances throughout the whole writing process. Students switch to their shared working language whenever they feel the need to express themselves more eloquently and more quickly. In fact, the use of English as a lingua franca is primarily detectable at the beginning of the writing process when the students figure out who is going to assume what role and when gathering ideas. The use of English might, therefore, firstly be explained by the fact that the students can phrase ideas differently and in a more complex way when using their lingua franca as a tool. Secondly, they might speak English because they knew they had a limited time to complete the task and, hence, wanted to save time. Also, they used it to discuss the German language from a different angle and thereby took important steps towards multicompetence.

4.3.4 An analysis: Instances of L1

Turning now to the use of students' first languages during the writing process. As explained in the general description of the method and the research group, the students speak four different first languages. Helena speaks Spanish as her L1, Anna speaks Russian, Alireza speaks Persian and Monika, Sonia as well as Veronika share their L1, which is Slovak. Usually there are two more students who come to class on a regular basis. Those two students speak Persian and Chinese. What can be concluded from the use of first languages in previous remedial German as a second language classes, those students who speak the same language, talk to each other in their L1 frequently. Those students who do not have any colleagues who speak their first languages, either use their phones or switch to English if they do not know a word or cannot express a certain thought in German. How often participants of the peer group use their first languages in the writing process will be analyzed in the following chapter.

I understand their translation better than it's written here.

The first sequence that has been chosen for further analysis is taken from the very beginning of the writing process. The teacher gives final instructions on the text prompt. The students read through the text and discuss the meaning of the text

prompt in Slovak. Anna asks them a Russian question and after I interrupted them and asked them what they are discussing, they explain that are translating the quotes into their first language to understand the instructions.

Transcript extract Line 1-17

- 28 T: das ist eure aufgabenstellung. lest es euch durch. schaut_s es euch mal an und dann habt ihr zeit darüber zu sprechen. ja. ((walks away))
- 29 A: that doesn_t look frankly. ((laughs))
- 30 H: yeah; no it doesn_t.
- 31 S: **dobre. (unintelligible slovak) (ked sa kontakt na)**aha- okay (.) okay.
- 32 M: **(unintelligible slovak)**
- 33 V: **(unintelligible slovak) šťastitický: ah- (vozne:) (unintelligible slovak)**
- 34 A: **chto vstrecha?** ((laughs))
- 35 V: aha; ((laughgs)) **(expresné) (unintelligible slovak) pozitívne concurrent-**
- 36 A: **ze konkurencia pozitíva i negatíva?**((laughs))
- 37 V: ja. ((laughs))
- 38 T: worüber sprecht ihr gerade?
- 39 A: ((laughs))
- 40 M: ((laughs))
- 41 S: ((laughs))
- 42 V: ((laughs)) wir sozusagen wir (.) we_re translating the text.ja. (.) so, we kind of like put it together like what we're gonna write about.
- 43 T: AH- okay.
- 44 A: sie (.) so (.) I try to understand the translation because I understand their translation better than it_s written here. so (.) ((laughs)).

A detailed analysis of the present interaction units can lead to several interpretations. The students firstly get an instruction from the teacher saying that they should read through the text prompt and that they have time to talk about what they will be writing about in the text afterwards. Thereby the students are encouraged to discuss the topic first, before starting the writing process. Shortly after that Anna says that the text does not look “frankly” to her. This could either mean that the quotes on the prompt do not appear to be honest to her, or that she does not understand the whole meaning of the instructions on the prompt. As it

turns out, she refers to the fact that she does not understand the meaning of some words because she admits later on that she understands the Slovak translation better.

Subsequently, the three Slovakian students start discussing something in Slovak. Unfortunately, they speak very quietly so that only some words are clear. The comprehensible parts suggest that they are discussing the meaning of certain words. Veronika seems to translate the text word by word and her two colleagues add words or translations in Slovak when she makes a longer pause. One explanation for the use of the students' first language in this context might be that they compile a Slovak translation of the German text prompt in order to understand the text. It might also be possible that Veronika already understands the text but is trying to help the other two girls by translating whole sentences for them. Since both Monika and Sonia help Veronika by adding some translations when she does not know the Slovak word either, it seems that the translation is rather a group work that helps each and every one of them. Surprisingly, Anna interferes as well and asks the three Slovak speakers a question in Russian, which they seem to understand since they all start to laugh. In this context, Anna seems to use her first language, firstly, because she wants to participate in the conversation and, secondly, because she needs assistance in order to understand the text prompt.

After that, I decided to ask the students what they were talking about and interfere one last time in the writing process, after explaining the whole cooperative writing task. Veronika then confirms what I had expected in the first place, namely that they have been discussing the meaning of the text prompt. Anna adds that she understands the Slovak translation better than the German text prompt. Hence, the students use their first languages to translate the instructions on the text prompt and to be able to start the writing process after all. Without any doubt the Slovakian students are in favor in this situation, since they can serve as each other's translators. The other students do not interfere or ask questions while the Slovakian girls are discussing the meaning of the instructions. This might be explained by the fact that they either know all of the words and understand the quotes or because they do not have a partner to share their thoughts in their first language. In Helena's

case the first explanation seems to apply because she soon after asks her colleagues who is going to write the text and brings in ideas right from the beginning. Alireza, on the other hand, stays extremely calm throughout the whole writing process. This might be due to the fact that he did not discuss the meaning of the writing prompt with anybody.

In short, the first instance of an inclusion of students' first language occurs at the beginning of the writing process. The students use their first languages to get a better understanding of what is asked in the writing task. Unfortunately a complete summary of what they students are saying in their L1 cannot be presented, since they, firstly, talk quietly and, secondly, speak at the same time.

But we have the dobrovoleč.

Another instance of the inclusion of the students' L1 can be found in line 32 and 33. Monika and Sonia communicate with one another in Slovak while the other girls are speaking in English and when Anna uses what at first listening appears to be a mixture of Slovak and Russian to address the three Slovak girls. Anna switches from English to Croatian when the students have decided on who is going to be the writer of the text and the note-taker. Helena then suggests that they could make a list of ideas before writing the whole text. While Helena and Veronika are figuring out what the first content point asks them to do, Monika and Sonia mumble something intelligible in Slovak.

Transcript extract Line 28-33

- 28 A: but we have the **dobrovoleč**. ((laughs))
29 M: so (.) we just have to have a meinung.
30 H: should we make a list first of what we want to put in,
31 V: yeah. I can make a list if you want. like but (.) ahm (.) häh? it
would be great if we had a text because this is like yeah, there
are-?
32 M: <whispers (unintelligible slovak)>
33 S: <whispers (unintelligible slovak)>

Anna uses the word dobrovoleč, which is the Croatian translation for the word 'volunteer' as soon as the group has decided on who is going to be the note-taker in the writing process. The Slovak (dobrovol'ník) as well as the Russian (dobrovolets)

words are very similar to the Croatian translation. It might be that she uses the Croatian word for volunteer because she does not know the meaning of the English or German word. Another, probably more plausible explanation is that Anna wants to relate to the Slovak speaking students, who are very active in the conversation. She even tries to come up with a Croatian translation, which she most likely mistakes for the Slovak translation of the word volunteer in order to show them that she speaks a similar language to theirs. What is striking is that she always laughs after using Russian, Slovak or Croatian words, which suggests that she is either insecure while doing so or tries to evoke sympathy from her Slavic colleagues. Other instances when Anna switches to Slavic languages will be presented in the next transcript sequences.

While Helena and Veronika continue discussing what they are going to do first and what the different content points require them to do in English, Monika and Sonia start mumbling in the background. Unfortunately neither the audio nor the video recording allow a word by word transcription of what they say. When looking at the video of the sequence, it becomes apparent that the two are discussing the meaning of some words since they point to different words on their handout and thereby seem to reconstruct their meaning. After a while, they stop and start listening to the others. In fact, this is the only time that two discussion are going on at the same time even though parallel conversations might indeed be expected when a group of six learners is asked to write a text together. They all seem to respect each other and in most of the cases even wait until the other person has finished his or her thought before answering or reacting to an utterance.

The previous transcript sequence, hence, shows two different cases of the students' L1 use in the writing process. In the first case, Anna tries to use a Slavic language in order to become part of the conversation and in the second example, Sonia and Monika start discussing the meaning of some words, using a very low volume in order to understand the instructions better, and will, as a consequence, become more active in the subsequent writing process.

Jap. Presne.

Other instances of Anna's code-switching technique can be found in the following transcription extracts. The first one is taken from a discussion between Anna and Veronika, in which Anna and Veronika try to come up with the correct pronunciation and stress pattern of the word 'Anforderung'.

Transcription extract line 53-59

- 53 A: die leisten unter druck oder sowas,
54 V: aha.
55 A: oder die anfor (.) oder die anFORderung an der schule ist zu
hoch. (--)
56 V: erforder (ung)? nein! ja!
57 A: an (.) anforderung. an FOR derung.
58 V: jap. (.)
59 A: **presne.** ((laughs))

Anna tries to summarize her colleagues' thoughts in German and is not sure which syllable is stressed in the word 'Anforderung'. Veronika finally confirms that she pronounced and stressed the word correctly and after that Anna uses the Slovak word 'presne' when reacting to Veronika's consent. The word means 'exactly' in English and proves Anna's well developed language skills in other Slavic languages and could also be explained by the fact that she appreciates Veronika's comment on the question that she asked before. Again, Anna laughs when saying the word.

Students, thus, use each other as resources and give each other feedback on their pronunciation and vocabulary accuracy. Also, students' first language is used to strengthen a relationship between speakers.

Es gibt sehr viele...wie sagt man das? Příčina?

The following extract shows an example when Anna uses another Slavic language, this time Czech. In this interaction unit, Helena summarizes the group's thoughts in English and then asks her colleagues how she should phrase it in German. Anna starts an English summary of Helena's sentence and then translates it to German. When she does not know the German word for 'cause', she uses the Czech word for it, which is 'příčina'.

Transcription extract line 121-129

121 H: nowadays, there_s a lot of stress for people (.) ähm caused by
school, by work (.) sports, lack of sleep, malnutrition. like, how
should I formulate that sentence?
122 A: there are a lot of uh, I don_t know-
123 H: causes.
124 V: ja. es kann, es kann,
125 A: es gibt sehr viele (.) wie sagt man das? **příčina?**
126 V: ja- ah (.)
127 H: gr- grunde.
128 V: !GRÜNDE! ja (.) genau.
129 A: genau.

Interestingly, this extract shows the importance of including several languages in the writing process. Even though Helena gives the English word and thereby completes Anna's sentence in line 32 and 33, Anna does not react to Helena's comment, either because she did not perceive what Helena said or because she did not know the English word 'cause'. Therefore, she uses her multilingual competence and comes up with a word that her Slovak colleagues might know. Together, they develop the same translation that Helena presented at the very beginning of the extract and finally they are all content because they can say exactly what they want to say because they have been working on the translation as a team. In fact, this represents a prime example of multilingual dialogues in which students completely exploit their multilingual competence and cooperate to phrase thoughts precisely. Also, this is one of the first examples of when the language learners discuss a German word on a meta-level.

I say 'from a low age' in Slovak.

Another example of a discussion of a phrase on a meta-level can be found in the following extract. The students try to summarize their thoughts on health problems that young people have to face. Helena starts by phrasing her thought in English. Veronika tries to translate the phrase and Anna completes her thoughts. Veronika is not sure about a certain collocation in German and compares it to the saying in Slovak. Anna does the same with Russian and finally they come up with a final phrase in German.

