



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

„The use of the first language(s)
in monolingual and multilingual EFL classes“

verfasst von / submitted by

Sabrina Koch

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Magistra der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2015 / Vienna, 2015

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

A 190 344 456

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

Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Geographie und
Wirtschaftskunde

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. M. Evelien Keizer

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Univ.-Prof. Dr. M. Evelien Keizer. She was always willing to read through my drafts and provided me with constructive feedback.

I owe special thanks to my parents Christa and Josef and my grandparents Christine and Gustav for their encouragement and massive support in every respect throughout my studies. This extends to my friends who were always open to discussions about my thesis and who managed to cheer me up when I felt low.

Lastly, I would also like to thank my boyfriend Adi for his love, his long-term moral support and his understanding when time together was rare.

Thank you!

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	iv
List of figures	vi
1. Introduction	1
2. Important terms and definitions.....	3
2.1 Monolingual vs. multilingual.....	3
2.1.1 Monolingual	3
2.1.2 Bilingual	4
2.1.3 Multilingual.....	5
2.1.4 Teaching monolingual and multilingual classes	7
2.2 First language, native language or mother tongue	8
2.3 English as a lingua franca	10
2.4 The (non)-native English speaker teacher.....	12
3. Teaching methods and approaches.....	15
3.1 Methods, approaches and techniques in ELT	15
3.2 Two hundred years of foreign language teaching.....	16
3.2.1 Methods tolerating L1 use.....	17
3.2.2 Methods insisting on TL use	20
3.3 L1 in official documents	25
3.3.1 The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages	25
3.3.2 The Austrian curriculum	26
3.3.3 European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages and European Language Portfolio.....	27
3.3.4 Educational standards (Bildungsstandards E8).....	28
4. Code-switching	29
4.1 Definition and distinction	29
4.2 Arguments against and for code-switching.....	31
4.3 Code-switching as object of investigation	34
4.3.1 Code-switching and the teacher	35
4.3.2 Code-switching and the students.....	38

5. Research design.....	40
5.1 Research purpose and research questions	40
5.2 Research methods and analysis	41
5.2.1 Classroom observations	41
5.2.2 Teacher interviews.....	43
5.2.3 Data analysis.....	43
5.3 Settings and participants.....	44
5.3.1 The setting	44
5.3.2 The participants	46
5.4 Expectations and challenges.....	47
6. Analysis of classroom observations.....	49
6.1 Code-switching on the part of the teachers	52
6.1.1 Content-related functions	52
6.1.2 Non-content-related functions	64
6.2 Code-switching on the part of the students	66
6.2.1 Content-related functions	66
6.2.2 Non-content-related functions	76
6.3 Code-switching by absolute numbers.....	79
7. Analysis of interviews.....	84
7.1 Personal information	85
7.2 Multilingual students.....	86
7.3 Classroom practice	87
7.4 Classroom experience.....	91
7.5 (Advanced) training.....	92
7.6 Personal view	94
8. Discussion	97
9. Conclusion	101
10. Bibliography.....	103
Appendix	112

List of abbreviations

BMBF	Bundesministerium für Bildung und Frauen
CEFR	Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
CLL	Community Language Learning
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
ELP	European Language Portfolio
ELT	English Language Teaching
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
EPOSTL	European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
(non)-NEST	(non)-Native English Speaker Teacher
TL	Target language
TPR	Total Physical Response

List of figures

Table 1: Definitions of mother tongue	9
Table 2: The view on L1 use in different teaching methods and approaches	24
Table 3: The functions of code-switching from a teacher's perspective	35
Table 4: The functions of code-switching from a student's perspective	38
Table 5: The settings	45
Table 6: Monolingual and multilingual classes	46
Table 7: Code-switching functions for teachers	50
Table 8: Code-switching functions for students	51
Table 9: Number of teachers' switches	79
Table 10: Content-related and non-content-related language used by teachers	81
Table 11: Number of students' switches	81
Table 12: Content-related and non-content-related language used by students	83
Table 13: Coding interview data	84
Table 14: Personal information	85
Table 15: Multilingual students	86
Table 16: Classroom practice	87
Table 17: Classroom experience	91
Table 18: (Advanced) training	92
Table 19: Personal view	94

1. Introduction

The use of the first language in the foreign language classroom has always been a controversial issue and the view that the medium of instruction must be restricted to English only prevailed for a long time (Jingxia 2010: 10), according to the motto “Every second spent using the L1 is a second not spent using English! – And every second counts!” (Atkinson 1993: 12). This attitude has its origin in the nineteenth century when L1 use was discouraged and banned from the classroom because of its negative effects on the development of the target code (Cook 2001: 404). From 1960 onwards there was a shift towards a more humanistic approach which considers both affective and cognitive factors influencing language learning and which no longer considered the L1 to be a hindrance but rather an asset to language learning. Nevertheless, it was still avoided in foreign language classrooms for quite a long time (Hall 2011: 89-93). In recent years, the use of students’ first language in the foreign language classroom has received considerable support and teachers’ attitudes seem to be rather positive (Littlewood and Yu 2011: 64).

The purpose of the present research is to analyse monolingual and multilingual settings in terms of L1 use or code-switching incidents, to highlight similarities and differences between these two settings and to learn about teachers’ beliefs and practices. Moreover, it is intended to be thought provoking, make teachers reflect on their teaching and their idea of language learning and in the best case lead to positive improvements of existing practices.

The research questions are the following:

1. Is there a difference between code-switching in monolingual and multilingual EFL classes as far as functions and quantity are concerned?
2. What are teachers’ attitudes towards code-switching? Is it regarded as an asset or a hindrance to foreign language learning?
3. Do language policies, language learning experience and teacher training have an influence on teachers’ beliefs and practices?
4. Do teachers in multilingual EFL settings tolerate or even integrate first languages other than German? If yes, why and how? If no, why not?

These questions will be answered in Chapters 6 to 8 of this thesis. Prior to that, however, background information on previous research is given. In the second chapter, important terms

and definitions are explained and investigated in detail. These include the terms ‘monolingualism’, ‘multilingualism’, ‘first language’, ‘English as a lingua franca’ and ‘non-native English speaking teacher’.

Chapter 3 focuses on different teaching methods and approaches that have influenced the way English was and is taught in schools. These methods and approaches are sub-divided into two main categories, namely those which are based on the exclusive use of the target language and those which tolerate the use of the first language.

The phenomenon of code-switching is dealt with in Chapter 4, which addresses the historical perspectives and current views and considers the arguments of proponents and opponents. Moreover, different functions of code-switching will be presented and divided into teachers’ and students’ switches.

The research design outlined in Chapter 5, which deals with the research purpose, the methods, the analysis, the setting, and the participants, is followed by the evaluation of qualitative data. This data is intended to provide new insights into foreign language teaching and learning.

2. Important terms and definitions

As the terms ‘monolingual’, ‘multilingual’ and ‘first language’ will occur frequently throughout this thesis, they will be presented and described in the present chapter. The terms will not be dealt with in detail though, as this would go beyond the scope of the discussion. The aim is to give a brief insight into the subject matter as well as to draw attention to research and literature in those areas. Apart from these concepts, the issue of English as a lingua franca and the native/non-native English-speaking teacher debate are considered to be worth mentioning since they have a huge influence on the ELT profession and are considered to be relevant in terms of monolingual and multilingual classrooms.

2.1 Monolingual vs. multilingual

2.1.1 Monolingual

There seems to be disagreement among scholars regarding the meaning of the term monolingual or monolingualism, since various definitions can be found in the literature. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2015), for example, defines a monolingual person as somebody who can “speak and understand only one language”. Other scholars (including Crystal 1987, referred to in Ellis 2006, Kemp 2009, Madonsela 2014 etc.) share this view, while Richards and Schmidt (2010: 374) add an interesting point, namely that a monolingual person possesses “active knowledge of only one language, though perhaps a passive knowledge of others”. This definition is rather broad since the attribute monolingual also applies to people who have at least heard of or even learned another language to some extent. Yet it implies that they are not able to have a conversation in this language. Ellis (2006: 176) also claims that monolinguals must be “placed on a continuum”, which means that they range from people who can say single words in another language to those who may have learned other languages but cannot communicate. This is also true for some of the students who participate in this study. They are monolingual in the sense that they can speak and use one language, which is German, but probably know single words and expressions in other languages. This may be due to the media, personal interest, holidays in foreign countries etc. In addition, they have had up to four years of English in school, but especially students with an A1 proficiency level are not likely to be able to communicate effectively in English but can only understand and produce very basic expressions. Therefore, according to the definition proposed by Ellis

(2006) – which is considered most appropriate for the purpose of this study – those students are monolingual.

As for monolingual classrooms, Madonsela (2014: 630) states that those are characterised by “learners [who] speak the same language and, in most cases, also share a cultural background”. This is the case for EFL classes in northern Carinthia, where all of the students who participated in the present study share German as their first language. Moreover, all of them grew up in the same environment and come from the same cultural background. Therefore, in this thesis the term monolingual will be applied to refer not only to an individual’s knowledge of a language, but also to depict the overall linguistic composition of a classroom.

2.1.2 Bilingual

Baker starts his introduction to bilingualism with an interesting statement. He first claims that as a bicycle has two wheels and as binoculars are made for two eyes it would be logical to assume that bilingualism implies speaking two languages. He then goes on to claim that it is not that easy (2006: 2). Other authors are also aware of the difficulties in formulating a precise definition of the term bilingualism as “there is a huge literature on what one might term the ‘technicalities’ of bilingualism [...]” and scholars’ opinions on this matter vary considerably (Edwards 2010: 234). According to Edwards, for example, everybody is bilingual because everybody can say some words in another language, so even people who can just say and/or understand ‘buon giorno’ in Italian can be considered bilingual. Weinreich, the pioneer of bilingual studies, states that “the practice of alternately using two languages will be called bilingualism, and the person involved, bilingual” (1986: 1). Another definition is provided by Richards and Schmidt who regard a bilingual as “a person who uses at least two languages with some degree of proficiency” (2010: 54). They also add that bilinguals often have different commands of the two languages. At this point important questions arise – how proficient does somebody need to be in order to call him/herself bilingual and how is proficiency defined after all? According to Kemp (2009: 18), there is still some dissent on this issue, although researchers have put much effort into answering this question. Bloomfield (1933: 55), for example, claims that bilingual speakers need to have “native-like control of two languages” while others, such as Haugen (1953: 7) state that people merely need to be able to “produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language”. The different notions provided by Bloomfield, Haugen and Edwards are regarded as the “maximal” or “minimal” definitions of bilingual and both fail to describe the term

accurately, according to Cook and Singleton (2014: 4). While the former is too exclusive, as it applies to very few people, the latter is too inclusive, as it is applicable to everybody who knows some words or expressions in a language other than his/her first one (Cook and Singleton 2014: 4).

What is clear from bilingual studies is that earlier definitions place much emphasis on native-like and equal control of both languages, while later ones are much broader and encompass various proficiencies (Edwards 2010: 236). Bilingualism is also often perceived as a “continuum” by various researchers (Valdès et al. 2003: 36) and “bilingual people will find themselves at different points on this continuum” (Crystal 1997: 364). Crystal clarifies, however, that the boundaries are not clear-cut since various factors and dimensions need to be considered (1997: 364). These are the ability in terms of the four language skills, balance of the two languages, age of acquisition, development of the two languages and effect on the other language, contexts in which the languages are used and acquired etc. (Baker 2006: 3-4). Those factors will not be dealt with though, since this would go beyond the scope of this study.

Mackey (1962, cited in Kemp 2009: 19) suggests that scholars have come to the conclusion that it is “either arbitrary or impossible to determine” when people can be called bilingual. So, in general one could claim that the boundary between monolingualism and bilingualism and within various stages of bilingualism is rather fuzzy which becomes apparent when considering the above-mentioned definitions. One can conclude that this ambiguity is also true for multilingualism, as we shall see in the next subchapter.

2.1.3 Multilingual

Multilingualism, too, is a controversial issue and definitions vary considerably among scholars. Most of them agree that multilingualism implies more than two languages, so “the use of three or more languages” (Kemp 2009: 11). They also agree that multilinguals use and speak their various languages with different proficiencies, for different purposes, in different contexts etc. (Richards and Schmidt 2010: 379, Cenoz 2009: 2, Kemp 2009: 11). Terms like polyglot or plurilingual are often used synonymously.