Transcription extract line 222-249

222 H: people start having health problems and sleeping problems from a young age.
223 V: (beginnen von Problemen von jung Alter haben) haben diese prob, haben die;
224 A: bekommen diese probleme. (...)
236 V: schon von sehr- (---)
237 A: jungen alter? nein.
238 H: kleines alter? **nízky** (unintelligible)? (-) niedriges alter?
239 A: (-) (**unintelligible russian**) (.) **slovatskiy- slovenskiy- russkiy** (**unintelligible russian**) (**tak to bolo**) (wir haben was anderes),
240 S: a to je- (**unintelligible slovak**)
241 (...)
242 V: oder zum beispiel, jede von unsere gruppe can contact with this.<mumbles (**unintelligible slovak**)>
243 A: <mumbles (**unintelligible german**)>
244 S: hat schon (---) hat schon mit- mit stress ah getroffen (---)
245 H: <mumbles (**unintelligible german**)> von dem jungen alter? (---) von einem jungen alter.
246 V: aha;
247 A: von jungem alter. von jungem (---) von (---) wie sagt man das über über alter? wir sagen dass (.) das (.) nicht niedrig (oder hoch)-
248 H: vo- because you say from A young age. not from young age.
249 V: ja aber zum bei (---) for example I say from a (-) low age in slovak. oh it_s SO; it_s so different but I think german is more related to english than to us.

Veronika is not sure whether she uses the correct phrase that refers to the English collocation of 'low age' in German. She suddenly starts comparing the saying in different languages. At that point she starts using all languages at her disposal to come up with the correct phrase and even states that some languages are more related than others in line 249. Anna and Helena also participate in the discussion and compare the same phrase to how things are constructed in their first language and English. In fact the discussion becomes very lively and unfortunately cannot be transcribed word by word as some parts are intelligible.

All in all, it has to be noted that the inclusion of students' first languages in the best case leads to a metalinguistic understanding of the concept of language itself.

Students start to benefit from and at the same time trust their linguistic competence expertise. Thus, students compare languages and intuitively use a language they know in order to be able to express what they want to say in German.

A summary

In fact, only three of the research participants could rely fully on their first language during the writing process. Those are the three students that, in the end, use their first language most often. They do not hesitate to ask their classmates questions in Slovakian or translate something to Slovakian to make things clearer. Another student, who speaks Russian as her first language, suddenly also starts communicating with the three Slovakian language learners, in what appears to be a mixture of Russian, Slovakian as well as other Slavic languages.

Since Helena grew up speaking Spanish but has been living in the United States before coming to Austria and went to school there, the English language could actually also be regarded as her first language. In fact, she grew up speaking Spanish and then moved to the United States where she learnt English as her second language when she was in secondary school. Hence, she is a lot more used to speaking English in an education context than any of the other participants. The last student, who is also the quietest one in the whole discussion does not get a chance to use his first language and he also solely sticks to the German language when addressing the others.

The inclusion of students' L1 can, hence, either act as a form of scaffolding if a student does not yet know a word in German or it can also encourage a metalinguistic view on language itself. Four out of six students continuously utilize their L1 when code-switching or translating from English or German.

4.4 An interpretive summary

Unfortunately not all instances of multilingual language strategies that are used during the writing project can be analyzed in the present paper due to a limited amount of pages. A transcription of the most important instances of language

switches, metalinguistic discussions or first language utterances can be found in the appendix. Some prime examples for all the multilingual techniques that are used in the course of the writing process are represented in the short and final transcript extract.

Lösung!

The students try to come up with a final sentence for their text. Helena makes a suggestion that is further developed by Veronika. Anna brings in another idea and cannot come up with the German word for 'solution'. Veronika tries to help her by providing a Slovak translation, which apparently helps Anna to find the German word. Helena then combines all thoughts into the last sentence of the text.

Transcript extract line 273-283

273 H: let_s (.) let_s save ourselves from shaking hands. and- (--)
274 V: eh: (.) or: we could like (-) we could write an empfehlung. find
what you like (-) find what you find relaxing.
275 H: we can- we can-
276 H: cause everybody needs their beauty sleep. ((thinks))
277 V: !oh yes!
278 A: everyone can find a solution for- für sich selbst.
279 V: ja (.) ja (.) jeder kann eine riešenie (---)
280 A: lösung, lösung, !lösung!
281 V: !lösung!; <<laughs> solution?> ja;((laughs))aber ich glaub-
282 S: warum nicht?
283 H: ah (-) jeder muss seine lösung ah: seine eigene lösung-

Firstly, Veronika uses a German word in an English sentence in line 274. She then continues speaking in English. Helena answers in English but Anna suddenly brings in a German phrase at the end of her utterance. Veronika reacts to her thought in German but uses the code-switching technique in order to include the Slovak word riešenie when she cannot come up with the German translation to 'solution'. The Russian speaking Anna understands the Slovak word and then answers by giving the German translation to the word. Finally, Helena summarizes the whole idea in German and writes down the sentence.

The writing project proves that especially at the beginning of the writing process, the language learners switch to English on a regular basis. While discussing who is going to be the writer of the whole text or gathering ideas on the topic, the English language is used continuously. Also, the meaning of the instructions that are given on the students' text prompt is depicted with the help of the English language. Hence, the students' shared working language seems to make up an important part of the first section of the writing process, in which organizational choices are prevalent and the task itself is clarified.

As soon as the students have gathered enough ideas, they switch to German and use their second language almost continuously. However, they still include some instances of English when discussing the meaning of words or if they are not sure whether a special phrase is correct. Hence, they use their working language to discuss the meaning of words, ask each other questions on the pronunciation or spelling of difficult vocabulary and define complex words. Also, this allows them to view phrases or saying from a metalinguistic level and thereby they continuously develop their personal multicompetence and metalinguistic awareness.

Similar rules seem to apply for the use of students' first languages. It has to be stressed that in the present study, only three out of six students can draw from their existing language skill, since nobody else speaks their language. Nevertheless, the three Slovakian students take the opportunity and talk to each other using their first language especially at the beginning, when trying to figure out the instructions on the text prompt. After that, they do not talk to one another in their first language anymore but instead use English to address the whole group if they do not know a word or phrase in German. As a consequence, English is obviously used more often than any other language. This might be due to the fact that the students want everybody to be able to participate in a discussion. Interestingly, first languages are not solely used to share ideas and discuss meanings but also to be able to join a conversation.

Other sequences, in which the students include their first languages in the writing project are when the meaning of a word or phrase is discussed. The language

learners prove to be skilled and trained multilinguals by comparing languages to one another and reflecting on language differences. This contributes to a positive development of the language learners' metalinguistic awareness.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

In this paper, I propose a new method of foreign language writing in the German as a second language classroom and examine the use of students' first languages and their lingua franca English in a cooperative and multilingual writing process. The main concern of the paper was to investigate the frequency and cause of multilingual structures. It has been found that students use multilingual strategies, such as code-switching, translanguaging or translating repeatedly.

The sequential analysis of the lesson transcript addressed not only instances of L1 use, but also the inclusion of English as a working language. To my knowledge, it is the first research project to investigate the inclusion of English as a lingua franca in the German as a second language classroom. Research on foreign and second language teaching often proposes the use of children's first languages as a way to reduce language barriers, but thereby presupposes that the students share the same first languages (Cummins 2008: 67; Brooks & Donato 1994: 268). Cook (2001: 417) clearly states advantages of using students' first languages as scaffolds, but is at the same time aware of its limitations to a rather homogenous language classroom, where students speak similar first languages.

Donovan and Bransford (2005: 4) even view language learners' L1 as a "foundation" for further language learning, but still do not consider the fact that students are competent speakers of more languages than their L1. After analyzing the continuous use of English as a working language, it is crucial to note that multilingual language strategies do not have to be limited to students first languages. Hence, the present study offers unprecedented evidence for the use of English as a working language in the German as a second language classroom and widens our knowledge of the usefulness of including multilingualism in language teaching.

Even though, the study presents a novel solution to language barriers in the multilingual language classroom, the results are not conclusive, and several questions remain unanswered. Hence, further research on the inclusion of English in

the German as a foreign language classroom is needed in order to develop further teaching methods that support multilingual students in their language acquisition process and prove the benefits of English as a lingua franca by analyzing comparative empirical studies.

5.2 Summary

Multilingualism is a constant in the German as a second language classroom of the 21st century. An ever increasing number of children grow up bi- or multilingually, speaking two or even more languages. In the school year 2017/18 one out of three students in an Austrian AHS (short for Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule) spoke a different first language than German (Garnitschnig 2019). In reaction to this growing linguistic diversity in Austrian schools, the ministry of education introduced remedial German classes, which they called 'Sprachstartklasse' in October 2016. Those additional language classes were aimed at language learners who have just arrived in Austria and who did not speak German sufficiently well to be able to participate in regular classes. The research interest of the present study evolved in such German as a second language course.

According to research (De Angelis 2007: 3; Cenoz 2013: 10; Jessner 2006: 42) multilingual language learners can benefit from their multicompetence if they develop multilingual awareness and recognize their multilingual language skills. They can even outdo their peers if they are taught to utilize the language learning strategies they developed when learning their first language and thereby learn how to exploit their existing potential. To date, the German as a second language classes have focused on a development of students' multicompetence by including first languages in language learning activities. The fact that most learners speak different first languages but share one common working language with their colleagues is often disregarded. In fact, most German as a second language learners are proficient speakers of English, which they have learnt as their first foreign language and could, thus, benefit from a shared working language.

The present paper addresses the research question if German as a second language learners include their shared lingua franca English, or their first languages in a cooperative writing process. The research group was composed of six German as a second language learners who have been going to school in Austria for one or two years. They all spoke different first languages but shared one working language: English. In the course of a multilingual and cooperative writing process, they had 45 minutes to phrase their opinion in form of a comment. Their German text should have 120 words and they could use any languages at their disposal. With the consent of the language learners, the writing process was filmed and recorded.

After the research project was carried out in a German as a second language class of a Viennese AHS in June 2018, the audio recording was transcribed following the GAT transcription rules and using the transcription program EXMARaLDA. Important sequences of the latter transcription were subsequently analyzed following Krummheuer's (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999) interactional analysis as well as Schwab and Schramm's (2016) transcription conventions. The interaction analysis tried to answer the research question by noting any interaction units, in which English or students' first languages were utilized in the peers' writing process.

The results show that German as a second language learners use English as their working language in the writing process on a regular basis, but they also refer to their first languages in several points of their conversation. Especially at the beginning of the writing process, the language learners speak in their common lingua franca in order to exchange ideas on how they want to structure their text and a group of four out of six students switches to their first languages when trying to figure out the meaning of the instructions of the writing task. In the course of the lesson sequence, the students also apply multilingual strategies, such as code-switching or 'translanguaging' in order to phrase their thoughts and ideas in a different way. Moreover, they discuss linguistic structures and compare collocations or vocabulary using English as their working language. Thereby they arrive at meta-level examinations and investigations from a multilingual's point of view. To put it in a nutshell, five out of six German as a foreign language students make use of English

as their working language, but also include their first languages when writing their text in a peer group.

This research project has clearly shown that it is about time to change language teacher's as well as language learners' views on the inclusion of other languages apart from the target language in the German as a second language classroom. It was the main purpose of the paper to draw attention to the valuable use of English as a lingua franca in the German as a second language classroom. Clearly, further research will be needed to determine the direct effects of the inclusion of English as a lingua franca and the advantages of switching to students' first languages. Nonetheless, it can be concluded that multilingual cooperative writing creates a learning environment that enables language learners to recognize their existing multicompetence and develop multilingual awareness, which facilitates their language learning process further.

6. German Summary

Mehrsprachigkeit ist in der globalisierten, vernetzten Welt des 21. Jahrhundert eine Konstante. Im Schuljahr 2017/18 sprach einer von drei Schülern und Schülerinnen in österreichischen allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen eine andere Erstsprache als Deutsch (Garnitschnig 2019). Als Reaktion auf die sprachliche Diversität an Österreichs Schulen führte das Bildungsministerium im Schuljahr 2016/17 Sprachstartgruppen ein, die sich an jene Schüler und Schülerinnen richteten, die erst vor kurzem nach Österreich gekommen waren und die nicht ausreichend gut Deutsch sprachen, um dem regulären Unterricht folgen zu können, und somit den außerordentlichen Status erhalten hatten. Das Forschungsinteresse der vorliegenden Masterarbeit entstand im Zuge des Deutsch als Zweitsprache-Unterrichts in einer der sogenannten Sprachstartgruppen.

Studien weisen darauf hin, dass mehrsprachige Schüler und Schülerinnen einen Vorteil gegenüber ihren einsprachigen Kollegen und Kolleginnen haben, da sie auf bereits erlernte Lernstrategien, sowie ihre Erstsprachen zurückgreifen können (Jessner 2006: 42). Sprachwissenschaftler und Sprachwissenschaftlerinnen betonen jedoch immer wieder, dass multilinguale Sprachlernende von ihrer mehrsprachigen Sprachkompetenz nur dann profitieren können, wenn sie im Sprachunterricht bei der Entwicklung ihrer *multilingual awareness* unterstützt werden (Cenoz 2013: 10). Bisher baute ein Deutsch als Zweitsprache (kurz: DaZ) Unterricht, der die Entwicklung einer *multicompetence* unterstützen wollten, meist auf die Verwendung der Erstsprachen von Lernenden auf. Dabei oftmals nicht berücksichtigt wurde die Tatsache, dass diese mehrsprachigen Sprachlernenden nicht nur ihre Erstsprache sprechen, sondern in den meisten Fällen auch kompetente Sprecher und Sprecherinnen der englischen Sprache sind.

Die vorliegende Arbeit versucht folglich der Frage nachzugehen, ob DaZ-Lernende in einem kooperativen Schreibprozess Englisch als *lingua franca*, sowie ihre Erstsprachen verwenden. Die Forschungsgruppe bestand aus sechs DaZ-Schülerinnen und Schülern, die seit ein oder zwei Jahren ein österreichisches Gymnasium besuchten. Sie alle sprachen verschiedene Erstsprachen, teilten jedoch eine gemeinsame Arbeitssprache: Englisch. In einem multilingualen und

kooperativen Schreibprozess hatten die Sprachlernenden 45 Minuten Zeit, eine Meinungsäußerung im Umfang von 120 Wörtern zu verfassen, wobei sie alle Sprachen, die ihnen zur Verfügung standen, verwenden durften. Der Schreibprozess wurde nach Einwilligung der Schülerinnen und Schüler mithilfe einer Kamera aufgezeichnet und als Tonspur aufgenommen.

Um die Forschungsfrage zu beantworten, wurde nicht die gesamte Konversation transkribiert, sondern wichtige Stellen davon ausgewählt und zur Analyse herangezogen. Die Transkription der Audioaufnahme, welche den Regeln des Gesprächsanalytischen Transkriptionssystems (kurz: GAT) folgt, wurde mithilfe des Programms EXMARaLDA angefertigt. Im Zuge dieser Arbeit nicht analysiert, wurde die Videoaufnahme, die lediglich als Unterstützung diente, um die jeweiligen Sprecher und Sprecherinnen besser erkennen zu können. Schließlich wurde die Transkription einiger Sequenzen des Schreibprozesses mithilfe Krummheuers (Krummheuer & Naujok 1999) Interaktionsanalyse, und nach den Kriterien der Diskursanalyse nach Schwab und Schramms (2016) analysiert und auf die Verwendung von Englisch als Arbeitssprache, sowie den Einbau der Erstsprachen der Schüler und Schülerinnen untersucht.

Mithilfe der Sequenzanalyse wurde gezeigt, dass die Deutschlernenden sowohl Englisch als Arbeitssprache, als auch ihre Erstsprache im Laufe des Schreibprozesses immer wieder verwenden. Besonders zu Beginn des Schreibprozesses greifen sie auf ihre gemeinsame *lingua franca* zurück, um Ideen zur Gliederung auszutauschen, und verwenden ihre Erstsprachen, um die Aufgabenstellung zu klären. Im weiteren Verlauf der Unterrichtssequenz verwenden sie multilinguale Strategien, wie *code-switching* oder *translanguaging*, um ihre Ideen besser und vielleicht auch schneller auszudrücken zu können. Des Weiteren diskutieren sie unter Verwendung von Englisch als Arbeitssprache deutsche Strukturen auf einer Metaebene, indem sie Sprachvergleiche anstellen.

Das vorliegende Forschungsprojekt zeigt, dass es an der Zeit ist, vorherrschende Einstellungen zur Verwendung von verschiedenen Sprachen im DaZ-Unterricht zu ändern. Auch wenn es weiterer Untersuchungen nach den konkreten Auswirkungen

und den Vorteilen einer Verwendung von Englisch als Arbeitssprache bedarf, bietet ein multilingualer kooperativer Schreibprozess dennoch ein Unterrichtsumfeld, welches es mehrsprachigen Lernenden erlaubt ihre *multicompetence* im DaZ-Unterricht zu ihrem Vorteil zu nutzen.

7 References

- Allgäuer-Hackl, Elisabeth; Jessner, Ulrike. 2013. "Mehrsprachigkeitsunterricht aus mehrsprachiger Sicht: Zur Förderung des metalinguistischen Bewusstseins" In Vetter, Eva (ed.). *Professionalisierung für sprachliche Vielfalt. Perspektiven für eine neue LehrerInnenbildung*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider-Verlag Hohengehren, 111-147.
- Baker, Colin; Prys Jones, Sylvia. 1998. *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Beno, Eszter. 2011. "Kreatives Schreiben im DaF-Unterricht. Schreiben zu und nach literarischen Texten ". *Neue Didaktik* 1, 79-96.
- Blocher, Eduard. 1909. "Zweisprachigkeit: Vorteile und Nachteile". In *Reins Encyklopädisches Handbuch der Pädagogik*. Beyer: Langensalze, 665-670.
- Block, David. 2007. "Bilingualism: four assumptions and four responses". *Innovation in language learning and teaching* 1(1), 66-82.
- Brandt, Birgit. 2004. *Kinder als Lernende. Partizipationsspielräume und -profile im Klassenzimmer: Eine mikrosoziologische Studie zur Partizipation im Klassenzimmer*. Frankfurt am Main, Wien: Lang.
- Braun, Maximilian. 1937. "Beobachtungen zur Frage der Mehrsprachigkeit". *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 4, 115-130.
- British Council. 2013. "The English Effect". <https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english-effect-report-v2.pdf> (25 Aug 2019).
- Brooks, Frank B.; Donato, Richard. 1994. "Vygostkian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks". *Hispania: A Journal Devoted to the Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese* 77(2), 262-274.
- Brosch, Cyril. 2015. "On the conceptual history of the term lingua franca". *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies* 9(1), 71-75.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Byrne, Donn. 1988. *Teaching Writing Skill*. London: Longman.
- Cenoz Jasone; Jessner, Ulrike. 2000. *English in Europe: the acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Cenoz Jasone; Jessner, Ulrike. 2000. *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Genesee, Fred. 1998. *Beyond Bilingualism: multilingualism and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk. 2011. "Focus on Multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing". *The Modern language journal* 95(3), 356-369.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2000. "Research on multilingual acquisition". In Cenoz, Jasone; Jessner, Ulrike (eds.). *The acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 39-53.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2013. "Defining Multilingualism". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33, 3-18.
- Cook, Vivian. 2001. "Using the First Language in the Classroom". *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57, 402-423.
- Crystal, David. 1994. *An encyclopedic dictionary of language and languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cummins, Jim; Bismilla, Vicki; Chow, Patricia; Cohen, Sarah; Giampapa, Frances;

- Leoni, Lisa; Sandhu, Perminder; Sastri, Padma. 2005. "Affirming Identity in Multilingual classroom". *Educational Leadership* 63(1), 38-43.
- Cummins, Jim. 2008. "Teaching for transfer: challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education". In Cummins, Jim; Hornberger, Nancy (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* 5. New York: Springer, 65–75.
- Cummins, Jim. 2009. "Multilingualism in the English language classroom: pedagogical considerations". *Tesol Quarterly* 43(2), 317-321.
- De Angelis, Gessica. 2007. *Third language acquisition*. Clevedon, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Dengscherz, Sabine. 2012. "Auf dass sie wissen, was sie tun: Strategierepertoires in einer L2 erweitern". In Ö DaF-Mitteilungen 2012(2), 65–80.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 1999. *Gespräche analysieren: Eine Einführung in konversationsanalytische Methoden*. Opladen: Leske and Budrich.
- Deurer, Rebecca, Gita. 2018. *Ein Text, zwei Menschen, drei Lesarten: Interaktive Interpretationen eines biblischen Textes in offenen Unterrichtsgesprächen*. Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkhardt.
- Dittmar, Norbert. 2009. *Transkription: Ein Leitfaden mit Aufgaben für Studenten, Forscher und Laien*. (3rd edition). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Donovan, Suzanne M.; Bransford, John D. 2005. *How students learn: history, mathematics, and science in the classroom*. Washington DC: National academy press.
- Eberle, Thomas S. 1997. "Ethnomethodologische Konversationsanalyse". In Hitzler, Roland; Honer, Anne. (eds.): *Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik: Eine Einführung*. Opladen: Springer, 245–279.
- Ellis, Rod; Barkhuizen, Gary P. 2005. *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission. 2007. *Final Report: high level group on multilingualism*. Luxembourg: European Communities.
- Faistauer, Renate. 1997. *Wir müssen zusammen schreiben! Kooperatives Schreiben im fremdsprachlichen Deutschunterricht*. Innsbruck Wien: Studien-Verlag.
- Faßmann, Heinz. 2018. "1391/AB".
https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXVI/AB/AB_01391/imfname_709039.pdf (25 Aug. 2019)
- Flick, Uwe. 2014. *An introduction to qualitative research*. (5th edition). Los Angeles: Sage.
- García, Ofelia; Kleifgen, Jo Anne. 2010. *Educating emergent bilinguals: policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, Ofelia; Sylvan, Claire E. 2011. "Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities". *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 385-400.
- García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garnitschnig, Ines. 2018. "Der muttersprachliche Unterricht in Österreich: Statistische Auswertung für das Schuljahr 2016/17. Bundesministerium Bildung Wissenschaft und Forschung" . http://www.schule-mehrsprachig.at/fileadmin/schule_mehrsprachig/redaktion/hintergrundinfo/info5_09-2018.pdf (20 Aug. 2019)
- Garnitschnig, Ines. 2019. "Der muttersprachliche Unterricht in Österreich