On the other hand, there are those researchers who do not make a distinction between bilingualism and multilingualism but use the term multilingual to refer to anybody who

knows two or more languages. In this regard, bilingualism is just a subcategory of multilingualism but not a category in its own right. Moreover, there are those who just distinguish between monolinguals, as speakers of one language, and bilinguals, as speakers of two or more languages. For both groups, bilinguals and multilinguals are the same, which meets with criticism (Kemp 2009: 15). Bhathia and Ritchie (2013: 111) refer to several scholars who call for a distinction between bilingualism and multilingualism and who have investigated possible benefits that multilinguals enjoy over bilinguals. Such benefits include more language experience, increased metalinguistic awareness, greater cognitive flexibility etc. It is because of these discrepancies and the difficulty of distinguishing between a monolingual, bilingual and multilingual speaker that some researchers suggest rejecting those terms and, for instance, employing the concept “second language (L2) user for somebody who is actively using a language other than their first” (Cook and Singleton 2014: 4).

In the present study, the distinction between bilinguals and multilinguals is not of concern, which is why the issue will not be investigated any further. Both bilingual and multilingual students draw on prior language knowledge – be it two or more languages. The question is rather whether they are allowed to make use of this prior knowledge in class and whether the teacher uses existing knowledge of his/her students as a resource.

What is important for the present study is that “a person who knows more than one language can perceive and experience the world through more than one lens” (Saville-Troike 2006: 94). With this statement as a basis, this thesis will only distinguish between speakers of one language, monolinguals, and speakers of more than one language, multilinguals. In this context the term multilingual is used to refer to both speakers of two and of more languages. What is also worth mentioning is that it not only refers to an individual’s knowledge of a language but also to the overall linguistic composition of a classroom. The multilingual classroom is characterised by students who have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, meaning that different first languages are present in the classroom (Poudel 2010: 123). This does not mean that students in a multilingual class have to be multilingual necessarily. A multilingual classroom can consist of both monolingual and multilingual students. The important characteristic is that the student body is heterogeneous and that it consists of different first languages.

2.1.4 Teaching monolingual and multilingual classes

As far as teaching in monolingual and multilingual classes is concerned, Poudel (2010) lists several factors that should be taken into consideration. It is claimed, for example, that students in monolingual classes are more likely to switch to their first language than students in multilingual classes, who are more dependent on using the target language as they do not share a common tongue. In this study, however, students in multilingual classrooms have a common language, which is German. Some of them may lack a high degree of proficiency though, because they may not have lived in Austria for long, or may not speak German at home and with their friends or their first language may be very different from German etc. What Poudel also points out is that teaching multilingual classes requires the teacher to adopt a quite ‘individualised’ approach, since students encounter different language problems which do not affect everybody in the classroom. In a monolingual classroom, however, the students all have similar problems. Therefore, the multilingual classroom requires skilled teachers who can deal with their students’ linguistic diversity. What is not appropriate in terms of heterogeneous classrooms is to call for an English-only approach – instead students’ linguistic background should be taken into account (2010: 123-124). Unfortunately many schools neglect students’ language repertoires and treat them as if they were monolingual (Garcia and Sylvan 2011: 385, Muller and Beardsmore 2004: 24). According to Garcia and Sylvan (2010: 390), it is high time that schools adopt a more multilingual approach to language teaching and no longer restrict the medium of instruction to only one or two tongues.

Coelho (2012: 194), for example mentions various ways to create a classroom environment which appreciates multilingualism and raises language awareness among the participants. Although she speaks of L2 settings in this context, her suggestions are also applicable to foreign language settings. One of her suggestions is to do a language audit or create a language profile, which lists all the languages spoken by the students and which may include samples of handwriting, maps, further information on the languages etc. In this way, both the learners and the teachers get an overview of the linguistic diversity in the classroom and get information on other languages and cultures. Another interesting approach is to nominate a language of the week or month, within which learners teach certain expressions in their language to the class. The idea behind this is to motivate learners to draw a comparison between different languages. In order to create an ‘authentic’ multilingual environment, bulletin boards should be introduced which contain signs, notices and other material in different languages (Coelho 2012: 205-211). Butzkamm and Caldwell also recommend

various strategies which can be employed in multilingual classrooms and support multilingual learners. According to them, schools should at least supply bilingual dictionaries in different languages which can be used as an aid at any time. Moreover, students who are good at both their L1 and the foreign language could be “linguistic informants” and act as tutors for colleagues who share their L1 and who have an issue with the target code. During the lessons, “time-outs” could be introduced within which students are allowed to speak their first language for a certain amount of time in order to clarify what the teacher said in English. This strategy is said to be very beneficial because it enhances motivation, interest and the relationship among the learners. Butzkamm and Caldwell not only address what students can contribute to a multilingual environment but also highlight the teachers’ responsibility. They suggest that teachers should acquire basic knowledge of the most common foreign languages in order to help their students with pronunciation and grammar, for example. Moreover, they say that it would be useful to record frequent mistakes to anticipate or even prevent troubles with specific words and structures (2009: 230-235). These are just some of the suggestions mentioned by Coelho (2012) and Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009). The ideas of these particular authors were chosen because they are considered to be easily realisable in the foreign language classroom and create a supportive and pleasant atmosphere for a linguistically heterogeneous body of pupils.

Edwards claims that by integrating their various L1s in the classroom pupils are empowered and their languages and cultures are valued (2010: 196). As the teachers do not speak all these languages and the students need to help one another, “a shift toward shared authority” takes place, which means that both the instructors and the learners play an important role in the classroom when it comes to conveying and inferring meaning (Auerbach 1993: 23-24).

2.2 First language, native language or mother tongue

Sometimes, the terms first language, native language and mother tongue are used interchangeably as the differences are rather unclear. What they all have in common is that they are acquired very early, which means in the first three years of life (Saville-Troike 2006: 4). Richards and Schmidt (2010: 221) define them in the same way. “A first language”, L1, is described as “a person’s mother tongue or the language acquired first” and is equivalent to ‘native language’. They also state that people “may gradually shift from the main use of one language to the main use of another”. The question is if the term is still appropriate then. And what if people are raised bilingually? Do they have two ‘first’ languages? Is one language

regarded as the first and the other one as the second? (Davies 2003: 17). Would it be better to use another term instead, such as mother tongue?

TABLE 1.1 *Definitions of mother tongue*

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Definition</i>
<i>Origin</i>	the language(s) one learned first
<i>Competence</i>	the language(s) one knows best
<i>Function</i>	the language(s) one uses most
<i>Identification</i>	
a. internal	the language(s) one identifies with
b. external	the language(s) one is identified as a native speaker of by others

Table 1: Definitions of mother tongue

In order to define ‘mother tongue’, Skutnabb-Kangas (1988: 16) adopts four criteria which can be seen in Table 1 - not all of them are equally important or describe the term well though. She regards the definition by function as the least appropriate since people are often compelled to speak a certain

language and cannot chose which one they want to speak in everyday life. This is especially true for minority groups. The definition by competence is also considered to be inadequate because people may be denied the opportunity to develop their mother tongue in institutional settings where another language is dominant, and therefore, they cannot achieve competence. A combination of origin and identification, however, is assumed to define mother tongue best. “Origin is something basic that the person herself/himself cannot change [...] Identification has to do with a basic human right to self-definition. Competence and function on the other hand can be results of political decisions.” (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1989: 455).

Baker and Jones (1998: 47-48) also draw attention to the vagueness of the term mother tongue itself. Regarding the literal meaning of mother tongue, it implies “the language that the mother speaks to a child”. In this context both the role of the father is neglected, certain family structures are ignored and the influence of peers is not taken into account. As far as competence and identification are concerned, they are believed to possibly change over time, depending on the context and environment.

The terms native language and mother tongue are automatically associated with the notion of the native speaker, which is difficult to pin down as well. Several authors, including Mesthrie (2010: 600) claim that “native speaker and mother tongue are no longer transparent terms in the sociology of English”, and are not satisfactory anymore in terms of educational issues because they suggest a monolingual approach (Love and Ansaldo 2010: 589). The monolingual native-speaker has long been an ‘exemplary model’ in linguistics and was used as the benchmark for communication in a foreign language. In recent years, however, the beliefs that underlie those notions have frequently been scrutinised (Kravchenko 2010: 678).

One can conclude from the preceding discussion of the terms ‘first language’, ‘mother tongue’, and ‘native language’ that all of them are controversial. For the purpose of this thesis it was decided to mainly work with ‘first language’ or ‘L1’. This decision is based on the fact that these terms occurred most frequently in the literature consulted and seem to be accepted in linguistic circles when it comes to educational issues. Moreover, a gender bias should be avoided and importance is attached to gender sensitive language which is why the concept of ‘mother tongue’ is rejected as a technical term. However, it will be used in the student questionnaire simply because students learn this term in secondary school and might not know the phrase ‘first language’. As far as native language is concerned, the controversy surrounding the native speaker, which will be addressed below, has prompted the author of this thesis to discard this term.

In this thesis a first language or L1 is defined as the language(s) that was(were) acquired early and that a person strongly identifies with. Based on the idea of Skutnabb-Kangas (1988: 16) it is assumed that a person can have more than one first language because students in multilingual classrooms are likely to have been raised multilingually.

2.3 English as a lingua franca

Although the issue of ‘English as a lingua franca (ELF)’ will not be a main concern in this thesis, it is regarded as important, as it inevitably plays a role in the next chapter, which deals with the discussion of ‘native and non-native teachers’. Therefore, a very brief introduction will be given and the implications of ELF for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) will be addressed. Moreover, the topic may be relevant in relation to multilingualism and multilingual classroom practices. In this context it would be interesting to discover if students of multilingual backgrounds use communication strategies differently to monolingual students.

Various terms are used to describe communication among speakers who do not share a first language. Those include “English as an international language (EIL)”, “English as a lingua franca (ELF)”, “English as a global language”, “English as a medium of intercultural communication” and “International English” (Seidlhofer 2004: 210). In this study, however, the concept of ELF will be used exclusively. A simple definition of ELF is difficult to give, however (Jenkins 2009: 200), and the various definitions provided by different authors leave room for interpretation (Smit 2010: 49). According to House (1999: 74), for example, “ELF interactions are defined as interactions between members of two or more different

linguacultures in English, for none of whom English is the mother tongue". This definition corresponds to Firth's understanding of the term, who regards ELF as a "contact language" that is used for communication among speakers of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds (1996: 240). Those definitions seem to be rather narrow and exclude native speakers. Not all researchers, however, define ELF so rigidly but also include people from what Kachru termed the inner and outer circle (Jenkins 2006: 161).

When it comes to the focus of ELF, Cogo (2012: 98-99) states that "[t]he main purpose of ELF research today is of course, to reveal some of the forms that emerge in ELF interaction in specific communities, but more importantly to highlight the pragmatic strategies speakers draw on as they collaboratively engage in communication". She stresses the fact that identifying core features is not the aim and impossible anyway, since the context of ELF communication is highly variable – as is the group of speakers. ELF descriptions – both in the phonological, pragmatic and lexicogrammatical area – have increased in the last few years. In her paper, Seidlhofer (2004: 215) mentions some of the findings on those levels, which will not be addressed at this point though, especially as far as the phonological level and lexicogrammatical features are concerned.

Cogo and Dewey's paper (2006: 68-69) reports on findings in ELF pragmatics and reveals several features that support communication, including overlaps, utterance completion, latching, back-channelling and code-switching. Although the recorded conversations in Cogo and Dewey's study occurred in a natural environment and were not restricted to instructional settings, the strategies might also be adopted in the classrooms that will be investigated. Both types of classrooms – monolingual and multilingual – involve non-native speakers of English. The questions that arise in this context are whether the strategies applied in monolingual classrooms differ from those applied in multilingual ones, where students do not share a common language, whether students in multilingual classrooms tend to rely on paraphrasing rather than on code-switching, whether they are more dependent on using English than monolingual classrooms, and others.

Other aspects that are associated with the highly complex issue of English as a lingua franca would go beyond the scope of this thesis and cannot be addressed for this reason. What is worth mentioning though is the native/non-native English-speaking teacher debate, which is investigated in the next subchapter.

2.4 The (non)-native English speaker teacher

Phillipson (1992: 185) refers to five different tenets that highly influenced English language teaching and he concludes that each one is wrong. Among them is the tenet that English is best taught monolingually, which the author calls the “monolingual fallacy”. According to this tenet, language learning is enhanced when only the target language is used and knowledge of other languages is ignored. However, “when the mother tongue is banned from the classroom, the teaching leads to the alienation of the learners, deprives them of their cultural identity, and leads to acculturation rather than increased intercultural communicative competence” (1992: 193). Moreover, the tenet is irrelevant in the sense that the majority of English teachers do not speak English as their first language and are able to use two or even more languages – a situation of which they can take advantage. A concept that is related to the monolingual fallacy is the “native speaker fallacy” which regards the native speaker as the optimal teacher and sets native-like proficiency as the ultimate goal for language learning (1992: 185, 193). Although this tenet has long influenced the ELT profession, it has lost validity nowadays because “[a] teacher is not adequately qualified to teach a language merely because it is his [or her] mother tongue” (UNESCO 1953: 69).