- Statistische Auswertung für das Schuljahr 2017/18". *Informationsblätter zum Thema Migration und Schule* 2019(5).
- Gibbons, Pauline. 2002. *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gogolin, Ingrid. 1988. *Erziehungsziel Zweisprachigkeit: Konturen eines sprachpädagogischen Konzepts für die multikulturelle Schule*. Hamburg: Bermann & Helbig.
- Gorter, Durk; Cenotz, Victoria; Cenoz, Jasone. 2013. *Minority Languages and Multilingual Education: Bridging the Local and the Global*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Grosjean, François. 2010. *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Hadfield, Charles; Hadfield, Jill. 1990. *Writing Games*. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Son.
- Hahn, Natalia; Schöler, Marianne. 2013. Mit Scaffolding zur Fachsprache Film im DaF-Unterricht. *Informationen Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 40(6), 584–621.
- Henrici, Gert. 1995. *Spracherwerb durch Interaktion? Eine Einführung in die fremdsprachenerwerbsspezifische Diskursanalyse*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider-Verlag Hohengehren.
- Höck, Gyde. 2015. *Ko-Konstruktive Problemlösegespräche im Mathematikunterricht: Eine Studie zur lernpartnerschaftlichen Entwicklung mathematischer Lösungen unter Grundschulkindern*. Münster, New York: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- Howatt, Anthony P.R. 1984. *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jessner, Ulrike. 2006. *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jessner, Ulrike. 2008. "Teaching third languages: findings, trends and challenges". *Language Teaching* 41(1), 15-56.
- Jin, Yanhua. 2016. "A case study of interactional analysis between 'flipped classroom' and 'traditional classroom'". *Revista Iberica de Sistemas e Tecnologias de Informacao* 2016(11), 395–404.
- Krumm, Hans-Jürgen. 2005. "Von der additiven zur curricularen Mehrsprachigkeit: über die Notwendigkeit der Einbeziehung von Minderheiten-, Migranten- und Nachbarsprachen". In Hufeisen, Britta; Lutjeharms, Madeline (eds.). *Gesamtsprachencurriculum. Integriert Sprachendidaktik. Common Curriculum. Theoretische Überlegungen und Beispiele der Umsetzung*. Tübingen: Narr, 27-36.
- Krummheuer, Götz; Brandt, Birgit. 2001. *Paraphrase und Traduktion: Partizipationstheoretische Elemente einer Interaktionstheorie des Mathematiklernens in der Grundschule*. Weinheim: Beltz.
- Krummheuer, Götz; Naujok, Natascha. 1999. *Grundlagen und Beispiele interpretativer Unterrichtsforschung*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Krummheuer, Götz. 2011. "Interaktionsanalyse". http://www.fallarchiv.uni-kassel.de/backup/wp-content/plugins/old/lbg_chameleon_videoplayer/lbg_vp2/videos//krummheuer_interaktionsanalyse.pdf (25 Aug. 2019).
- Langer, Antje. 2010. "Transkribieren – Grundlagen und Regeln" In Friebertshäuser, Barbara; Langer, Antje; Prengel, Annedore (eds.): *Handbuch qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft*. Weinheim : Juventa-Verlag, 515–526.

- Legutke, Michael; Schramm, Karen. 2016. "Forschungsethik" In Caspari, Daniela; Klippel, Friederike; Legutke, Michael; Schramm, Karen (eds.). *Forschungsmethoden in der Fremdsprachendidaktik. Ein Handbuch*. Tübingen: Narr Francko Attempo, 280-297.
- Li, Wie. 2011. "Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: code- and modeswitching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools". *Modern language journal* 95(3), 370-383.
- Lo, Adrienne. 1999. Codeswitching, speech community membership, and the construction of ethnic identity[I am grate]. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4), 461-479.
- Malakoff, Marguerite; Hakuta, Kenji. 1991. "Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness in bilinguals". In Bialystok, Ellen (ed.). *Language processing in bilingual children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141-166.
- Mempel, Caterina; Mehlhorn, Grit. 2014. "Datenaufbereitung: Transkription und Annotation" In Settinieri, Julia et al. (eds.). *Empirische Forschungsmethoden für Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache. Eine Einführung*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 147-166.
- Oberwimmer, Konrad; Vogtenhuber, Stefan; Lassnigg, Lorenz; Schreiner, Claudia. 2019. "Nationaler Bildungsbericht Österreich 2018, Band 1". https://www.bifie.at/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/NBB_2018_Band1_v4_final.pdf (25 Aug. 2019)
- Perit Çakır, M., Zemel, Alan; Stahl, Gerry. 2009. "The joint organization of interaction within a multimodal CSCL medium". *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning* 4(2), 115-149.
- Pokorn, Nike K. 2005. *Challenging the traditional axioms: translation into a non-mother tongue*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Polio, Charlene G.; Duff, Patricia A., 1994. "Teachers' Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: a Qualitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation". *Modern Language Journal* 78(3), 313-26.
- Rechnungshof. 2013. „Bericht des Rechnungshof: Schüler mit Migrationshintergrund“ http://www.rechnungshof.gv.at/fileadmin/downloads/2013/berichte/teilbericht/bund/Bund_2013_06/Bund_2013_06_4.pdf (20 Aug. 2019).
- Ringbom, Hakan. 1987. *The role of first language in foreign language learning*. Clevedon, Avon, England, Philadelphia. Multilingual Matters.
- Rösch, Heidi. 2011. *Deutsch als Zweit- und Fremdsprache*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Schlömerkemper, Jörg. 2010. *Konzepte pädagogischer Forschung: Eine Einführung*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Schwab, Götz; Schramm, Karen. 2016. "Diskursanalytische Auswertungsmethoden". In Caspari, Daniela; Klippel, Friederike; Legutke, Michael; Schramm, Karen (eds.). *Forschungsmethoden in der Fremdsprachendidaktik: Ein Handbuch*. Tübingen: Narr Francko Attempo, 280-297.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2011. *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selting, Margret et al. 2011. "A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT 2 translated and adapted for English by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten". *Gesprächsforschung* 12, 1-51.
- Sri Wahyuni. 2015. "Student teams-achievement division to improve students' writing skill". *Inferensi Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan* 8(1), 1-22.

- Stavans, Anat; Hoffmann, Charlotte. 2015. "Multilingualism". Cambridge: University Press.
- Stavans, Anat; Hoffmann, Charlotte. 2015. *Multilingualism: key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Storch, Neomy. 2005. „Collaborative writing: product, process and students' reflections“. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14(3), 153-173.
- Szubko-Sitarek, Weronika. 2015. *Multilingual Lexical Recognition in the Mental Lexicon of third language users*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Török, Valentina; Jessner, Ulrike. 2017. „Multilingual awareness in L2 (foreign language) learners' strategies and processing“. *Hungarian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 17(2), 1-18.
- Tracy, Rosemarie. 2014. "Mehrsprachigkeit: Vom Störfall zum Glücksfall". In Krifka, Manfred; Blaszczyk, Joanna; Leßmöllmann, Annette; Meinunger, André; Stiebels, Barbara; Tracy, Rosemarie; Truckenbrodt, Hubert (eds.). *Das mehrsprachige Klassenzimmer: Über die Muttersprachen unserer Schüler*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 13-33.
- Verhoeven, Ludo. 1991. "Acquisition of biliteracy". In Hulsijn, Jan H; Matter, Johan F (eds.). *Reading in two languages*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 61-74.
- Volgger, Marie-Luise. 2014/15. "Professionalisierung für den Umgang mit Mehrsprachigkeit als Aufgabe der Ausbildung von Lehrer(innen) romanischer Sprachen". In Greistorfer, Karin et al. *Pädagoginnenbildung neu: Auf dem Weg zur Professionalisierung und Kompetenzorientierung*. Wien: Institut für Romanistik, 39-59.
- Wood, David; Bruner, Jerome S.; Ross, Gail. 1976. "The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving", *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 17, 89-100.

8. Appendix

8.1 English abstract

Research suggests that multilingual language learners can benefit from their *multicompetence* if they develop *multilingual awareness*. To date, most multilingual teaching strategies have focused on the inclusion of students' first languages even though most German as a second students share one common lingua franca: English.

The paper investigates the use of English as a lingua franca as well as the inclusion of students' first languages in a peer group's multilingual writing process. For this purpose, students of a remedial German as a second language class engaged in a cooperative writing project in which they were asked to write a German text. An analysis of the transcript of this very writing process, which was realized in an Austrian AHS, has shown that students included English as their working language but also switched to their first languages repeatedly. The students' multilingual writing process suggests that they constantly utilize their multicompetence by analyzing linguistic structures in English while switching to other languages, by providing spontaneous translations and code-switches to various languages or by discussing language on a meta-level.

8.2 Sequence transcript

- 1 T: das ist eure aufgabenstellung. lest es euch durch. schaut_s es
euch mal an und dann habt ihr zeit darüber zu sprechen. ja.
(walks away))
- 2 A: that doesn_t look frankly. ((laughs))
- 3 H: yeah; no it doesn_t.
- 4 S: dobre. (unintelligible slovak) (ked sa kontakt na)aha- okay (.)
okay.
- 5 M: (unintelligible slovak)
- 6 V: (unintelligible slovak) šťastitický: ah- (vozne:)
(unintelligible slovak)
- 7 A: chto vstrecha? ((laughs))
- 8 V: aha; ((laughgs)) (expresné) (unintelligible slovak) pozitívne
concurrent-
- 9 A: ze konkurencia pozitíva i negatíva?((laughs))
- 10 V: ja. ((laughs))

11 T: worüber spricht ihr gerade?
 12 A: ((laughs))
 13 M: ((laughs))
 14 S: ((laughs))
 15 V: ((laughs))wir sozusagen wir (.) we_re translating the text.ja.
 (.) so, we kind of like put it together like what we're gonna
 write about.
 16 T: AH- okay.
 17 A: sie (.) so (.) I try to understand the translation because I
 understand their translation better than it_s written here. so
 (.) ((laughs)).
 18 H: do we know who_s gonna write?
 19 M: no.
 20 V: I just don_t want to write.
 21 S: I don_t too.
 22 H: like (.) I can write. you can tell me what to say what to write.
 23 S: okay.
 24 M: okay (.) great.
 25 V: ja.
 26 H: my hand writing isn_t that pretty either. (.) so: (-)
 27 V: yeah- so: (.) mmmh:
 28 A: but we have the dobrovolec. ((laughs))
 29 M: so (.) we just have to have a meinung.
 30 H: should we make a list first of what we want to put in,
 31 V: yeah. I can make a list if you want. like but (.) ahm (.) häh?
 it would be great if we had a text because this is like yeah,
 there are-?
 32 M: <whispers (unintelligible slovak)>
 33 S: <whispers (unintelligible slovak)>
 34 H: yeah- but maybe we can use the video that we watched before?
 35 V: yeah.
 36 H: we can use some information of the video.
 37 V: so (.) like connect this too.
 38 A: do you think how to begin it? or:?
 39 H: immer mehr kinder und jugendliche erkranken an atresssymptomen;
 40 V: ((thinks)) ja:. aha.
 41 A: do you think how to begin it or?
 42 V: yeah (.) just just the notes.
 43 H: yeah. just like a gliederung sort of like a (.) so what_s that
 called?
 44 V: yeah (.) so I can do the (-)g l i e d e r u n g. (-) ah (.) so
 (.) sch- schlechtes, schlechtes essen.

45 H: a:hm- er: (.) er (.) ernährung?
 46 V: ah. ahja das.
 47 A: so, are we allowed to use this one or not?
 48 H: ja.
 49 A: okay, we have that.
 50 M: okay. (---)
 51 V: okay. da:nn (.) ah: (.) sie hat gesagt- dass fünf prozent von;
 52 (...)
 53 A: die leisten unter druck oder sowas,
 54 V: aha.
 55 A: oder die anfor (.) oder die anFORderung an der schule ist zu
 hoch. (--)
 56 V: erforder (ung)? nein! ja!
 57 A: an (.) anforderung. an FOR derung.
 58 V: jap. (.)
 59 A: presne. ((laughs))
 60 (...)
 61 H: was glaubt_s ihr? also sollen wir (.) zuerst (.) weil ich glaub
 es sind hundertzwanzig wörter?
 62 A: wie denken wir darüber?
 63 S: mhm.
 64 M: mhm, ja (.) wir zuerst,
 65 V: mhm. also zuerst müssen wir;
 66 M: einleitung kann (.) ah: (.) können wir die (.) (ako- ko ty
 vyzerás) (.) situation (.) die, die dritte frage (-) wie ist die
 situa- situation in ihren, ihrem land? so (.) wie (.) mhhh: (.)
 wie sehen das? (-)
 67 S: wie sieht das aus?
 68 M: ja.
 69 V: aber warum wolltest du damit begonnen?
 70 H: äh: (.) sollen wir mit de (-)
 71 A: ich habe andere vorschlag. wir können beginnen mit etwas, wie (-
 -) ich glaube dass das thema sehr aktuell ist vielen menschen
 bewegt und dass es derzeit oft diskutiert wird. (...)
 72 M: ja (-) und wir wissen dazu- DAS.
 73 S: wir sollen das schreiben wie ICH oder wie WIR?
 74 A: ja- genau.
 75 S: wir glauben dass (--)
 76 H: wollen wir alle, alle also alle eine meinung haben? oder (-)? im
 text oder? (---)
 77 S: aha.
 78 M: mhm.

79 A: das ist eine gute idee.

80 T: (...)

81 V: also, wollen wir das zuerst? also, (--)

82 H: zuerst- oder irgendwo in der (-)

83 V: ich weiß nicht.

84 M: das ist frage. ((laughs))

85 H: ahm, we can use the facts to back up our opinions.

86 V: yah:.

87 H: yeah, I mean I was thinking that we have a couple of facts
written down (.) hard facts (.) and then we (.) we formulate our
opinion. and then (.) put that in our text to back up our
opinion.

88 V: yeah.

89 A: on the one hand but on the other hand (.) and, and so on. and
then after that we could (.) we could take these facts but after
the facts we could tell about persönliche erfahrungen. and we
could (.) but in my land it_s like this. yeah?

90 H: exactly.

91 V: yeah.

92 M: so, now:,

93 (...)

94 M: but today is like young people in the school (.) okay (.) in
unsere, unserem land (.) is like (.) when the young woman or men
just don_t have to do it, they don_t do it. you know is like (.)
ah homeworks. if I don_t have to do it, why I? then is like (--)
the positiv konkurrenz is to do something for myself. it_s like
den positiven gest (.) äh, konkurrenzgeist, das positive ist sehr
wichtig.

95 A: !mhm!

96 (...)

97 M: okay (.) die zweite.

98 A: leistungsdruck (.) was heißt das?

99 V: ich weiß nicht. ((laughs))

100 M: das ist ahm, wenn ahm. you have to do it, you have to do it, you
have to do it.

101 A: aha (.) okay.

102 H: I don_t know what you_d call that in english but ahm but like
pressure

103 M: ja (.) pressure. (.) and if you don_t will do it. you will fail.
you (-) !so bad!

104 (...)

105 S: also? unsere erfahrungen?

106 H: who here is stressed?
 107 V: I am. (.) the last three months my hands are constantly shaking.
 108 A: EVERYone.
 109 (...)
 110 H: are you stressed all the time or are you stressed at certain times?
 111 V: like at certain times it_s worth but it_s constant. it_s still there. I still feel that yes (.) I do have diese prüfungen in zwei wochen und deswegen ur stressed (.) also (,) ja. und schon sehr lange. aber wenn ich dazu etwas mache (.) also lerne oder so (.) dann geht es besser. (.) aber when I procrastinate it_s like I_m SO stressed.
 112 (...)
 113 A: people passen auf sich nicht auf. ((laughs)) denglich.
 114 (...)
 115 A: heutzutage leisten viele leute unter stress
 116 V: oder lei, lei, leiden
 117 H: leiTen? (.) oder?
 118 V: leiden. (.) like to suffer.
 119 A: mhm.
 120 (...)
 121 H: nowadays, there_s a lot of stress for people (.) ähm caused by school, by work (.) sports, lack of sleep, malnutrition. like, how should I formulate that sentence?
 122 A: there are a lot of uh, I don_t know-
 123 H: causes.
 124 V: ja. es kann, es kann,
 125 A: es gibt sehr viele (.) wie sagt man das? příčina?
 126 V: ja- ah (.)
 127 H: gr- grunde.
 128 V: !GRÜNDE! ja (.) genau.
 129 A: genau.
 130 H: what should I?
 131 A: es gibt sehr viele gründen?
 132 V: die gründen dafür sind zum beispiel (.) und jetzt- (.) arbeit, wenig zeit, schule.
 133 A: gründe!
 134 H: (-) sind (-) ahm: (.)
 135 Al: ((mumbles something))
 136 A: daily routine.
 137 V: aber schlechte rou, routine?
 138 A: routine.

139 H: ja. (.)
 140 V: exams, oder, oder prüfungen (.) ahm (.)
 141 H: die (.) äh: (.) ja (.) es gibt unendlich viele gründe für stress.
 142 V: ja. ((laughs))
 143 M: ja.
 144 H: diese drei: (--) ahm;;
 145 M: schlagzeilen?
 146 V: ja (.) schlagzeilen
 147 H: ah, ja. (.)
 148 A: (--) sind auch die gründe für stress.
 149 V: oder könnten?
 150 A: könnten auch die gründe für stress sein.
 151 H: aber es ist nicht in (--) also es sind nicht die gründe (.) also (.) ((...))
 152 (...)
 153 A: if I have, ich denke an jemanden oder jemandem oder an etwas (-)
 154 H: (-) weil wir jeden tag an: (--) an;;
 155 A: an diesen sachen denken? (.)
 156 H: daran denken.
 157 A: mhm. (.) ohja. (.) das klingt gut. viel besser.
 158 V: ja. ((laughs))
 159 (...)
 160 V: ich glaub wir, wir könn- wir könnten schreiben dass ja wir sind dieser meinung auch. und (.) es kann (.) eigentlich (.) aber es MUSS eigentlich nicht immer so sein.
 161 A: seit ich beim (unintelligible) bin.
 162 H: okay, we, we can say we_re, we have, we share the same opinion (.) within a certain range.
 163 A: or we can (.) we can tell (.) it_s good but with a limit. if it_s übertrieben then (-)
 164 H: ja.es sind;
 165 V: also ähm, im einen (.) geg- geg- gegrenzten,
 166 A: grenzen (.) grenzen.
 167 V: ja, grenzen.
 168 A: grenzen auch (.) man sagt (.) wenn das gegrenzt ist;
 169 H: wir stimmen, wir stimmen diese drei punkte an (.) aber mit grenzen.
 170 V: ist das nicht ZU?
 171 H: äh: zu- zu.
 172 V: ja- zu- ja. wir stimmen diesen drei punkten zu. aber eben in einem bereich.

173 (...)

174 V: zum beispiel die konkurrenz im zweite punkt.

175 A: einerseits (.) ja.

176 H: wir haben nicht zu viele wörter. wir haben eh nur hundertzwanzig
 und wenn wir so viel über unser meinungen (.) und (.)

177 S: ja, aber wir haben nicht so viel zeit.

178 H: ja, stimmt. aber dafür haben wir noch viel mehr;

179 A: einerseits ist dieses system gut weil äh (--) weil äh leute klug
 sind. (.) how to make this (.)? ((laughs))

180 H: like, it_s not a good ah (.). like, it_s a good argument. (.)
 ya, ya but link think it_s not a very good argument too;

181 A: yeah (.) but I thought (-) I thought: einerseits (.) yeah but,

182 V: dann wir können einfach sagen dass (.) ah (.) stress ist überall
 und alle haben erfahrung, erfahrungen damit. und dann zum
 beispiel sagen dass ja (-) was für eine erfahrung. was ist die
 konsequenz? dass manche nicht gut schlafen können (.) manche
 haben wie ich zitternde hände oder manchmal kann man auch diese
 bauchprobleme haben.

183 H: ja, kopfschmerzen und bauchschmerzen.

184 V: es ist diese gesundheits- gesundheitsprobleme.

185 A: immer mehr kinder machen schlecht erfahrungen damit,

186 (...)

187 A: wir wissen dass, wir sind überzeugt dass;

188 H: wir sind überzeugt?

189 A: like (.) we are convinced that-

190 V: ja, das könnte anfang sein. wir sind überzeugt dass jeden
 tag; ja, das ist gut. kannst du das schreiben?

191 A: wir sind überzeugt dass jeden tag immer mehr kinder erfahrungen
 mit stress machen.

192 (...)

193 H: wir sind was?

194 A: überzeugt. (.) okay, jetzt müssen wir denken. was kommt erstens?
 dass jeden tag immer mehr kinder? oder dass immer mehr kinder
 jeden tag schlechte erfahrungen machen?

195 V: !jeden tag!

196 A: dass jeden tag kinder schlechte erfahrungen machen, mit stress
 machen.

197 V: mit: (-) haben;

198 A: man macht erfahrungen, oder?

199 V: !NEIN!

200 H: haben erfahrungen.

201 A: haben, das was du schon hast aber machen, was du noch nicht
hast. ich meine, wenn du hast erfahrungen, das heißt dass du
weißt schon etwas. aber wir sagen dass jeden tag immer kinder
bekommen;

202 H: !erleben!

203 V: erleben ist gut.

204 (...)

205 A: dass (---) ahm: (---)

206 M: jeden tag;

207 S: jeden tag;

208 V: jeden tag (--)immer mehr kinder. (--) gut?

209 A: mhm. ((laughs))

210 M: mhm.

211 V: ja, ich (---) das war deine satz.

212 A: egal ((laughs)). wir schreiben alle dasselbe.

213 H: (--) wegen (--) stress schlechte erfahrungen erleben?

214 M: mhm.

215 (...)

216 A: sie bekommen problemen mit gesundheit, können nicht gut
schlafen.

217 V: ja.

218 M: mhm.

219 H: menschen (.)

220 V: oder man bekommt.

221 A: oder sie bekommen, kinder.

222 H: (.) like people, people start having health problems and
sleeping problems from a young age, which will affect their
future. ah: menschen. ah;; what did I just say?

223 V: !JA!

224 A: jaja (.) but that in german. ((laughs))

225 A: one more time, say it in english.

226 H: people start having health problems and sleeping problems from a
young age.

227 V: (beginnen von Problemen von jung Alter haben) haben diese prob,
haben die;

228 A: bekommen diese probleme.

229 H: menschen bekommen ah (---) problem;

230 A: gesundheitsprobleme.

231 S: (.) gesundheitsprobleme.

232 H: how do you say stress related problems? (-) ah: (---)menschen
ahm (--)

233 A: problemen die sind mit stress verbunden; (---) ah:
stressverbundene !problemen! (...)

234 S: bekommen

235 A: stressverbundene probleme.

236 V: schon von sehr- (---)

237 A: jungen alter? nein.

238 H: kleines alter? nízky (unintelligible)? (-) niedriges alter?

239 A: (-) (unintelligible russian) (.) slovatskiy- slovenskiy- russskiy
(unintelligible russian) (tak to bolo) (wir haben was anderes),

240 S: a to je- (unintelligible slovak)

241 (...)