Several questions need to be addressed at this point. Who is a native speaker of English? What competences does a native speaker have? What distinguishes a native from a non-native speaker? Who is a better teacher? An attempt to answer these questions is made below.

At first sight, the term native speaker might seem to be logical and self-explanatory. However, “from a sociolinguistic perspective [...] the native/non-native issue is controversial” (Medgyes 1992: 341). Cook (1999: 185-187) summarizes the different meanings and interpretations that are provided by various authors and thereby illustrates the complexity and ambiguity involved in defining the term. Apart from having learnt a native language in childhood, a native speaker has

(a) a subconscious knowledge of rules, (b) an intuitive grasp of meanings, (c) the ability to communicate within social settings, (d) a range of language skills, [...] (e) creativity of language use [...] (f) identification with a language community [...] (g) the ability to produce fluent discourse, (h) knowledge of differences between their own speech and that of the ‘standard’ form of the language, and (i) the ability ‘to interpret and translate into the L1 of which she or he is a native speaker’. (Cook 1999: 186)

The author expresses criticism about some of the factors mentioned above. Firstly, native speakers may not know how their speech varies from the standard form (h). Secondly, they

might suffer from language disorders which hinder them from achieving accurate production and/or reception (g). Thirdly, only those who speak another language are able to translate into that language - monolingual native speakers, on the other hand, obviously lack this ability (i). Fourthly, people might not identify with a certain language community any longer for whatever reason but nevertheless remain native speakers of this language. Moreover, many non-native speakers have those competences as well, which is also claimed by other scholars. Davies (2003: 215), for example, does not mention characteristics which distinguish the native from the non-native English speaker – “all characteristics except that of early childhood exposure are contingent ones”. Instead of dividing people into native and non-native speakers of English, which entails various difficulties, researchers have come up with alternative concepts. Among them are “more or less accomplished users of English”, “more or less proficient users of English”, “expert speakers and affiliation” etc. (Medgyes 1992: 342). Medgyes, however, infers that “they are no less spurious than the concept of the native versus non-native speaker” and claims that “they will never become indistinguishable” (1992: 349). In terms of language teaching, Cook argues for shifting the emphasis from the native speakers to the L2 users who “should be considered as speakers on their own right” (1999: 185).

As far as self-perception of non-native English speaker teachers (non-NESTs) is concerned, research has revealed that differences in teaching behaviour which are attributable to language proficiency directly influence the way non-NESTs see and assess themselves compared to their native speaking colleagues (Braine 2006: 15). In Medgyes’ study, non-NESTs mentioned several difficulties in the use of English, especially in terms of fluency, followed by vocabulary, pronunciation, idiomatic English and so on. However, although language competence is a prerequisite for good teaching, it is not the only variable, which leaves room for other skills (1992: 345). In this context Medgyes came up with different assumptions or strengths of non-NESTs, which are, for example, being better at foreseeing language difficulties and being more sensitive to students’ needs in terms of language learning, which is due to the fact that they went through the same process of learning English as a foreign language. Another big advantage is their ability to speak the same first language as their students which may positively influence language learning and teaching. This argument will be investigated in detail below. The strengths just mentioned hold true for monolingual settings but become less important in multilingual classrooms (Medgyes 1992: 346-347). As far as this thesis is concerned though, it is assumed that the vast majority of students can speak and understand German, even in multilingual classrooms, so, the respective

competences are advantageous. Nevertheless, the issue of non-native English speaking teachers and their benefits is certainly more important in monolingual contexts.

Regarding students' perceptions of non-NESTs, studies have generally confirmed a rather positive attitude. Students respect non-NESTs and seem to give priority to professionalism and personal features rather than cultural background, linguistic background or accent. Nevertheless, they are aware of their respective strengths and weaknesses and relate very distinctive characteristics to either native or non-native-speaking English teachers. NESTs strengths are, for instance, oral skills, vocabulary and knowledge about the target culture, while they are often unable to answer questions raised by students and cannot comprehend the process of learning English as a foreign language. Non-NESTs, on the other hand, are believed to be able to better understand students with regard to language learning, to answer questions more easily and to control grammar. Oral skills and knowledge of the target culture, however, are considered to be their weaknesses (Braine 2006: 19-21).

Having addressed the strengths and weaknesses of both NESTs and non-NESTs, one important question remains: Who is the better teacher? Medgyes gives an answer here: "The concept of 'the ideal teacher' is not one reserved for either category" (1992: 348) since both of them have specific competences. Therefore, he suggests having an equal amount of NESTs and non-NESTs who can complement one another at school.

Unfortunately, many non-native English speaker teachers are still unaware of the current developments in second and foreign language learning and teaching and are unaware of their strengths and the contributions they can make to successful learning. Instead they stick to the native speaker norm and regard native-like proficiency as the ultimate goal (Llurda 2004: 319). Gradually, however, changes will take place. In this context Cook (1999: 204) claims that "[t]ogether with the change in attitude, placing more emphasis on the successful L2 user and on using the L1 more in teaching can bring language teaching to the realization that it is helping people use L2s, not imitate native speakers".

3. Teaching methods and approaches

Over the years, a large number of methods of language teaching have been developed. These methods each have different assumptions about language, about language learning, about the role of the teacher and of the student, and about the activities and techniques that best bring about language learning. They are based on principles and they involve various techniques for language learning. (Kitao and Kitao 1999: 14)

The authors provide a good introduction to the present chapter of this thesis, which will deal with methods and approaches that have influenced English language teaching over the last two centuries. First of all, however, the terminology that is essential for this discussion – concerning method, approach and technique – needs to be addressed briefly.

3.1 Methods, approaches and techniques in ELT

As the terms method and approach will often occur in the course of this thesis, a definition and distinction is considered to be necessary. In 1963, Edward Anthony first tried to develop a scheme which differentiates between method, approach and technique and which is frequently used to define the terms (Brown 2000: 169).

An approach is a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. [...] Method is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material [...] which is based upon the selected approach. An approach is axiomatic, a method procedural. Within one approach there can be many methods [...] A technique is implementational – that which actually takes place in a classroom [and is] used to accomplish an immediate objective. (Anthony 1963, cited in Richards and Rodgers 2001: 19)

Richards and Rodgers criticised Anthony's scheme as being too simple and replace his terms "approach", "method" and "technique" by "approach", "design" and "procedure". While the concept approach is consistent with the one provided by Anthony, the concepts design and procedure are much more precise. The level of design includes the syllabus, objectives, learning and teaching activities, learner roles, teacher roles and materials, while the level of procedure specifies the practices and behaviours involved in the current teaching situation (2001: 20-31).

Brown (2000: 170) claims that "[t]hrough their reformulation, Richards and Rodgers made [...] principal contributions to our understanding of the concept of method". What one can conclude from Richards and Rogers' elaboration is that a method or a design is very restrictive, since it specifies exactly what a teacher is supposed to do in the classroom and

thereby neglects that classroom situations are highly dependent on the respective contexts, students and teachers. According to Brown (2001: 15), most researchers still prefer Anthony's classification though, since Richards and Rogers' term 'design' is only related to curriculum and syllabus design but not in used in other contexts.

3.2 Two hundred years of foreign language teaching

A vast number of methods and approaches have been developed so far in quest of the ultimate way of teaching and learning (Crystal 2010: 394) and some of them are still used in one way or another (van Els et al. 1984: 146). The most popular ones are presented and investigated here in more detail, especially in terms of first language use. As different as they may be, they share one characteristic:

They all assume that there is a single set of principles which will determine whether or not learning will take place. Thus they all propose a single set of precepts for teacher and learner classroom behaviour, and assert that if these principles are faithfully followed, they will result in learning for all. (Nunan 1991, cited in Hall 2011: 78)

The history of teaching methods dates back to the eighteenth century, where the aim of learning a foreign language was to develop reading proficiency. Translation and the use of students' first language were characteristic for language teaching and inevitable until the end of the nineteenth century, which placed different demands on language learning and teaching. Hall (2011: 85) refers to this century as "an era in which the development of international business and travel required language learners to be able to use and communicate in the L2 [...]". At that time it was believed that second language learning closely resembles first language acquisition, which is why the students' L1 was banished from the classroom (Hall 2011: 81-85). As pointed out by Widdowson "[t]he conventional wisdom that holds that monolingual teaching is the best way of getting bilingual results dates back a century at least [...]", so the monolingual habit that persisted for so long had its origin in the nineteenth century (2003: 155). In this context, Thornbury remarks that the exclusive use of the target code remains "as an article of faith amongst many teachers to this day [even]" (2006: 67). Then structural and behaviouristic theories of language and of learning heavily influenced SLA research and consequently also the teaching methods that were developed. From 1960 onwards there was a shift towards a more humanistic approach, which considers both affective and cognitive factors influencing language learning and which encourage learner autonomy. This approach was then followed by a communicative one (Hall 2011: 85-93). Although the students' first language is no longer considered to be a hindrance but rather an

asset to language learning, it is still avoided in foreign language classrooms. This is due to the fact that for quite a long time “[t]he influence of the L1 may have been reconceptualized in SLA research, but seems to have brought about no corresponding reconceptualization in second language teaching” (Widdowson 2003: 152). Moreover, native-speaker teachers and their monolingual practices have long provided a model for both language learners and non-native English speaker teachers.

A global use of English, however, requires a bilingual or even multilingual pedagogy, since it coexists with other languages and is no longer owned by its native speakers (Widdowson 2003: 155-158). As far as existing teaching methods are concerned, they need to take into account that a first language is a students’ most vital resource and teachers need to employ both monolingual and bilingual strategies depending on the context and their students’ needs.

The most important means of acquiring an FL is certainly the FL itself, because in many respects, a language teaches itself. But the second most important means is the learners’ MT [mother tongue]. It should be employed regularly and systematically, and in its fullest form *where that is appropriate*. (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009: 25)

In summary, it can be stated that teaching methods have first promoted a bilingual instruction strategy, followed by a long period of monolingual dogmas. Only recently has a shift backwards to a bilingual pedagogy taken place; this shift, however, still needs to be anchored in language teaching. In the chapters 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, the different teaching methods and approaches will be dealt with in detail. For this purpose, they are divided into methods that allow the use of students’ first language and those that claim exclusive use of the target language, similar to Ellis and Shintani’s categorization (2014: 227).

3.2.1 Methods tolerating L1 use

Grammar-Translation Method

The Grammar-Translation Method has its origin in the study of the classical languages Latin and Greek. Because it is linked to the way the classical languages were taught for hundreds of years, it is also called “Classical Method” (Kitao and Kitao 1999: 14) or “traditional method” (van Els et al. 1984: 147). When other languages than Latin and Greek were incorporated into the curriculum in the eighteenth century, the same method was applied (Richards and Rogers 2001: 4).

The principles that form the basis of the Grammar-Translation Method are mentioned by various authors. The ultimate goal of the method is the ability to read in the target language.

In order to reach this goal, it was necessary for students to learn grammar rules and vocabulary and to make use of this knowledge by translating content from the target language into the first language and vice versa (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 17, Richards and Rogers 2001:5). The emphasis on grammar and translations makes Richards and Rogers claim that “[it] [...] views language learning as consisting of little more than memorizing rules”. Apart from being able to read in the target language, the method pursues another goal: Translation into and from the target language and comparison between the two tongues should clarify how the grammar of students’ first language works. Moreover, it should help them to “develop intellectually” (Kitao and Kitao 1999: 15) since analysing language, learning grammar and vocabulary by heart and applying this knowledge contributes to memory training (van Els et al. 1984: 147).

The students’ first language occupies an important role, not only in terms of translation and vocabulary acquisition but also as far as the medium of instruction is concerned. Vocabulary is provided in the form of bilingual word lists and successful language learning is associated with good translation skills. Instruction is almost always restricted to the students’ first language, while the target language is only the “object of study” (Kitao and Kitao 1999: 15), but not used for communicative purposes. Therefore, students are unable to speak the target language and making use of it in conversation (Celce-Murcia 2001: 6).

Community Language Learning

Based on the idea of counselling learning, Charles Curran developed the Community Language Learning Method (or CLL; referred to in La Forge 1971: 45) in the early 1970s. CLL belongs to the so called humanistic methods, which do not only appreciate cognitive but also affective factors. It is named ‘Community’ Language Learning because “[l]earners become members of a community [...] and learn through interacting with the community. Learning is not viewed as an individual accomplishment but as something that is achieved collaboratively” (Richards and Rogers 2001: 92).

According to Curran (referred to in Bell 1981: 64-65), learners go through five different stages in order to develop from a dependent to an independent language user. At the first stage, they can and actually do express everything in their first language. The teacher, or counsellor, then translates the student’s utterance into the target language and the student repeats it. At later stages more and more utterances are produced in the target language and the teacher is no longer needed to translate the students’ utterances. When they have reached

the last stage, stage five, they are independent language users and can communicate in the target code.

Thus, as far as the role of students' first language is concerned, "Curran viewed the native language not as an obstacle, but as a vehicle for the mastery of the target language" (La Forge 1971: 54). At the same time, this valuable vehicle causes difficulties and meets with criticism, since it is hard to implement in multilingual classrooms – "[p]erhaps one of the thorniest difficulties in adopting a CLL approach arises in classes where many language backgrounds are represented [...]. In order to use CLL's translation technique, the teacher must clearly be competent in all of the native languages represented [...]" – this is highly unlikely (Brown 1977: 371).

The Natural Approach

In the mid-1970s Terrell (1977: 325) suggested "a more 'natural' approach to the teaching of a second language", based on the way people acquire – not learn – a language in a non-institutional environment and which aims at developing communicative competence. Terrell clearly distinguishes between the conscious processes of learning and the subconscious process of acquiring a language and calls for more emphasis on the latter in L2 classrooms (1977: 325-327).

The Natural Approach is based on several hypotheses formulated within Krashen's theory on second and foreign language acquisition. These hypotheses include the natural order hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the input hypothesis and the affective filter hypothesis. A detailed discussion of them can be found in Krashen and Terrell's book (1983), which extensively deals with the Natural Approach, its background and its implementation in the classroom, and in Krashen (1981, 1982).

Several guidelines are claimed to be the key to a successful implementation of this approach, among them the use of students' first language, which is advocated especially in early stages of language acquisition (Terrell 1977: 330-331). According to her (1977: 331), "students should feel free to respond in L1, L2 or any mixture of the two" – otherwise they are overwhelmed. It is natural that they "fall[...] back" on their L1 as they do not have the respective knowledge in the target code yet (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 41). The teacher, on the other hand, does not switch between the two codes but only uses the target language and provides comprehensible input by means of pictures, realia etc. (Krashen 1982: 138).

3.2.2 Methods insisting on TL use

The Direct Method

The limitations of the Grammar-Translation Method, especially the students' inability to actually speak the target language, gave rise to the development of another method in the nineteenth century – the Direct Method (Celce-Murcia 2001: 6). The reason why it is called this way is explained by Larsen-Freeman (2000: 23) who writes that “[t]he direct method receives its name from the fact that meaning is conveyed directly in the target language”. It rests on the belief that foreign language learning is comparable to first language acquisition, which is why the use of learners' first language and the teaching of grammar rules are considered redundant (Kitao and Kitao 1999: 16). The Direct Method is also known as the Berlitz Method named after Maximilian Berlitz, who successfully implemented it in language schools around the globe (Richards and Rogers 2001: 12).

The following principles are typical for this method: a) the target language is the only medium of instruction, b) vocabulary and sentences that are dealt with are meaningful and reflect real life communication, c) oral skills are emphasised, d) vocabulary is contextualised and explained by means of pictures, gestures, objects etc. and e) grammar is taught inductively, so students are asked to deduce grammar rules themselves (Richards and Rogers 2001: 12).

The Direct Method is recognised as an official teaching method in various countries and Berlitz language schools still advertise with exclusive use of the target language, a focus on speaking skills and classes with native speakers (Berlitz Austria GmbH 2013). The idea behind the disregard to the students' first language and the disapproval of translation is that students should “associate meaning and the target language directly” and learn to think in the target language just as children do when they acquire their first language (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 27-29). Moreover, it was believed that “language systems were unique and translation would serve only to confuse the two systems in the mind of the learner” (Bell 1981: 89). However, the exclusive use of the target language can be very time consuming, for example when comprehension problems arise. In this case, a switch to the learners' L1 would be much more effective (Richards and Rogers 2001: 13).

The Audio-Lingual Method

The Audio-Lingual Method, invented in the mid-twentieth century, is based on the theory of structural linguistics on the one hand and on the theory of behavioural psychology on the other hand (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 36). Cook's interpretation of this method is that

“[l]anguage is [regarded as] a set of habits, just like driving a car. A habit is learnt by doing it again and again” (2008: 244). New material, for instance grammar and vocabulary, is always presented in the form of dialogues, which ought to provide an authentic context and reflect real-life situations. Afterwards, oral drills or pattern practices are applied in order for a habit to develop (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 14). During such drills utterances and sentences are repeated over and over until the learners are able to produce them correctly and rapidly, without hesitation – automatically as it were (Byrne 1980: 45).

Since the integration of students’ L1 is frowned upon, the medium of instruction is confined to the target language only. This principle is grounded in the belief that the first language hampers the learning of another language because different tongues have different linguistic systems. Therefore, interference should be avoided at any costs and teachers should draw on other means that ensure understanding of the target language, such as pictures, realia, demonstration, etc. (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 42). The problem is, however, that students are likely to learn content by heart without knowing and understanding what they are actually saying (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 15).

The British counterpart to the Audio-Lingual Method is the Oral Approach or Situational Language Teaching, which is influenced by behaviourism and British structuralism. Structures are linked to situations in which they occur and are practiced by repetitions and drills. As the medium of instruction is restricted to the target language, the meaning of those structures is not provided by translation, but should be deduced from the situational context (Richards and Rogers 2001: 40-41).

Total Physical Response

The Total Physical Response Method (TPR) was developed by James Asher in the late 1960s and early 1970s and is frequently associated with the teaching of young and low-level learners (Blair and Catwallader 1993: 34). The process of first language acquisition, which all children go through, provides the basis for this method. Children are exposed to a vast amount of linguistic input from birth and in this way acquire fluency in listening. Only gradually, however, do they begin to actually produce language. It is assumed that foreign language learning also works this way, which is why learners are asked to just listen and physically respond to commands before they speak a word in the target language (Asher 1969: 4). Widodo summarises the main idea behind this method and states that “TPR is a language teaching method built around the coordination of speech and action; it attempts to teach language through physical [...] activity” (2005: 237). Imperative drills are important,

characteristic tools for this method and are used to direct students' behaviour, who listen to those commands and act them out. After hours of listening, students then give commands themselves, provided that they are ready to do so. They are never forced to produce output in order to avoid stress (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 112). On the contrary – teaching all four language skills simultaneously is considered to be inefficient and hence Asher suggests focussing on only one skill in early language learning – in this case listening. Spoken language evolves naturally when students have achieved fluency in listening (1969: 16).

With regard to students' first language, Widodo claims that “the use of [the] mother tongue is deemphasized” (2005: 247) since meaning should always be communicated by means of action.

The Silent Way

As opposed to other language teaching methods, such as the Natural Approach or the Audio-Lingual Method, The Silent Way, invented in the early 1970s, does not aim to imitate first language acquisition because “learning a foreign language is in many respects radically different from the learning of the mother tongue” (Gattegno 1972: 8). Therefore, Gattegno, the inventor of The Silent Way, refers to his approach as being “artificial” compared to the other approaches mentioned above. The Silent Way assigns an important role to the students, who should actively participate in the language learning process, while the role of the teacher recedes into the background and is rather passive – in other words the teacher should be silent most of the time. (1972: 26-27).

Gyi (1994: 40) illustrates how The Silent Way may be implemented in the classroom. First of all, the teacher provides a sample structure which is associated with a coloured rod, for example.

The teacher may hold up a green rod and say, ‘A rod’ (in the target language). Then the teacher may add [...] ‘A green rod’. Then the teacher may pick up a red one and repeat the procedure [...] After some manageable chunk of the target language has been presented, the teacher remains silent while the pressure for [...] the students to fill the silence grows [...]. (Gyi 1994: 40)

Those rods are suited to teach numbers, colours, comparatives, adjectives, verbs etc. Other essential techniques and materials which are employed to convey meaning include sound colour charts, gestures and word charts (Kitao and Kitao 1999: 22). The most powerful tool, however, is silence, which should allow learners to develop autonomy and responsibility for their learning (Gattegno 1983: 73). Although the recourse to the students' mother tongue

should generally be avoided (Gattegno 1972: 56), it may be used occasionally at lower levels – but only if absolutely necessary (Larsen-Freeman 2000: 67). Molina et al. (2005: 26) claim that “in general, the method follows an audiolingual perspective, as translation is avoided [...]”. Richards and Rogers also deduce similarities from audiolingualism, especially the fact that the teacher provides a model which the students have to repeat (2001: 88).

Communicative Language Teaching

In the 1970s innovative teaching approaches emerged as a reaction to traditional methods, among them Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). As its name implies, the goal of CLT is communicative competence, which students should acquire through authentic and meaningful interaction. The main principles of CLT involve real communication, tolerance of errors, emphasis on accuracy as well as fluency, balance and linkage of all four language skills, and discovery learning. The roles of both learners and teachers are redefined in the sense that learners are allocated more responsibility for their learning and are active participants in the classroom, while the teacher ‘only’ functions as facilitator or monitor (Richards 2006: 2-13). Task-Based Language Teaching is an advancement of CLT and hence shares many underlying principles (Richards and Rogers 2001: 223).

CLT does not seem to place much emphasis on students’ L1 but rather promotes the use of the target language. Larsen-Freeman refers to “judicious use” of the L1, stressing that mostly – or almost exclusively – the target language should be spoken (2000: 132). Ellis and Shintani (2014: 226-227) share this opinion and draw the readers’ attention to the fact that one can find hardly any – or no – hints to students’ prior language knowledge. Therefore, CLT actually neither belongs to methods that require the use of the first language nor to those that reject it.

Recent methods do not so much forbid the LI as ignore its existence altogether. Communicative language teaching and task-based learning methods have no necessary relationship with the LI, yet, [...], the only times that the LI is mentioned is when advice is given on how to minimize its use [...] Most descriptions of methods portray the ideal classroom as having as little of the LI as possible [...]. (Cook 2001: 404)

Only recently scholars, among them Hung (2012), began to develop ideas of how the first language may be implemented in current approaches, such as task-based language teaching, and provide examples of how to integrate it into the three-part framework which is characteristic for task-based teaching. As far as future research is concerned, “there remains a need for more recognition, reporting, and theorizing of how MT can be a positive resource [...]” (Carless 2008: 337).

Table 2 below summarizes the view on first language use in teaching methods and approaches that have just been mentioned. It presents the various methods in a more or less chronological order and groups them according to negative and positive perspectives on L1 use.

The view on first language use in different teaching methods and approaches		
	negative	positive
Grammar Translation Method		high dependence on students' L1 for the purpose of translation and as medium of instruction
Direct Method	exclusive use of the target language, L1 must not be used → learning L2 = acquiring L1	
Audio-Lingual Method	L1 should not be used → language learning is habit formation; a habit is formed by doing something again and again	
Total Physical Response	L1 should not be drawn upon → meaning should be conveyed through actions	
The Silent Way	L1 should be avoided; it may only be used if absolutely necessary at low proficiency levels	
Community Language Learning		students are allowed to use their L1 and teacher translates into the TL; with increasing competence L1 should fade into background
Natural Approach		students are allowed to speak in L1, L2 or any mixture of the two but only in early stages of language learning; the teacher only uses the target language
Communicative Language Teaching	ignorance of students' L1; these days a shift towards judicious use is taking place	

Table 2: The view on L1 use in different teaching methods and approaches

Post method pedagogy

So far, a wide range of different teaching methods has been discussed, none of which has withstood the test of time, which gave rise to the emergence of a post-method pedagogy idea (Huda 2013: 7). Prabhu (1990: 175) claims that “there is no best method” since teaching is highly dependent on context and since every method has its justification in some way or another, and Cattell (2009: 59) asserts that “[t]he notion that one method can be appropriate for every teacher and every learner in every time and every place is absurd when one considers the myriad factors that comprise a given language classroom”.

A post-method pedagogy is believed to provide a solution. In its early stages, it suggested a “principled eclecticism”, meaning that teachers should choose from and adopt a variety of methods in their teaching depending on the context and their learners’ needs (Rivers 1981, cited in Hall 2011: 100). This eclectic approach was extended by Kumaravadivelu who suggests a three-dimensional “pedagogy of particularity, practicality and possibility” (1990: 544-545). The particularity dimension emphasises a context-sensitive pedagogy that considers the respective linguistic, cultural and political circumstances of the teaching environment. The practicality dimension encourages teachers to reflect upon their teaching and to develop their own theories based on their actual practice in the classroom. The possibility dimension should enable the students to establish their identities in the language classroom rather than just focusing on linguistic knowledge. Kumaravadivelu also refers to the students’ first language in a positive way in the sense that he advises teachers to explore their students’ resources and make use of them in the classroom (544-550). Although this classification seems to be quite suitable and comprehensible there is a danger that “the [p]ostmethod becomes, in effect, another method” (Hall 2011: 101).