242 V: oder zum beispiel, jede von unsere gruppe can contact with
this.<mumbles (unintelligible slovak)>

243 A: <mumbles (unintelligible german)>

244 S: hat schon (---) hat schon mit- mit stress ah getroffen (---)

245 H: <mumbles (unintelligible german)>von dem jungen alter? (---) von
einem jungen alter.

246 V: aha;

247 A: von jungem alter. von jungem (---) von (---) wie sagt man das
über über alter? wir sagen dass (.) das (.) nicht niedrig (oder
hoch)-

248 H: vo- because you say from A young age. not from young age.

249 V: ja aber zum bei (---) for example I say from a (-) low age in
slovak. oh it_s SO; it_s so different but I think german is more
related to english than to us.

250 (...)

251 H: this is a world-wide problem that affects all of us in each and
every one of our countries?

252 V: ja.

253 V: ja- da (.) das ist das ist ein weltweites problem. ist es DAS
problem?

254 A: ja, das problem.

255 S: !mhm!

256 V: ein weltweites problem- der jede von uns;

257 A: das (.) DAS problem.

258 V: ah DAS das jede von uns (---)

259 (...)

260 H: you said a sentence like de:r ja.

261 V: su- suicide rate is (.) taking up;

262 A: ja, wenn wir auf die situation denken.

263 V: selbstmord? ist es selbstmord?

264 A: wenn wir an die situation denken (---)

265 H: die: (--) selbst- mord- rate.
 266 (...)
 267 V: die (.) die er selbstmordrate (-) wird (.) wä- wächst.
 268 H: okay, now we just have to write a really inspiring last
 sentence.
 269 V: you can do this.
 270 M: ((laughs))
 271 S: ((laughs))
 272 A: ((laughs)) let_s (.) let_s not die. ((laughs))
 273 H: let_s (.) let_s save ourselves from shaking hands. and- (--)
 274 V: eh: (.) or: we could like (-) we could write an empfehlung. find
 what you like (-) find what you find relaxing.
 275 H: we can- we can-
 276 H: cause everybody needs their beauty sleep. ((thinks))
 277 V: !oh yes!
 278 A: everyone can find a solution for- für sich selbst.
 279 V: ja (.) ja (.) jeder kann eine riešenje (---)
 280 A: lösung, lösung, !lösung!
 281 V: !lösung!; <<laughs> solution?> ja;((laughs))aber ich glaub-
 282 S: warum nicht?
 283 H: ah (-) jeder muss seine lösung ah: seine eigene lösung-
 284 A: wir sind (typen) von lösung ((laughs)).
 285 M: jeder soll? hm?
 286 H: soll.((writes the sentence))
 287 V: also! soll!.
 288 (...)
 289 V: ja- everybody needs their beauty sleep. ((laughs)) that_s nice-
 like a little joke when you
 290 H: ah: ja;;
 291 H: exactly. jeder soll seine eigene ah: lösung selbst finden; und
 seine beauty sleep.
 292 V: oder mei- oder warte mal; mei (.) man einfach braucht seine-
 293 M: aha.
 294 A: schönheitsschlaf;
 295 H: weil- weil man einfach seine schönheitsschlaf braucht;
 296 M: ((laughs))

8.3 Text outline

- Stresssymptome durch schlechter Ernährung
- $\frac{1}{5}$ von Kinder zwischen 6 und 11 - Stresssymptomen
- Anforderung der Schule - zu hoch

→ 1. FR

- überall Stress
- unabhängig von Alter $\Rightarrow$ Healthproblems
- Probleme mit Konzentration
- Konkurrenz (+) Gut (-) schlecht

→ 2. FR

- ~~Stress~~ zitternde Kinder, konstant stress
- ~~Prüfungen~~ Prüfungen, wenig schlafen, Procrastination, nicht genug Zeit, (-) Routine $\Rightarrow$ Burnout

→

8.4 Final text production

Heutzutage gibt es sehr viel Stress für Menschen. Die Gründe dafür sind Arbeit, schlechte Routine, Prüfungen, Schule etc. Die drei Schlagzeilen sind uns alle bekannt, weil wir jeden Tag davon denken. Wir stimmen diese drei Punkte zu, aber in einem abgegrenzten Bereich. Wir sind überzeugt, dass jeden Tag immer mehr Kinder ~~setzt~~ wegen Stress schlechte Erfahrungen erleben. Menschen bekommen mehr stressverbundene Probleme ~~von einem Tag~~ von einer jüngeren Alter, das auch die nächste Generation beeinflussen wird. Das ist ein weltweites Problem, das jede von uns, in unsere Heimatländer beeinflusst. In den USA ist es ein großes Problem ~~für~~ nicht nur für die Studenten sondern auch für Erwachsene und Kinder ebenso. Die Selbstmordrate wächst wie auch schlechte Gesundheit und Ernährung und damit verbundene Obesität. Jeder soll seine eigene Lösung selbst finden, weil man einfach seine Schönheitsschlaf braucht.

Meta Information

**Project
name**

**Referenced
file** file:/H:/DeutschtextAKTUELL.wav

**Referenced
file** file:/G:/DeutschtextAKTUELL%20BIS-7-57.wav

AutoSave ;C:\Users\Familie Mayer\EXMARaLDA_AutoBackup_2019_08_27_10_20_22.exb at
2019_08_27_10_20_22;C:\Users\Familie
Mayer\EXMARaLDA_AutoBackup_2019_08_27_11_21_22.exb at
2019_08_27_11_21_22;C:\Users\Familie
Mayer\EXMARaLDA_AutoBackup_2019_08_27_04_15_57.exb at
2019_08_27_04_15_57

Comment

Speakertable

	Sex	f
T	Name	Teacher
	Comment	
	Sex	f
A	Name	Anna
	Comment	
	Sex	f
H	Name	Helena
	Comment	
	Sex	f
V	Name	Veronika
	Comment	
	Sex	f
M	Name	Monika
	Comment	
	Sex	f
S	Name	Sonia
	Comment	
Al	Sex	m
	Name	Alireza

Comment

[1]

0 [00:00.0] 1 [00:00.0]

T [v] das ist eure aufgabenstellung. lest es euch durch. schaut_s es euch mal an und

[2]

.. 2 [00:17.3]

T [v] dann habt ihr zeit darüber zu sprechen. ja. ((walks away))

A [v] that doesn_t look frankly.

[3]

.. 3 [00:24.4] 4 [00:26.3] 5 [00:26.7] 6 [00:27.9] 7 [00:28.3]

A [v] ((laughs))

H [v] yeah; no it doesn_t.

V [v] (unintelligible slovak)

M [v] (unintelligible slovak)

S [v] dobre. (unintelligible slovak) (ked sa kontakt na)

[4]

.. 8 [00:38.6] 9 [00:41.4]

A [v] chto vstrecha? ((laughs))

V [v] šťastitický: ah- (vozne:) (unintelligible slovak) aha; ((lauhgs)) (expresné)

M [v]

S [v]

[5]

.. 10 [00:46.7] 11 [00:50.8] 12 [00:53.3] 13 [00:54.3]

A [v] ze konkurencia pozitíva i negatíva?

V [v] (unintelligible slovak) pozitívne concurrent- ja. ((laughs))

M [v]

S [v] aha- okay (.) okay.

[6]

.. 14 [00:55.8] 15 [00:57.3] 16 [01:01.0] 17 [01:02.7] 18 [01:03.1]

T [v] worüber spricht ihr gerade? AH- okay.

A [v] ((laughs)) ((laughs)) sie (.) so (.) I try to

V [v] ((laughs)) wir sozusagen wir (.) we_re translating

M [v] ((laughs))

S [v] ((laughs))

[7]

..

T [v]
A [v] understand the translation because I understand their translation better than it_s written
V [v] the text.

[8]

.. 19 [01:04.6] 20 [01:08.6] 21 [01:11.0]

T [v]

A [v] here. so (.) ((laughs)).

V [v] ja. (.) so, we kind of like put it together like what we're

[9]

.. 22 [01:14.9] 23 [01:16.4] 24 [01:16.8]
H [v] do we know who_s gonna write?
V [v] gonna write about. I just don_t want to write.
M [v] no.

[10]

25 [01:18.6] 26 [01:19.6] 27 [01:20.7] 28 [01:21.1] 29 [01:24.0] 30 [01:24.4]
H [v] like (.) I can write. you can tell me what to say what to write. my
V [v] ja.
M [v] okay (.) great.
S [v] I don_t too. okay.

[11]

.. 31 [01:28.6] 32 [01:32.3] 33 [01:33.4]
A [v] but we have the
H [v] hand writing isn_t that pretty either. (.) so: (-)
V [v] yeah- so: (.) mmmh:
M [v] so (.) we just

[12]

.. 34 [01:36.4] 35 [01:36.2]
A [v] dobrovolec. ((laughs))
H [v] should we make a list first of what we want to put in,
M [v] have to have a meinung.

[13]

36 [01:38.2]
V [v] yeah. I can make a list if you want. like but (.) ahm (.) häh? it would be great if we had

[14]

.. 37 [01:42.1] 38 [01:49.2]
H [v] yeah- but maybe can use the video that we
V [v] a text because this is like yeah, there are-?
M [v] <whispers (unintelligible slovak)>
S [v] <whispers (unintelligible slovak)>

[15]

.. 39 [01:53.2] 40 [01:54.1] 41 [01:58.2]
H [v] watched before? we can use some information of the video.
V [v] yeah. so (.) like connect

[16]

.. 42 [02:00.2] 43 [02:02.4]
A [v] do you think how to begin it? or:?
H [v] immer mehr kinder und jugendliche
V [v] this too.

[17]

.. 44 [02:06.4] 45 [02:10.5]
A [v] do you think how to begin it or?
H [v] erkranken an atresssymptomen;
V [v] ((thinks)) ja:. aha.

[18]

46 [02:12.5] 47 [02:15.8]
H [v] yeah. just like a gliederung sort of like a (.) so what_s that
V [v] yeah (.) just just the notes.

[19]

.. 48 [02:21.0] 49 [02:25.2*] 50 [02:25.4*] 51 [02:25.5*] 52 [02:25.7*] 53 [02:25.8*] 54 [02:26.1*]
H [v] called?
V [v] yeah (.) so I can do the (-) g l i e
- - - -

[20]

55 [02:26.2*] 56 [02:26.4*] 57 [02:26.5*] 58 [02:26.6*] 59 [02:26.8*] 60 [02:26.9*] 61 [02:27.1*]
V [v] d e r uung. (-) ah (.) so (.) sch- schlechtes,
- - -

[21]

.. 62 [02:34.6] 63 [02:38.4] 64 [02:39.8]
A [v] so, are we allowed to use
H [v] a:hm- er: (.) er (.) ernährung?
V [v] schlechtes essen. ah. ahja das.