3.3 L1 in official documents

3.3.1 The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), developed by the Council of Europe (2001: 1), is the basis for language syllabuses, curricula, textbooks, etc. and applies to all countries in Europe. Special emphasis is put on multilingualism and multilingual education, since

the rich heritage of diverse languages and cultures in Europe is a valuable common resource to be protected and developed, and [...] a major educational effort is needed to convert that diversity from a barrier to communication into a source of mutual enrichment and understanding. (Council of Europe 2001: 2)

In this context, it is stressed that students’ different languages are not isolated systems but that they draw on these different languages when they make sense of, learn and communicate in another language – this also implies code-switching as an important communication strategy and tool for task accomplishment. Moreover, methodological options are listed, which make teachers aware of the different ways in which their students learn a foreign language. In relation to this, several questions are asked, which should encourage the teacher to reflect upon their teaching strategy and to adapt a flexible approach that meets the needs of different

learners (Council of Europe 2001: 4, 134, 143ff). Although the terms L1 and translation occur now and then and although multilingualism is generally advocated, the statements in CEFR are rather vague in the sense that they allow a variety of interpretations and do not refer to the benefits of the use of the students' first languages.

3.3.2 The Austrian curriculum

In the Austrian curriculum, several references are made to first language use and multilingualism both in the general educational objectives and in the didactic principles. Right at the beginning, the readers' attention is drawn to the fact that we are living in a constantly changing society and a globalised world, which connects us to people from all over the globe. The challenge for teachers in this context is to consider the different cultural and linguistic backgrounds of their students, who are encouraged to contribute their personal interests, skills, strengths and knowledge in the lesson design (BMBF¹ 2012: 2). Under the heading intercultural learning and multilingualism, it is stressed that all students are equal members of the classroom community and that each person's strengths should receive credit. Special emphasis is placed on students' prior language knowledge, which is considered to be an important resource to resort to.

Eine allfällige Mehrsprachigkeit von Schülerinnen und Schüler wird als wertvolle Ressource gesehen und nicht nur in jenen Unterrichtsgegenständen genutzt, die sich primär mit Sprache beschäftigen. [...] Besondere Bedeutung kommt der Ermutigung durch die Lehrerinnen und Lehrer zu, sprachliche Ressourcen in der Klasse zu nutzen². (BMBF 2012: 8)

Moreover, awareness-raising is addressed in the sense that the perception of other languages, their similarities and differences promotes interest and respect. As far as foreign languages in particular are concerned, lessons should contribute to the development of communicative competence and should do so by using both the first and the target language. However, the target language is emphasised and ought to be spoken most of the time, while students' L1s should only be used selectively to enhance understanding. Reference is also made to 'interlanguage' which is described as "Annäherung an die Zielsprache"³ and which constantly develops, meaning that it fades into the background, while the target language comes to the fore. In terms of multilingual classrooms teachers are encouraged to make use of their

¹ The Bundesministerium für Bildung und Frauen (BMBF) is responsible for the school system in Austria.

² Translation: Multilingualism is regarded as an important resource, which should be made use of in any school subject. Special importance is attached to teachers, who should encourage the use of linguistic resources in the classroom.

³ Translation: Approximation to the target code.

students' different first languages and to promote a positive attitude towards other languages and cultures (BMBF 2012: 33-35). Overall, one could claim that multilingualism is endorsed and that a student's first language is regarded as a resource.

3.3.3 European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages and European Language Portfolio

The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) was designed for future teachers to inspire them to ponder their didactic knowledge and skills and to allow them to monitor their progress. The various sections include so-called "self-assessment descriptors" which are core competences that teachers ought to achieve successfully (Newby et al. 2007: 5). Reference to the use of the students' first language is only made indirectly in two subsections, namely 'teacher roles' and 'classroom language'. As far as the former is concerned, multilingual and multicultural students with their special skills and knowledge are addressed. Only twice, however, are the issue of multilingualism and the accompanying assets mentioned. The descriptors are as follows:

I can appreciate and make use of the value added to the classroom environment by learners with diverse cultural backgrounds.
I can take into account the knowledge of other languages learners may already possess and help them to build on this knowledge when learning additional languages. (Newby et al. 2007: 17)

The section that deals with classroom language focuses on the teachers' usage of the target language rather than the incorporation of their students' L1s. The following descriptors are mentioned in this context:

I can conduct a lesson in the target language.
I can decide when it is appropriate to use the target language and when not to.
I can use the target language as metalanguage.
I can use various strategies when learners do not understand the target language.
I can encourage learners to use the target language in their activities.
I can encourage learners to relate the target language to other languages they speak or have learned where and when this is helpful. (Newby et al. 2007: 43)

What is obvious here is the huge emphasis put on the target language while the first language is more or less neglected and only referred to implicitly. This mirrors the underlying, still relatively negative view on the use of the L1 in the foreign language classroom discussed above. Especially young, prospective teachers need to be made aware that students' L1s are a valuable resource that must be employed in language teaching. The various advantages of L1 use are presented in detail in chapter 4.2.

Descriptors that value and stress the use of the first language explicitly should be included in the EPOSTL. They could be as follows:

- I can motivate students to use their first language in class and can exploit their L1s as a resource.
- I can encourage a positive attitude towards and respect for other first languages.
- I can vary the use of the first language and the target language appropriately, depending on my learners' needs.
- I can encourage the students to speak the target language as much as possible on the one hand, and tolerate the use of first languages on the other hand.

The European Language Portfolio (ELP) is the counterpart of the EPOSTL and was designed for students as a tool to document their language skills and to reflect upon their language learning process. The ELP is language neutral which means that it is not restricted to English but can be used for any language. It is subdivided into three parts, two of which address students' prior language knowledge. In the language biography and the language passport, learners can record their language experiences both inside and outside institutional settings. Moreover, they can assess their language competences at various levels in listening, reading, speaking and writing (Schimek 2004). Overall, one can claim that the ELP is a very useful tool to promote language diversity and intercultural awareness, which draws learners' attention to the valuable resources that they have and that they can exploit when learning another language.

3.3.4 Educational standards (Bildungsstandards E8)

The educational standards are based on the curriculum and the CEFR and determine which competences students should have in English at the end of the eighth grade. They focus on the major language skills listening, reading, speaking, and writing and hardly refer to students' first language. Although tasks should generally be explained in the target language and translation should be avoided, it is allowed to use the first language in lower level classes (A1) in order to ensure understanding. Moreover, it is claimed that the students should speak in the target language as much as possible but may resort to their L1s when they lack vocabulary in speaking activities (ÖSZ 2009: 8, 85, 90). Those are the only two references to first language use.

4. Code-switching

4.1 Definition and distinction

Over the past decades, increasing interest in code-switching has triggered a variety of investigations and theoretical discussions which have shed light on our understanding of bilingual speech behavior. Code-switching as a specific phenomenon and strategy [...] received attention in the 1980s. From then on, there has been the heated debate between different views on whether it is helpful or impeding to switch back and forth between the target language and the native language in the foreign language learning classroom. (Jingxia 2010: 10)

The phenomenon of code-switching, which has received considerable attention in linguistics and pedagogy, is the main focus of the present thesis. Before the various arguments of proponents and opponents are addressed, a definition of code-switching will be provided and a distinction will be made between code-switching and a number of similar phenomena.

According to Lin, “one can easily define [...] code-switching as language alternation – the alternating use of more than one linguistic code [...]” (2013: 195). This definition is consistent with the one provided by Eldridge, who describes code switching as “the alternation between two (or more) languages” (1996: 303). Cook also refers to the speakers who are involved in language use and defines code-switching as “going from one language to the other in mid-speech when both speakers know the same two languages” (2008: 174). According to Levine (2011: 50), the following definition is accepted among the majority of scholars: “Code-switching is the systematic, alternating use of two or more languages in a single utterance or conversational exchange”. The definitions just mentioned are very similar, since they all address the alternating use of at least two different languages as the major characteristic of code-switching. In terms of classroom discourse, code-switching is related to “the alternate use of the first language and the target language” (Jingxia 2010: 10).

Some scholars differentiate between the terms ‘code-switching’ and ‘code-mixing’ while others use them synonymously (Younas et al. 2014: 518). Kachru (1983: 193), for example, refers to these concepts as two distinct phenomena and claims that code-switching is dependent on the context, i.e. the situation, the setting, the participants etc., while code-mixing is not. Annamalai (1989: 48) elaborates on the idea of context dependence and suggests that “mixing is not normally done with full sentences from another language with its

grammar, and switching is normally done for the duration of a unit of discourse". Muysken (2000: 1) has a similar approach and defines code-switching as "the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event", and code-mixing as "all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence". Unfortunately, both authors fail to specify what is meant by 'unit of discourse' and 'single speech event'. It may be assumed that these two authors use the term code-mixing at the word or sentence level and code-switching at the discourse level, i.e. for utterances that are longer than one sentence. Redouane herself has decided to apply the term code-mixing as "the process of mixing of elements from two languages in one utterance" and code-switching as "the product of this mix" (2005: 1921). Other scholars do not differentiate between them but regard them as same phenomena. On the whole, the term code-switching seems to be more common though (Walwadkar 2013: 44).

Another concept that is frequently contrasted with code-switching is borrowing, which "entails integration of linguistic units from one language into the linguistic system of the other language." (Kamwangamalu 1992, referred to in Walwadkar 2013: 48) Unlike code-switching, borrowing does not require bilingual competence but also occurs in the speech of monolinguals and does not involve sentences. According to Haugen, borrowing is "the [...] reproduction in one language of patterns previously found in another" (1959: 212). The author fails to define what a pattern is and just mentions that the original term is referred to as "model" and the borrowed term as "loan".

Even if borrowings and switches might seem to be rather different concepts at first sight, the distinction between them is not always clear, especially in the case of single words which can be either borrowings or switches (King 2000: 87). Therefore, several scholars argue that they should not be regarded as distinct entities (Poplack and Meechan 1995: 200). Regarding a possible distinction, King (2000: 87) claims that "borrowings are usually, but not always, phonologically, morphologically and syntactically incorporated into the borrowing language". Hoffmann (1991: 104) states that frequency and connotation are the only differences that exist between the two concepts, meaning that borrowings occur less frequently and are considered more positively than switches.

As far as this thesis is concerned, only the term code-switching will be used to refer to the alternating use of words, phrases and sentences in the first language and the target language. No difference is made between code-switching and code-mixing, since they are very similar

and believed to fulfil the same functions in classroom interaction. Borrowings, however, would be classified as a distinct category in its own right.

4.2 Arguments against and for code-switching

Against code-switching

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the belief that the target code should be used exclusively and the first language should be banned from the foreign language classroom has long influenced language teaching. One of the underlying reasons was the idea that learners should be exposed to the target language as much and intensively as possible in order to learn it, which is in keeping with Krashen's input hypothesis (Littlewood and Yu 2011: 64-66, Duff and Polio 1990: 154). The motto is: "the more exposure they receive, the more and the faster they will learn" (Ellis 2005: 217). Hawkins (1987: 97), for example, seems to support the maximum exposure to the target language as he compares language teaching to "gardening in a gale".

The teacher [...] strives like a keen gardener to implant in the recalcitrant soil a few frail seedlings of speech patterns in the foreign language. Just as the seedlings are taking root and standing up for themselves, the bell goes [...] For the next [...] hours the pupils are swept along by a gale of [German] [...]. (Hawkins 1987: 97)

This corresponds to Turnbull's (2001) idea that the teacher acts as the only linguistic model for learners, who often do not come into contact with the target language outside institutional settings, which is why the target code should be spoken exclusively. Moreover, he argues that various studies reveal a positive correlation between the amount of the target language used and students' proficiency in the respective language (2001: 532-533).