[22]

.. 65 [02:42.7] 66 [02:43.0] 67 [02:45.6] 68 [02:49.6]
A [v] this one or not? okay, we have that.
H [v] ja.
V [v] okay. da:nn (.) ah: (.) sie hat
M [v] okay. (---)

[23]

.. 69 [02:54.5] 70 [03:30.0] 71 [03:32.7] 72 [03:33.3]
T [v] (...)
A [v] die leisten unter druck oder sowas, oder
V [v] gesagt- dass fünf prozent von; aha.

[24]

.. 73 [03:37.5]
A [v] die anfor (.) oder die anforDerung an der schule ist zu hoch. (--)
V [v] erforder (ung)? nein!

[25]

.. 74 [03:42.4] 75 [03:45.5] 76 [03:53.8] 77 [03:56.5] 78 [05:04.9] 79 [05:09.9]
T [v] (...)
A [v] an (.) anforderung. an FOR derung. presne. ((laughs)) wie
H [v] was glaubt_s
V [v] ja! jap. (.)

[26]

..	80 [05:11.7]	81 [05:12.7]
A [v]	denken wir darüber?	
H [v]	ihr? also sollen wir (.) zuerst (.) weil ich glaub es sind hundertzwanzig wörter?	
M [v]		mhm, ja
S [v]	mhm.	

[27]

..	82 [05:14.1]	83 [05:15.6]
V [v]	mhm. also zuerst müssen wir;	
M [v]	(.) wir zuerst, einleitung kann (.) ah: (.) können wir die	

[28]

..
M [v] (.) (ako- ko ty vyzerás) (.) situation (.) die, die dritte frage (-) wie ist die situa- situation

[29]

..	84 [05:37.4]
M [v]	in ihren, ihrem land? so (.) wie (.) mhhh: (.) wie sehen das? (-) ja.
S [v]	wie sieht das aus?

[30]

.. 86 [05:39.0]	87 [05:41.5]	88 [05:45.1]
A [v]	ich habe andere	
H [v]	äh: (.) sollen wir mit de (-)	
V [v]	aber warum wolltest du damit begonnen?	
M [v]		

[31]

..
A [v] vorschlag. wir können beginnen mit etwas, wie (--) ich glaube dass das thema sehr

[32]

..	89 [05:54.5]
A [v]	aktuell ist vielen menschen bewegt und dass es derzeit oft diskutiert wird. (...)
M [v]	ja (-) und

[33]

..	90 [05:56.7]	91 [06:00.5]
A [v]	ja- genau.	
M [v]	wir wissen dazu- DAS.	
S [v]	wir sollen das schreiben wie ICH oder wie WIR?	

[34]

92 [06:02.5]	93 [06:03.2]
H [v]	wollen wir alle, alle also alle eine meinung haben? oder (-)? im
S [v]	wir glauben dass (--)

[35]

..	94 [06:12.2] 95 [06:12.9] 96 [06:13.6]	97 [06:15.6] 98 [07:08.2]
T [v]	(...)	

A [v] das ist eine gute idee.
H [v] text oder? (---)
V [v] also, wollen wir das zuerst?
M [v] mhm.
S [v] aha.

[36]

.. 99 [07:11.1] 100 [07:13.9] 101 [07:15.2] 102 [07:15.9]
H [v] zuerst- oder irgendwo in der (-) ahm, we can use the facts to
V [v] also, (--) ich weiß nicht.
M [v] das ist frage. ((laughs))

[37]

.. 103 [07:22.0] 104 [07:22.5]
H [v] back up our opinions. yeah, I mean I was thinking that we have a couple of
V [v] yah:.
M [v]

[38]

..
H [v] facts written down (.) hard facts (.) and then we (.) we formulate our opinion. and then

[39]

.. 105 [07:36.4] 106 [07:36.9]
A [v] on the one hand but on the other
H [v] (.) put that in our text to back up our opinion.
V [v] yeah.

[40]

..
A [v] hand (.) and, and so on. and then after that we could (.) we could take these facts but

[41]

..
A [v] after the facts we could tell about persönliche erfahrungen. and we could (.) but in my

[42]

.. 107 [07:53.3] 108 [07:54.5] 109 [07:55.4] 110 [07:57.0] 111 [13:14.5]
T [v] (...)
A [v] land it_s like this. yeah?
H [v] exactly.
V [v] yeah.
M [v] so, now:, but today is like young

[43]

..
M [v] people in the school (.) okay (.) in unsere, unserem land (.) is like (.) when the young

[44]

..
M [v] woman or men just don_t have to do it, they don_t do it. you know is like (.) ah

[45]

..
M [v] homeworks. if I don_ t have to do it, why I? then is like (--) the positiv konkurrenz is

[46]

..
M [v] to do something for myself. it _s like den positiven gest (.) äh, konkurrenzgeist, das

[47]

.. 112 [13:53.3] 113 [13:54.3] 114 [14:54.3] 115 [14:56.4]
T [v] (...)
A [v] !mhm! leistungsdruk (.) was
M [v] positive ist sehr wichtig. okay (.) die zweite.

[48]

.. 116 [14:58.2] 117 [14:59.5]
A [v] heißt das?
V [v] ich weiß nicht. ((laughs))
M [v] das ist ahm, wenn ahm. you have to do it, you have

[49]

.. 118 [15:05.3] 119 [15:07.5]
A [v] aha (.) okay.
H [v] I don_ t know what you_ d call that in english but
M [v] to do it, you have to do it.

[50]

.. 120 [15:11.1]
H [v] ahm but like pressure
M [v] ja (.) pressure. (.) and if you don_ t will do it. you will fail. you (-

[51]

.. 121 [15:20.8] 122 [16:46.3] 123 [16:48.3] 124 [16:52.1] 125 [16:52.9]
T [v] (...)
A [v] EVERYone.
H [v] who here is stressed?
V [v] I am. (.) the last three
M [v]) !so bad!
S [v] also? unsere erfahrungen?

[52]

.. 126 [16:53.6] 127 [17:02.4] 128 [17:17.1]
T [v] (...)
A [v]
H [v] are you stressed all the time or are
V [v] months my hands are constantly shaking.

[53]

.. 129 [17:21.1]
H [v] you streded at certain times?
V [v] like at certain times it_ s worth but it_ s constant. it_ s still

[54]

V [v] there. I still feel that yes (.) I do have diese prüfungen in zwei wochen und deswegen

[55]

V [v] ur stressed (.) also (,) ja. und schon sehr lange. aber wenn ich dazu etwas mache (.)

[56]

V [v] also lerne oder so (.) dann geht es besser. (.) aber when I procrastinate it_s like I_m SO

[57]

T [v] (...) (...) 130 [17:51.0] 131 [19:27.2] 132 [19:30.9] 133 [22:03.5]
A [v] people passen auf sich nicht auf. ((laughs)) denglisch.
V [v] stressed.

[58]

A [v] heutzutage leisten viele leute unter stress 134 [22:08.1] 135 [22:11.6] 136 [22:13.3]
H [v] leiTen? (.) oder?
V [v] oder lei, lei, leiden leiden. (.)

[59]

T [v] (...) 137 [22:16.7] 138 [22:17.9] 139 [22:28.0]
A [v] mhm.
H [v] nowadays, there_s a lot of stress for people (.) ähm
V [v] like to suffer.

[60]

H [v] caused by school, by work (.) sports, lack of sleep, malnutrition. like, how should I

[61]

A [v] there are a lot of uh, I don_t know- 140 [22:39.6] 141 [22:43.2] 142 [22:43.9]
H [v] formulate that sentence? causes.
V [v] ja. es kann, es kann,

[62]

A [v] es gibt sehr viele (.) wie sagt man das? příčina? genau. 143 [22:46.9] 144 [22:49.7] 145 [22:51.9] 146 [22:54.0] 147 [22:55.2]
H [v] gr- grunde.
V [v] ja- ah (.) !GRÜNDE! ja

[63]

A [v] es gibt sehr viele gründen? gründe! 148 [22:55.9] 149 [22:58.6] 150 [22:59.1] 151 [23:01.1] 152 [23:08.1]
H [v] what should I?

V [v] (.) genau. die gründen dafür sind zum beispiel (.) und jetzt- (.)

[64]

.. 153 [23:09.8] 154 [23:11.1] 155 [23:12.3] 156 [23:14.0]
A [v] daily routine.
H [v] (-) sind (-) ahm: (.)
V [v] arbeit, wenig zeit, schule. aber schlechte rou,
AI [v] ((mumbles something))

[65]

.. 157 [23:15.6] 158 [23:16.9] 159 [23:22.0] 160 [23:38.5]
A [v] routine.
H [v] ja. (.) die (.) äh: (.) ja (.) es
V [v] routine? exams, oder, oder prüfungen (.) ahm (.)

[66]

.. 161 [23:42.4] 162 [23:44.4] 163 [23:49.3]
H [v] gibt unendlich viele gründe für stress. diese drei: (--) ahm;;
V [v] ja. ((laughs))
M [v] ja. schlagzeilen?

[67]

164 [23:52.6] 165 [23:55.7] 166 [23:59.1] 167 [24:04.0] 168 [24:05.7]
A [v] (--) sind auch die gründe für stress. könnten
H [v] ah, ja. (.)
V [v] ja (.) schlagzeilen oder könnten?

[68]

.. 169 [24:14.6]
A [v] auch die gründe für stress sein.
H [v] aber es ist nicht in (--) also es sind nicht die gründe (.)

[69]

.. 170 [24:22.8] 171 [25:10.8]
T [v] (...)
A [v] if I have, ich denke an jemanden oder jemandem oder an etwas (-)
H [v] also (.) ((...))

[70]

172 [25:15.6] 173 [25:21.5] 174 [25:29.7] 175 [25:30.4]
A [v] an diesen sachen denken? (.) mhm. (.)
H [v] (-) weil wir jeden tag an: (--) an;; daran denken.
V [v] ja.

[71]

.. 176 [25:35.0] 177 [26:42.2]
T [v] (...)
A [v] ohja. (.) das klingt gut. viel besser.
V [v] ((laughs)) ich glaub wir, wir könn- wir könnten

[72]

V [v] schreiben dass ja wir sind dieser meinung auch. und (.) es kann (.) eigentlich (.) aber es

[73]

A [v] seit ich beim (unintelligible) bin.
H [v] okay, we, we
V [v] MUSS eigentlich nicht immer so sein.

[74]

A [v] or we
H [v] can say we_re, we have, we share the same opinion (.) within a certain range.

[75]

A [v] can (.) we can tell (.) it_s good but with a limit. if it_s übertrieben then (-)
H [v] ja.

[76]

A [v] grenzen (.) grenzen. grenzen
H [v] es sind;
V [v] also ähm, im einen (.) gegr- geg- gegrenzten, ja, grenzen.

[77]

A [v] auch (.) man sagt (.) wenn das gegrenzt ist;
H [v] wir stimmen, wir stimmen diese drei punkte

[78]

H [v] an (.) aber mit grenzen. äh: zu- zu.
V [v] ist das nicht ZU? ja- zu- ja. wir stimmen diesen drei

[79]

T [v] (...)
V [v] punkten zu. aber eben in einem bereich. zum beispiel die konkurrenz- die

[80]

A [v] einerseits (.) ja.
H [v] wir haben nicht zu viele wörter. wir haben eh nur
V [v] konkurrenz im zweite punkt.

[81]

H [v] hundertzwanzig und wenn wir so viel über unser meinungen (.) und (.)
S [v] ja, aber wir

[82]

A [v] einerseits ist
 H [v] ja, stimmt. aber dafür haben wir noch viel mehr;
 S [v] haben nicht so viel zeit.

[83]

A [v] dieses system gut weil äh (--) weil äh leute klug sind. (.) how to make this (.)?

[84]

A [v] ((laughs)) yeah (.) but I thought (-) I thought: einerseits (.) yeah but,
 H [v] like, it _s not a good ah (.) like, it _s a good argument. (.) ya, ya but link

[85]

A [v]
 H [v] think it _s not a very good argument too;
 V [v] dann wir können einfach sagen dass (.) ah (.)

[86]

V [v] stress ist überall und alle haben erfahrung, erfahrungen damit. und dann zum beispiel

[87]

V [v] sagen dass ja (-) was für eine erfahrung. was ist die konsequenz? dass manche nicht

[88]

V [v] gut schlafen können (.) manche haben wie ich zitternde hände oder manchmal kann

[89]

H [v] ja, kopfschmerzen und bauchschmerzen.
 V [v] man auch diese bauchprobleme haben. es ist

[90]

A [v] immer mehr kinder machen schlecht
 V [v] diese gesundhei- gesundheitsprobleme.

[91]

T [v] (...)
 A [v] erfahrungen damit, wir wissen dass, wir sind überzeugt dass;
 H [v] wir sind

[92]

A [v] like (.) we are convinced that- wir sind überzeugt

H [v] überzeugt?	
V [v]	ja, das könnte anfang sein. wir sind überzeugt

[93]

..	211 [31:32.8]
A [v] dass jeden tag immer mehr kinder erfahrungen mit stress machen.	
V [v] dass jeden tag;	ja, das ist gut. kannst

[94]

..	212 [31:35.0]	213 [31:51.2]	214 [31:53.0]
T [v]	(...)		
A [v]		überzeugt. (.) okay, jetzt müssen wir denken.	
H [v]		wir sind was?	
V [v]	du das schreiben?		

[95]

A [v] was kommt erstens? dass jeden tag immer mehr kinder? oder dass immer mehr kinder
--

[96]

..	215 [32:11.9]	216 [32:13.7]
A [v] jeden tag schlechte erfahrungen machen?	dass jeden tag kinder schlechte	
V [v]	!jeden tag!	

[97]

..	217 [32:18.2]	218 [32:20.2]
A [v] erfahrungen machen, mit stress machen.	man macht erfahrungen, oder?	
V [v]	mit: (-) haben;	

[98]

219 [32:24.3]	220 [32:25.7]	221 [32:27.0]	222 [32:40.7]
A [v]	haben, das was du schon hast aber machen, was du noch		
H [v]	haben erfahrungen.	!erleben!	
V [v]	!NEIN!		

[99]

A [v] nicht hast. ich meine, wenn du hast erfahrungen, das heißt dass du weißt schon etwas.
H [v]

[100]

..	223 [32:41.5]	224 [32:41.5]	225 [32:45.1]	226 [32:54.0]
T [v]		(...)		
A [v] aber wir sagen dass jeden tag immer kinder bekommen;		dass (---		
H [v]				
V [v]		erleben ist gut.		

[101]

..	227 [32:56.0]	228 [32:58.6]	229 [33:02.3]	230 [33:02.6]
A [v]) ahm: (---		mhm. ((laughs))		
V [v]	jeden tag (--) immer mehr kinder. (--) gut?		ja, ich (---	das

M [v]	jeden tag;	mhm.
S [v]	jeden tag;	

[102]

..	231 [33:06.5]	232 [33:08.7]
A [v]	egal ((laughs)). wir schreiben alle dasselbe.	
H [v]	(--) wegen (--) stress	
V [v]	war deine satz.	

[103]

..	233 [33:14.7]	234 [33:15.3]	235 [33:38.2]
T [v]	(...)		
A [v]	sie bekommen problemen mit		
H [v]	schlechte erfahrungen erleben?		
V [v]	ja.		
M [v]	mhm.	mhm.	

[104]

..	236 [33:46.0]	237 [33:46.8]	238 [33:47.9]
A [v]	gesundheit, können nicht gut schlafen.		oder sie
H [v]		menschen (.)	
V [v]		oder man bekommt.	
M [v]			

[105]

..	239 [33:49.9]	240 [33:58.5]
A [v]	bekommen, kinder.	
H [v]	(.) like people, people start having health problems and sleeping	
V [v]	!JA!	

[106]

..	241 [33:58.6]	242 [34:03.1]
A [v]	jaja (.) but that in german. ((laughs))	
H [v]	problems from a young age, which will affect their future. ah: menschen. ah;; what did	
V [v]		

[107]

..	243 [34:04.8]	244 [34:06.8]
A [v]	one more time, say it in english.	
H [v]	I just say? people start having health problems and	

[108]

..	245 [34:15.8]
H [v]	sleeping problems from a young age.
V [v]	(beginnen von Problemen von jung Alter haben)

[109]

..	246 [34:21.8]	247 [34:23.1]
A [v]	bekommen diese probleme.	
H [v]	menschen bekommen ah (---)	
V [v]	haben diese prob, haben die;	

[110]

..	248 [34:25.5]	249 [34:28.3]	250 [34:31.1]
A [v]	gesundheitsprobleme.	problemen die sind mit stress verbunden; (---	
H [v]	problem;	how do you say stress related problems? (-) ah: (---	
S [v]	(.) gesundheitsprobleme.		

[111]

..	251 [34:37.7]	252 [34:44.8]	253 [34:46.5]	254 [34:48.5]
A [v]	) ah: stressverbundene !problemen! (...)			
H [v]		menschen ahm (--)		
S [v]			bekommen	

[112]

..	255 [34:50.5]	256 [34:53.2]	257 [34:55.0]
A [v]	stressverbundene probleme.	jungen alter? nein.	
H [v]			kleines alter? nízky
V [v]		schon von sehr- (---	

[113]

..	258 [34:59.1]
A [v]	(-) (unintelligible russian) (.) slovatskiy- slovenskiy
H [v]	(unintelligible)? (-) niedriges alter?
S [v]	a to je- (unintelligible slovak)

[114]

..	259 [35:12.9]	260 [36:00.7]
T [v]		(...)
A [v]	- russkiy (unintelligible russian) (tak to bolo) (wir haben was anderes),	
V [v]		oder
S [v]		

[115]

..	261 [36:06.2]
A [v]	<mumbles (unintelligible
H [v]	<mumbles (unintelligible
V [v]	zum beispiel, jede von unsere gruppe can contact with this. <mumbles (unintelligible
S [v]	hat schon (---) hat schon

[116]

..	262 [36:14.2]	263 [36:17.4]	264 [36:18.2]
A [v]	german)>		
H [v]	slovak)>	von dem jungen alter? (--)	von einem jungen alter.
V [v]	slovak)>	aha;	
S [v]	mit- mit stress ah getroffen (--)		

[117]

265 [36:20.2]	
A [v]	von jungem alter. von jungem (---) von (---) wie sagt man das über über alter? wir

[118]

..	266 [36:29.6]
----	---------------

A [v] sagen dass (.) das (.) nicht niedrig (oder hoch)-
H [v] vo- because you say from A young age.

[119]

..	267 [36:33.7]
H [v] not from young age.	
V [v] ja aber zum bei (--) for example I say from a (-) low age in	

[120]

..
V [v] slovak. oh it _s SO; it _s so different but I think german is more related to english than

[121]

..	268 [36:47.4]	269 [39:04.3]	270 [39:06.8]
T [v] (...)			
H [v] this is a world-wide problem that affects all of us in each and every one			
V [v] to us. ja.			

[122]

..	271 [39:07.4]	272 [39:09.7]
H [v] of our countries?		
V [v] ja- da (.) das ist das ist ein weltweites problem. ist es DAS problem?		

[123]

273 [39:17.2]	274 [39:19.2]	275 [39:22.4]	276 [39:24.8]
A [v] ja, das problem.		das (.) DAS problem.	
V [v] ein weltweites problem- der jede von uns;			ah DAS
S [v] !mhm!			

[124]

..	277 [39:27.4]	278 [42:34.4]	279 [42:36.7]
T [v] (...)			
H [v] you said a sentence like de:r			
V [v] das jede von uns (---)		su- suicide rate is (.) taking	

[125]

..	280 [42:38.4]	281 [42:38.6]	282 [42:41.6]
A [v] ja, wenn wir auf die situation denken.			wenn
H [v] ja.			die: (--
V [v] up;		selbstmord? ist es selbstmord?	

[126]

..	284 [42:49.3]	285 [42:49.4]
T [v] (...)		
A [v] wir an die situation denken (---)		
H [v]) selbst- mord- rate.		
V [v] die (.) die er selbstmordrate (-) wird (.) wä-		

[127]

..	286 [42:54.2]	287 [44:22.2]	288 [44:25.6]
T [v]			

A [v]	
H [v]	okay, now we just have to write a really inspiring last sentence.
V [v]	wächst. you can
M [v]	
S [v]	

[128]

..	289 [44:29.5]	290 [44:31.5]
A [v]	((laughs)) let_s (.) let_s not die. ((laughs))	
H [v]		let_s (.) let_s save ourselves from shaking
V [v]	do this.	
M [v]	((laughs))	
S [v]	((laughs))	

[129]

..	291 [44:35.6]	292 [44:37.9]
H [v]	hands. and- (--)	we can- we can-
V [v]	eh: (.) or: we could like (-)	we could write an empfehlung. find what

[130]

..	293 [44:39.2]	294 [44:44.1]	295 [44:45.9]
H [v]		cause everybody needs their beauty sleep.	
V [v]	you like (-)	find what you find relaxing.	!oh yes!

[131]

296 [44:47.4]	297 [44:48.3]	298 [44:53.2]
A [v]	everyone can find a solution for- für sich selbst.	
H [v]	((thinks))	
V [v]		ja (.) ja (.) jeder kann eine

[132]

..	299 [44:57.5]	300 [44:59.0]	301 [45:01.7]
A [v]	lösung, lösung, !lösung!		
V [v]	riešenie (---)	!lösung!; <<laughs> solution?> ja; ((laughs))	
S [v]			warum nicht?

[133]

302 [45:03.7]	303 [45:12.1]
A [v]	wir sind (typen) von lösung
H [v]	ah (-) jeder muss seine lösung ah: seine eigene lösung-
V [v]	aber ich glaub-

[134]

..	304 [45:14.1]	305 [45:15.5]	306 [45:16.3]	307 [45:18.3]	308 [45:35.7]	309 [45:37.1]
T [v]				(...)		
A [v]	((laughs)).					
H [v]		soll.	((writes the sentence))		ah: ja;;	
V [v]			also! soll!.		ja- everybody needs	
M [v]	jeder soll? hm?					

[135]

..

310 [45:38.9]

311 [45:41.6]

H [v] exactly. jeder soll
V [v] their beauty sleep. ((laughs)) that _s nice- like a little joke when you

[136]

..

312 [45:48.4] 313 [45:49.0]

A [v] schönheitsschlaf;
H [v] seine eigene ah: lösung selbst finden; und seine beauty sleep.
V [v] oder mei- oder warte mal;
M [v] aha.

[137]

..

314 [45:50.4]

315 [45:55.1]

A [v]
H [v] weil- weil man einfach seine schönheitsschlaf
V [v] mei (.) man einfach braucht seine-
M [v]

[138]

..

316 [45:59.1]

317 [46:00.0]

H [v] braucht;
M [v] ((laughs))