Cook (2001), a supporter of code-switching, also identifies motives for the avoidance of students' L1. Among them is the argument for language compartmentalisation which claims that the foreign language and the first language belong to different systems in the learners' minds, which should be kept separate in order to not to confuse the students and avoid negative transfer (Cook 2001: 407). In this context, the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is worth mentioning, which is defined as the systematic comparison of two languages. Its aim is to determine their similarities and differences and to predict difficulties that learners might encounter when learning another language (van Els et al. 1984: 38). Its strongest form assumes that the more different the two languages, the more errors the learner will make and

the more difficulties he or she will have with the target language. It presumes that “the prime cause, or even the sole cause, of difficulty and error in foreign language learning is interference coming from the learner’s native language” (Lee 1968: 180, cited in Ellis 1985: 23). Besides the effects of negative inference, teachers’ use of the L1 or code-switching was regarded as negative and interpreted as incompetence in terms of the target language:

[...] code switching has been discouraged in the educational system and society at large because of concerns that code switching will influence one or both of the languages and lead to language decay [...] or because of a perception that code switching is considered a sign of limited language proficiency in one or both languages [...]. The use of code-switching is perceived most negatively by monolingual speakers and majority cultural and generational groups in terms of understandability, attractiveness and correctness. (Hughes et al. 2006: 8)

Another argument that is frequently mentioned in order to justify the rejection of code-switching is that the exclusive use of the target language reflects communication in real life, where people from all over the world interact with one another who may not share a common tongue (Jingxia 2010: 11). Moreover, some scholars claim that students tend to ignore the target language when the L1 is allowed because “when learners can count on getting the information that is being communicated to them in a language they already know, they do not find it necessary to pay attention when the language they do not understand is being used” (Wong-Fillmore 1985: 35). Phillipson relates various tenets of the Makerere report to the English-only policy. These principles assume that “English is best taught monolingually”, that “the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker” and that “the more English is taught the better the results” (Phillipson 1992: 185).

For code-switching

The use of students’ L1 was long frowned upon in ELT but is nowadays appreciated as a highly purposeful tool (Eldridge 1996: 303). As pointed out by Sampson (2012: 294), “the focus of the debate now tends to be not if, but how, when, and how much learner L1 should be encouraged”.

Bhooth et al. mention several studies that prove the positive effect of students’ first language on both learning and understanding target language content. By employing the learners’ L1 a positive and affective learning environment is created, which enables them to express themselves right from the beginning and which conveys a sense of security (2014: 77-78). This idea links to Atkinson’s argument that the L1 is “a valuable ‘humanistic’ element in the

classroom” because it allows students to say what they actually want to say. Moreover, he argues that code-switching or translation in general are learner-preferred strategies on the one hand and valuable tools for teachers on the other hand, since they are very time-efficient and can save effort in certain contexts (1987: 242). Auerbach, also a supporter of code-switching, summarises the social benefits of the students’ first language as follows: “[...] its use reduces anxiety and enhances the affective environment for learning, takes into account sociocultural factors, facilitates incorporation of learners’ life experiences, and allows for learner-centered curriculum development” (1993: 20). Another social benefit that is attributable to the tolerance of students’ L1 is an increased rapport among teachers and learners. By switching to the target language, the teacher can reduce anxiety and ease the atmosphere in the classroom which in turn may facilitate the relationship among all participants (Harbord 1992: 354).

Madonsela (2014) even goes as far as to claim that students’ cognitive development is restricted when lessons are conducted in a foreign language exclusively and code-switching is prohibited. When learners only understand fragments of the lesson content, learning is impeded and they suffer from stress which may give rise to discouragement, withdrawal from participation, anxiety and even psychological problems in further consequence. Therefore, Madonsela calls for a multilingual approach to teaching which allows learners to use different codes and to switch between them (2014: 627-629).

Apart from its social dimension, the students’ first language has another important benefit – it can be used as a “cognitive and pedagogical resource” in the foreign language classroom. According to Butzkamm (2003: 31), many scholars nowadays agree that people build upon already acquired knowledge, a foundation, when learning another language.

Using the mother tongue, we have (1) learnt to think, (2) learnt to communicate and (3) acquired an intuitive understanding of grammar. The mother tongue is therefore the greatest asset people bring to the task of foreign language learning and provides a Language Acquisition Support System. (Butzkamm 2003: 29)

The recourse to the first language is thus a natural process which cannot be turned off. Even if it is excluded from the classroom it cannot be banned from students’ minds since they automatically associate new input with old knowledge and translate the target language into their L1 unconsciously (Butzkamm 2003: 31; 35). Cook (2001) shares this view and claims:

The L1-L2 connection is an indisputable fact of life [...]. Keeping the languages visibly separate in language teaching is contradicted by the invisible processes in students' minds. Language teaching that works with this fact of life is more likely to be successful than teaching that works against it. (Cook 2001: 408)

Overall, one can claim that the use of students' L1 and code-switching do not impede but rather facilitate foreign language learning and do not only serve as a scaffolding tool but also as a means to establish a friendly learning atmosphere that should be appreciated by both teachers and students (Harbord 1992, Turnbull and Arnett 2002, Butzkamm 2003, Bhooth et al. 2014). What is important in this context is its judicious use though – “obviously the use of the first language [...] should not be taken to an extreme” – meaning that the target code should remain the most important tool in the language classroom and employed as much as possible (Cook 2006: 59).

4.3 Code-switching as object of investigation

Thakur et al. report that “[t]here are three principal directions in which code-switching research has developed – syntactic, pragmatic and sociolinguistic” (2007: 111). Although all of these research branches are important, only the sociolinguistic approach will be addressed in this thesis. Sociolinguistic approaches to code-switching date back to the 1970s when various authors investigated the social meanings that underlie this phenomenon. The scholars that were most popular and influential in this field include Gumperz (1982), Blom and Gumperz (1972), Myers-Scotton (1993) and Auer (1995), whose studies were conducted in natural discourse (Lin and Li 2012: 471, Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult 1999: 2). As in this thesis the focus is on classroom discourse rather than natural discourse, the work of these authors is not dealt with.

Code-switching research in the second and foreign language classroom has received much attention especially from 1990 onwards. The majority of these studies focuses on the switches made by teachers and the functions that code-switching fulfils from a teacher's perspective, while little research is done on students' code-switching. Moreover, all of these studies are short-term and conducted by outside researchers who are not part of the classroom and who rely on interpretive paradigms to make sense of what has happened in the classroom. What is still missing are long-term studies carried out by teachers and students themselves (Lin 2013: 199-212). In the following chapter, the functions of code-switching will be described from both the teachers' and the students' perspectives.

4.3.1 Code-switching and the teacher

Functions

The different functions that code-switching can fulfil for teachers are shown in Table 3 below; it is important, however, to realise that these differ from scholar to scholar. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used by these scholars in order to collect data and to establish the following functions. The studies that are mentioned here are by no means complete but just represent a small selection of surveys that were carried out in different countries and various contexts.

The functions of code-switching from a teacher's perspective		
Scholars	Methods & participants	Functions
Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999: 2-3)	- video and audio recording - 24 lessons in upper secondary school - Sweden	- linguistic insecurity - topic switch ▽ - affective functions ♣ - socialising functions ♣ - repetitive functions ▲
Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 312,322)	- video and audio recording - 6 lessons in beginner-level EFL class at university - Turkey	- dealing with procedural trouble ● - dealing with classroom discipline ● - expressing social identity ♣ - giving an L1 equivalent - translating into the L1 - dealing with a lack of response in the L2 - providing a prompt for L2 use - eliciting an L1 translation - giving feedback - checking comprehension in the L2 ▲ - providing metalanguage information ■ - giving encouragement to participate
Jingxia (2010: 14-19)	- questionnaire (60) and audio recording (8 lessons) - 60 teachers teaching at university - China	- translating unknown vocabulary ■ - explaining grammar ■ - managing class ● - emphasizing some points ✕ - expressing empathy or solidarity ♣ - facilitating understanding by quoting others' words ▲
Gulzar (2010: 24-30)	- questionnaire - 406 teachers - Pakistan	- clarification ▲ - ease of expression - giving instructions effectively ● - creating a sense of belonging ♣ - checking understanding ▲ - translation - socializing ♣

		- emphasis ✕ - repetitive functions ▲ - topic shift ▽ - linguistic competence
Momenian et al. (2011: 769,777)	- questionnaire - 30 teachers teaching at elementary and advanced levels - Iran	- giving procedural instructions ● - managing or controlling the class ● - teaching new vocabulary ■ - teaching new grammatical items ■ - clarifying the message ▲ - attracting attention ● - putting emphasis on the utterance ✕
Tariq et al. 2013	- questionnaire - teachers teaching at intermediate level - Pakistan	- starting a new topic ▽ - lack of vocabulary - emphasis ✕ - clarification ▲ - translation - friendly environment ♣ - accessing the understanding ▲ - repetition ▲ - explaining grammar ■ - managing class ●
▲ understanding, ▽shift, ♣social function, ● classroom routine & management, ■ new vocabulary & grammar, ✕emphasis		

Table 3: The functions of code-switching from a teacher's perspective

Although the various scholars mentioned in Table 4 came up with rather different proposals, the functions they identify can be grouped into six different categories. Firstly, almost every author regards code-switching as a useful tool to ensure understanding and switches to the students' L1 in order to explain, elaborate, and clarify when he or she is unsure whether the learners have understood what was said in the target language (Gulzar 2010: 30). Secondly, it is often applied when a shift occurs either in terms of topics, focus or tasks – at this point teachers prefer and frequently tend to switch to another language. Thirdly, the social function of code-switching plays a major role since the shift to students' first language may not only contribute to a positive learning atmosphere and reduce anxiety but also allows the teacher to establish a closer relationship with his or her students by expressing emotions, empathy and solidarity in the shared tongue (Tariq et al. 2013, Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult 1999: 3). Fourthly, classroom management discourse is often restricted to a certain code, the students' first language, to make sure that the instructions are understood and to deal with discipline problems or procedural trouble (Üstünel and Seedhouse 308, 321). Fifthly, one of the most important functions of code-switching is in teaching grammar and vocabulary, as reflected in the study by Jingxia (2010), for example. Switching to the student's first language in this

context does not only save time but also enhances understanding. Lastly, code-switching may be used to emphasise and to draw students' attention to certain points (Jingxia 2010: 19-20).

Attitudes

Beliefs about code-switching in the EFL classroom are complex and constitute a controversial issue among teachers, who are either for or against the use of the L1. The teachers who participated in Copland and Neokleous' survey, for example, had rather negative attitudes towards L1 use and described it as a barrier that interferes with foreign language learning and that should be avoided as far as possible – a view that is shared by the majority of teachers. Interestingly, the teachers' reported behaviour deviated from their actual behaviour, meaning that they underestimated the frequencies of L1 use and indicated a relatively low number of code-switching instances during their teaching. This discrepancy may be due to the fact that they feel guilty when resorting to the L1 because they believe that it is their job to improve their learners' English proficiency which is considered to be impossible when allowing L1 use. Moreover, they think that they undermine their own beliefs about teaching and learning and display incompetence when switching between two languages (Copland and Neokleous 2010: 276-278). Other teachers claim that L1 use impairs fluency and fear that students get used to speaking their L1 in the EFL class, overuse it and avoid the target language (Bhooth et al. 2014: 77). To summarise: "The home language as a safety net is seen as preventing the development of English" (van der Walt 2009: 40). Another argument which is often put forward by teachers and which supports the English-only philosophy is the idea of an authentic learning atmosphere that reflects real life language use (Cheng 2013: 1281).

Although many educators favour an English only approach and try to avoid code-switching, it is difficult to ban the students' first language from the classroom as the following statement of a teacher illustrates: "In general [...] students should be encouraged to use English as much as possible, but in reality this doesn't always work" (Auerbach 1993: 14). So, they regard L1 use as an unavoidable necessity, a last resort, rather than an important resource and tool for language learning. What is interesting is that even if teachers are aware of the various functions of code switching and have positive attitudes in general, they still do not encourage L1 use in their classrooms but follow a monolingual principle instead (Ibrahim et al. 2013: 41).

4.3.2 Code-switching and the students

Functions

As mentioned before, research on students' use of code-switching in the classroom is much rarer. The following researchers are among those who have investigated this phenomenon and identified major functions.

The functions of code-switching from a student's perspective		
Scholars	Methods & participants	Functions
Eldridge (1996: 304-307)	- audio recording - secondary school - Turkey	- equivalence ▲ - floor holding ▽ - metalanguage ♣ - reiteration ● - group membership ■ - conflict control ■ - alignment and disalignment
Anton and Dicamilla (1999: 236, 245)	- audio recording - adult learners - Spain	- providing scaffolded help ▲ - achieving intersubjectivity i.e. a shared perspective on a task - directing ones' own thinking
Momenian and Samar (2011: 769, 776)	- questionnaire - 30 elementary and advanced students - Iran	- compensating for a lack of knowledge in L2 ▲ - holding or taking the floor ▽ - talking about or commenting on a task ♣ - clarifying one's own message ● - showing in-group membership ■ - creating a comic sense ■ - add colour to utterance - helping understand demanding topics - putting emphasis to utterance
Greggio and Gil (2007: 374, 386)	- audio recording - 12 lessons - Brazil	- maintaining the flow of conversation ▽ - filling a linguistic gap ▲ - providing equivalent meanings in the L1 ● - asking equivalent meanings in the L1 ● - asking about grammatical rules or structures ♣ - clarifying understanding of grammatical rules and structures ●
Horasan (2014: 35, 37)	- audio-recording - 8 lessons in a preparatory school for university - Turkey	Eldridge's functions were expanded to include: - talking about classroom routine - attracting attention ▽ - checking, clarifying, confirming ● - explanation ● - sense of humour ■
▲ linguistic gap, ▽ holding or trying to get the floor, ♣ metatask/metalanguage, ● clarifying, checking, ■ social function		

Table 4: The functions of code-switching from a student's perspective

The different functions of code-switching identified for students also show similarities across different surveys and can be classified into five main groups. One of the major functions for students is to fill a linguistic gap, which Eldridge calls equivalence (1999: 305). So, when students are unable to express themselves in the target language because they lack the necessary vocabulary they simply switch to their first language for either a single word or longer utterances (Greggio and Gil 2007:387). Moreover, code-switching is used to hold the floor and maintain the flow of the conversation. According to Eldridge, students often need much more time to retrieve content in the target language, which is why they switch to their first language in order to hold the floor and avoid communication gaps (1999: 306). At the same time they code-switch in order to attract attention and take the floor (Horasan 2014: 37). Apart from that, code-switching allows students to talk about the language or a task, which is called metlanguage or metatask (Amorin 2012: 180). Clarification or reiteration is another major function that enables students to confirm or check the understanding of target language content by switching to their first language (Horasan 2014: 37). It is used specifically when the target language message was not understood (Sampson 2011: 298). Last but not least, the social function of switches needs to be mentioned. Switches are often used to create a funny effect, which enhances group identity and the atmosphere in the classroom (Eldridge 1999: 306). This is often realised by jokes and word-plays which would lose their meanings when translating them into a foreign language (Horasan 2014: 37).

Attitudes

In general, students have a very positive attitude towards L1 use and appreciate code-switching both when interacting with the teacher and with their peers. The results of Ma's (2014) study, which are in accordance with other surveys, have shown that if teachers do not switch codes in certain contexts students have comprehension problems and lose interest in learning the target language (Ma 2014: 182-184). The majority of students is convinced that resorting to L1 helps them learn the target language and "think[s] very positively about the effectiveness of L1 use in ELT classes" (Mirza et al. 2012: 75). Juarez and Oxbrow's (2008) study has revealed that L1 use is only favoured in certain contexts though – "L1 seems to be preferred for linguistic or lexical content rather than metacognitive, social, or affective aspects [...]" (2008: 98). The data obtained from the observations of the present research, however, do not support this claim, as will be shown in Chapter 6. Overall, one can conclude that students clearly prefer code-switching because it serves as a useful resource that they can draw on and it enhances understanding rather than interfering with target language learning.

5. Research design

According to Dörnyei (2007: 72), “[m]ost research texts suggest that the proper way to do research involves first generating one or more research questions and then choosing the design, the method, and the instruments that allow the researcher to find answers to these questions”. This procedure will be adopted for the present research.

5.1 Research purpose and research questions

As the use of students’ first language in the foreign language classroom has received considerable support in recent years it would be interesting to investigate whether teachers are aware of this change of attitude and implement L1 use in their teaching. This begs another question, namely whether students’ first language is only made use of in monolingual settings, in which the students speak the same first language, or whether teachers in multilingual classrooms also try to consider the various first languages spoken by their students. Multilingual classrooms are particularly interesting because Vienna is a very multicultural city that people migrate to from all over the world. Immigration is a highly topical issue that affects society and the school system in particular, since these students need specific handling that takes their cultural background and linguistic knowledge into account. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to compare the two different settings – monolingual and multilingual classes – in terms of code-switching incidences. Both students’ and teachers’ switches are analysed in this context. Teachers’ beliefs about language teaching and learning and their attitudes concerning L1 use should give indications of their actual practices.

The research questions are the following:

1. Is there a difference between code-switching in monolingual and multilingual EFL classes as far as functions and quantity are concerned?
2. What are teachers’ attitudes towards code-switching? Is it regarded as an asset or a hindrance to foreign language learning?
3. Do language policies, language learning experience and teacher training have an influence on teachers’ beliefs and practices?
4. Do teachers in multilingual EFL settings tolerate or even integrate other first languages than German? If yes, why and how? If no, why not?

5.2 Research methods and analysis

In the present thesis qualitative research is adopted for data collection. According to Dörnyei, “[q]ualitative research involves data collection procedures that result primarily in open-ended, non-numerical data which is then analysed primarily by non-statistical methods” (2007: 24). The reason for choosing qualitative research was that it is “exploratory” and used to gain new insights into a subject matter. Moreover, it does not claim generalisability of results but rather “aims to broaden the repertoire of *possible interpretations*”, meaning that the findings may enhance people’s understanding of a subject matter but do not inevitably pertain to other contexts (Dörnyei 2007: 39-40 and Croker 2009: 9). Another core feature of qualitative research is the natural setting since its aim is to investigate genuine phenomena as they emerge in real life.

Although first language use or code-switching are well-researched topic areas, scholars have not yet examined two different EFL settings at once but rather focused on either monolingual or multilingual classrooms. The present thesis is aimed at bridging this gap and determining similarities and differences between these two settings. Therefore, it was decided to use classroom observations and teacher interviews in order to collect data on instances of code-switching and teachers’ beliefs and practices in selected Austrian new secondary schools. Information on settings and participants will be provided in the next subsection. It is worth mentioning that the setting was natural and not manipulated for research purposes.

5.2.1 Classroom observations

The first part of this qualitative research consisted of classroom observations. According to Cowie (2009: 66), the term ‘observation’ is defined as followings: “Observation is the conscious noticing and detailed examination of participants’ behaviour in a naturalistic setting. In applied linguistics, this can include a classroom or teachers’ room, or any environment where language use is being studied [...]” The author mentions that this data collection method is rarely used on its own but often combined with other methods, such as interviews and questionnaires, because in this way people’s practice can be checked against their personal views by asking questions after the observation. Dörnyei adds that it allows comparison of actual behaviour and intended behaviour (2007: 185). This is relevant for the present study in the sense that teachers were requested to estimate the amount of English they used during their lessons, to provide information on the situations in which they switch to the students’ first language, and to reveal their personal beliefs about first language use in foreign

language classes as well as their view on multilingual teaching approaches. Their statements were then checked against the data derived from the observations.

When making observations, researchers can take different roles. In this context Gold (1958, cited in Cowie 2009: 167) mentions four different types, namely “complete participant”, “participant as observer”, “observer as participant” and “complete observer”. When observing lessons at school, researchers most commonly do not participate in classroom routines, but stay passive and just watch and listen – they are complete observers (Dörnyei 2007: 179). One also has to decide whether the observation should be overt, meaning that the participants are aware of being studied, or covert, meaning that they are not aware of being studied (Cohen et al. 2001: 314). As far as the present research is concerned, the researcher took on the role of the “complete observer” and was not involved at all, except for being present in the classroom. Students and teachers were informed about being observed so the research was overt – although they were not told exactly what was being observed, in order not to influence their behaviour and distort data. In Cowie (2009: 177) this phenomenon is called “observer’s paradox”, which implies that people behave differently when being observed.

Following Dörnyei’s idea that “[v]ideo recording has provided a technology that might be considered ideal for classroom research [...]” it was decided to renounce taking field notes and videotape the lessons instead (2007: 183). The various drawbacks mentioned by Dörnyei, such as distraction, unusual behaviour, and the inability to capture the whole classroom, did not pose a problem in the present research. Two classrooms had even been videotaped before, and according to all four teachers, the students behaved as usual, except that they chatted less amongst themselves. Therefore, one can assume that they were neither distracted by the camera nor by the presence of the observer. With regard to the teachers, three out of four had had experience with electronic recording before – they had been videotaped by other students or colleagues or had done research themselves and used audio recordings, so being observed and recorded did not pose difficulties for them. The video camera was placed either in the left or right corner at the front of the classroom in order to capture the whole setting. When students worked in pairs, two audio recorders were used to record the conversations among them. Unfortunately, not every pair could be recorded.

5.2.2 Teacher interviews

After the classroom observation interviews were conducted because “they can provide insights into people’s experiences, beliefs, perceptions, and motivations at a depth that is not possible with questionnaires (Richards 2009: 187)”. Richards mentions three different types of interviews: structured, open and semi-structured interviews. The first type is highly controlled, meaning that a list of questions is prepared. The participants are asked the same questions with the same wording, in the same order, which allows for comparison among interviewees. The second type is very flexible, which implies that no questions are prepared and that the participants are not restricted in what they want to say about a particular subject. The semi-structured interview is something in-between the two types just described. In this context, the interviewer knows which issues he or she wants to address and might even have formulated a few questions in advance, but does not insist on adherence to an exact order or wording. Instead, the interviewee is enabled to elaborate on certain topics and the interviewer can react to unexpected subject matters (Richards 2009: 186). In the present research, the interviews were semi-structured and were dialogues or discussions rather than formal interviews. Although all the questions were prepared in advance, they were not posed in the same order, because sometimes the teachers answered several questions at once or they had diverted the conversation in a slightly different direction which would have rendered certain questions redundant. The interview questions, which can be found in the Appendix, were roughly divided into three categories, namely ‘personal information’, ‘classroom practice’ and ‘experience and personal view’. This ‘question pool’ formed the basis for the interviews but it was not adhered to strictly, in order to respond more naturally to the participants and provide a more pleasant atmosphere. Moreover, it was decided to let participants choose in which language they wanted to be interviewed. The basic idea here was to make the participants feel comfortable about the situation and to obtain as much data as possible. Interestingly, all of the participants preferred to do the interview in German. Twenty to thirty minutes had been proposed for each interview. Two interviewees, however, provided a lot of information and talked for about forty minutes.

5.2.3 Data analysis

Before the actual analysis, both the observations and the interviews were transcribed since “[w]ithout a transcript – a written/graphic representation – talk is impossible to analyse systematically” (Cameron 2001: 31). In this context a vast number of different conventions exist, whose use depends on the purpose of the research (Cameron 2001: 43). In the present

thesis, two different conventions were chosen, because classroom talk was mainly conducted in English while the interviews were conducted in German. For the observations, the VIOCE (2007) transcription conventions were applied, as these are standard at the English Department of the University of Vienna, whereas the interviews were transcribed according to the conventions by Stadler (2002), which are frequently used at the Department of Education for teaching analysis in the pedagogical domain. Both conventions are explained in more detail in the Appendix. It is worth mentioning at this point that people in Carinthia speak a certain dialect which can be difficult to understand. For this reason, it was decided to transcribe the interviews in standard German.

As far as the actual analysis is concerned, content analysis was applied. “This type of analysis follows the very generalized sequence of coding for themes, looking for patterns, making interpretations, and building theory” (Dörnyei 2007: 246). According to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005: 266), “[c]odes are names or tags assigned to concepts that represent [...] the experiences, ideas, attitudes or feelings identified in the data”. Before codes can be assigned, themes need to be identified – in other words, different ideas that belong to the same category need to be linked. In this way the amount of data is reduced and organized into meaningful chunks which allows for analysis and interpretation (Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005: 266). Regarding the functions of code-switching that were deduced from the observational data, the available literature in this area had been consulted, which had given a clear idea as to which categories were likely to occur in the context of code-switching research. As regards the interviews, however, themes and codes were created from scratch. More information is provided in Chapter 7.

5.3 Settings and participants

When doing ethnographic research, Silverman mentions some important issues that have to be considered in advance. Among these issues are making choices about the research site and the participants as well as how to gain access to the research setting (2006: 79).

5.3.1 The setting

In the present research, the focus is on monolingual and multilingual EFL classes in four new secondary schools. The reason for choosing new secondary schools was that this new type of school was legally established only in 2012, and therefore, it was expected that little research had been done in this area.

For the monolingual classrooms, it was decided to choose schools in northern Carinthia, which are characterised by a highly homogenous body of pupils who speak only German as their first language. For the multilingual classrooms, information on the distribution of migrants across Viennese districts was gathered in order to decide which schools to select. According to Statistik Austria (2013), the share of foreign citizens is highest in Rudolfsheim-Fünfhaus, followed by Brigittenau, Margareten, Leopoldstadt and Ottakring: about thirty per cent of the total population of each district. The schools were then chosen at random. The only requirement was that they exhibit either a homogenous or heterogeneous student body in terms of pupils' first language. The monolingual schools are located in Spittal an der Drau in Carinthia and the multilingual schools in Margareten and Ottakring in Vienna. For reasons of anonymity the schools are referred to as schools A, B, C and D. The table below provides information on these schools in terms of the student body composition.

The settings			
	Total number of classes	Total number of students	Number of students whose first language is not (only) German
School A	13	258	2
School B	8	148	1
School C	11	250	240 30 different L1s
School D	12	259	250 20 different L1s

Table 5: The settings

Gaining access to these settings was contingent on official authorisation, meaning applications were made to the education authorities responsible in each case – the Stadtschulrat Wien and the Landesschulrat Kärnten. The applications contained detailed information on the research purpose, research questions, organization plan, written agreements from the heads of the schools, research methods, letter to the parents, etc. Only after the permission had been granted by the authorities and the letters to the parents had been signed, could the research be conducted. Both the observations and the interviews were carried out in the period between May and June 2015.

5.3.2 The participants

Four English lessons in four different classes were observed for the purpose of this research. Classes A and B were monolingual and and Classes C and D were multilingual. The table below gives some information on each of these settings.

Monolingual and multilingual classes			
	Number of students	Proficiency levels and years	Number of L1s
Class A	22	A1 – year two	1
Class B	19	A1 – year one	1
Class C	24	A1 – year one	10
Class D	20	A2 – year four	7

Table 6: Monolingual and multilingual classes

Four teachers agreed to participate in this research. Two of them teach monolingual classes and two of them teach multilingual classes. For privacy reasons their names were changed and they are known as Alice, Bill, Claire and Diana. All teachers are non-native speakers of English and when they were asked about their English language competence, all of them gave similar answers. They were positive about their competences and claimed to have B2 or C1 levels.

Alice and Bill teach monolingual classes in northern Carinthia. Alice's first language is German and the only foreign language she speaks is English. In addition to teaching English, she also teaches Biology and has been carrying out this profession for thirty years. Bill's first language is German as well. He has been teaching English and Chemistry for almost thirty years. Although he knows some Italian, his knowledge is confined to very simple conversations.

Claire and Diana teach multilingual classes in Vienna. Claire reported that English is the only foreign language she can speak and that her second subject is History. She has been working as a teacher for ten years and is thus the youngest participant. Diana is the only teacher who was raised bilingually in German and Persian and so has more than one first language. Moreover, she speaks English, French and some Italian and has been working as a teacher for thirty years.

Pupils in the two monolingual classrooms have only German as their first language, whereas students in the two multilingual classrooms are very heterogeneous in terms of their language

background. According to Claire and Diana, classes C and D do not contain a single person whose first language is German or only German. So, all of their students have a linguistic background other than German. Seven different first languages are spoken by the students in class D, and a total of ten different languages in class C.

As this research only involves four classes and four teachers, it is certainly not representative of monolingual and multilingual settings in general. Nevertheless, it allows for various conclusions and reveals possible tendencies that could be explored in further research.

5.4 Expectations and challenges

As far as monolingual classrooms are concerned, it was expected that both teachers and students would frequently switch to German during their English lessons, since they share a first language which they can use as a resource. However, they probably do not switch consciously but unconsciously. With regard to multilingual classrooms, it was assumed that teachers would mostly follow a monolingual instruction strategy, as their student population is very diverse, with some even unable to speak German. In this case, the English language would be the only common tongue. Apart from this, it was expected that if another language was allowed in the classroom it would be German – languages other than German were believed to be banned and not yet regarded as an asset to language learning. Moreover, teachers were expected to be monolingual, having only one first language, which is German. Teachers' own language learning experience at school and during their teacher training were assumed to influence both their teaching style and their beliefs about language teaching and learning, unlike educational policy documents, such as the curriculum, which were not expected to have a considerable impact. On the contrary, it was believed that teachers are unaware of the anchorage of L1 use and multilingualism in the curriculum – and in general – and that they had not reflected upon these issues so far or at least, not in detail. The data gathered from observations and interviews will show whether these expectations are true or false.

One also has to consider the limitations of this research. Only four lessons were recorded in both monolingual and multilingual settings. These four lessons do not allow for a generalisation across monolingual and multilingual schools but only imply possible tendencies.

Regarding the challenges connected with classroom research, Dörnyei (2007: 188) mentions several issues that should be considered in advance. As far as this research is concerned, especially the collaboration with certain teachers and the multisite design turned out to be problematic. The coordination of appointments, for example, was very difficult, since the research was conducted in two federal states which are very far apart – Carinthia and Vienna. Moreover, there were several public holidays in May and June, students were on field trips, teachers were unable to be present for one reason or another and one of them even withdrew her participation at the last minute. In a nutshell, “[r]eports of research projects make it all look so simple. [...] There is no indication of the blood, sweat and tears that go into getting permission to undertake the project, that go into actual data collection, that go into transcription, and so forth” (Schachter and Gass 1996: viii).

6. Analysis of classroom observations

This chapter contains an analysis of the data obtained from the lessons observed. Since many authors have already concerned themselves with the phenomenon of code-switching and have developed different functions, some of them are referred to in the present analysis and form the basis for the development of a new framework. This framework consists of various functions that occurred during the four classroom observations. A general division is made between the functions of teachers' and students' switches. These functions are further divided into content-related and non-content-related functions and some of them are subdivided even further. This division is new and has not been made by other authors before. As far as content-related functions are concerned, instances of code-switching are mentioned that occur in the context of the content that is dealt with, in other words language-related code-switches. Non-content-related functions are those which are not relevant for the respective subject matter but concern other matters. The division between content- and non-content-related functions as well as the grouping of certain functions into broader categories were done for reasons of clarity and comprehensibility. Moreover, it was considered to be interesting to discover whether students and teachers mainly switched for language-related issues or off-topic matters.

So far researchers have only listed the various functions but have not combined them into meaningful groups, even though many of these functions share certain features. What is also worth mentioning at this point is that in this thesis, a 'function' implies an action, which means that a code-switching function consists of a verb and a noun that specifies the function, for example 'to ensure comprehension'. Other authors mix verbs and nouns when mentioning their functions, which is why several existing categories were revised for the purpose of this research.

As far as the teachers' switches are concerned, Üstünel and Seedhouse's (2005) classification provides a major source of input, because their analysis shows a great variety of functions. Moreover, Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999) are referred to in the framework. With regard to the students' switches and the functions that these switches fulfil, Horasan (2014) who extended Eldridge's (1996) functions deserves to be mentioned, since many of her functions were adapted for use in this research. Other researchers that were quoted frequently include Gregg and Gill (2007), Momenian and Samar (2001) and Anton and Dicamilla

(1999). While some of the existing functions were adopted as they were, others were adapted or rejected. Moreover, numerous new functions emerged which have not been mentioned by other authors so far, especially as far as the students' switches are concerned.

Both frameworks which served as a basis for the analysis are illustrated and explained in more detail below. The arrangement of the different functions is random. Although attempts were made to allocate the switches to a certain function, some switches might correspond to more than one category.

Code-switching functions TEACHERS	
content-related	non-content-related
ensure comprehension - explain - provide an equivalent - repeat - check understanding	discuss organisational matters
render assistance - provide a prompt for L2 use - deal with lack of response in L2	use fillers
give feedback - confirm - negate	
talk about language	
fill linguistic gap	
mention proper nouns	
attract attention	

Table 7: Code-switching functions for teachers

Code-switching functions STUDENTS	
content-related	non-content-related
ensure comprehension - clarify one's message - ask for equivalent meaning - check understanding	express emotions
constitute a bridging structure - fill a linguistic gap - hold the floor - direct one's own thinking	add humour
give feedback - confirm - negate	talk about classroom discourse
provide an equivalent	attract attention
talk about language - check understanding - clarify understanding	
talk about a task - talk about further procedure - give instructions - ask for/offer help	
discuss homework	

Table 8: Code-switching functions for students

6.1 Code-switching on the part of the teachers

In this chapter the code-switching functions of teachers are presented and investigated. Each term is defined before the actual analysis begins. Information that relates to multilingual classes is highlighted in grey in order to differentiate it from monolingual classes. The switches to German are in bold and their translations are indicated in italics.

6.1.1 Content-related functions

As explained earlier, content-related functions are those that concern the content that is dealt with during the lessons, i.e., functions that are related to the foreign language directly. In this case, teachers switch to German in order to ensure comprehension and render assistance with vocabulary, to give feedback to students concerning target language production, to talk about grammar, to fill a linguistic gap, to name proper nouns and to attract attention. These functions are defined and explained in more detail in the following subsections.

6.1.1.1 Ensure comprehension

The function ‘ensure comprehension’ is an umbrella term for four different sub-functions and implies that teachers switch to German to make sure that their students understand what was said in the target language. The different sub-functions are addressed in more detail below.

Explain

The function ‘explain’ implies that teachers switch to German in order to clarify the meaning of a word that has been mentioned in the target language. The word or the concept is not necessarily new to students – it can also concern words that they have heard and learned before. The function is similar to Gulzar’s term “clarification” (2010: 30), although his function only concerns unfamiliar vocabulary.

- (1) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
- T: pick flowers. you mustn’t pick flowers in a park for example. you mustn’t pick flowers in a park.
- S2: <L1de> **wos haßt denn pick up?** <L1de> *{what does pick up mean?}*
- T: <L1de> **pick up heißt aufheben.** <L1de> *{pick up means to lift something up.}*
- S2: <L1de> **oba es gibt jo a auto des hasst a pick up.** <L1de> *{there is also a car which is called pick up.}*
- T: <L1de> **jo und warum? do is hinten a ladeflaeche und do konn man dinge aufetuan und deswegen is es a pick up.** <L1de> *{yes and why? there is a cargo area at the back where one can put things onto. that is why it is called pick up.}*

In example (1) the teacher uses the phrase ‘pick flowers’ in a sentence. A student then asks in German what ‘pick up’ means and the teacher replies or gives an equivalent meaning in German. Afterwards S2 relates the word ‘pick up’ to a type of vehicle and makes the teacher aware of this fact, who then tries to explain why the car is called that. So the teacher clarifies the meaning of the word and how the two concepts – ‘pick up’ in the sense of lifting up, and in the sense of taking something along – interrelate and uses the L1 to facilitate understanding.

(2) (Class D, 19 June 2015)
 T: what is a prize in german?
 SS: <LQde> preis. <LQde>
 T: <L1de> **und zwar welcher preis? eine? eine auszeichnung ein gewinn. aufpassen. nicht der preis fuer eine ware.** <L1de> {which prize? an? an award. careful. not the price of a good.}

Example (2) occurred in a multilingual classroom. Here the teacher wants to elicit a German translation for the English word ‘prize’. Although the students translate it correctly, the teacher switches to German to explain or elaborate on the term since there is a danger of confusion with the word ‘price’, which has a totally different meaning.

Provide an equivalent

The function ‘to provide an equivalent’ is based on Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 322). However, the authors fail to give a definition of the concept, simply mentioning that they have identified this function. In this thesis, an example of providing an equivalent would be the teacher’s reply to a student’s request for a translation or just a German translation for an unfamiliar term. The difference to the function ‘explain’ is the length of the switch. When teachers provide an equivalent they only name a single word or a short phrase and when they explain something they elaborate on a concept.

In extract (1), S2 wants to know what ‘pick up’ means and the teacher gives an L1 equivalent for the term. She could have explained the word in English and could have provided sample sentences, but sometimes giving a translation is simply more efficient and can save precious time.

(3) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
 T: can you look at the picture please and now i want you to show us what you can see on the poster. okay? for example i can see (2) yes. a brown horse. and then you show us with the loop. {T demonstrates} <L1de> **mit der lupe.** <LQde> {with the loop.}

In extract (3) the teacher introduces a new word which is why she provides a German equivalent. Although the teacher demonstrates what the students should do, she translates into German to ensure they understand.

Repeat

To ensure understanding teachers also tend to repeat what has been said in the target language. This repetitive function has been used by Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult and it occurs “when teachers convey the same message in both languages” (1999: 3). They also add that this repetition can be “either partial or full” and that the information is usually provided in the target language first (1999: 9).

- (4) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
T: this is the material for the written test. okay? stick it into your exercise book and erm let your parents sign it. {T mimes writing} where it says signature let your parents sign it. <L1de> **also die eltern unterschreiben lassen.** <L1de> {so let your parents sign it.} and you can already start this weekend.

Extract (4) is an example of the repetitive function of code-switching. Here the teacher wants to make sure that his students understand what he has just said and repeats the whole sentence in German. The information he wants to get across in extract (4) seems to be essential because he first tells the students what to do in English, then mimes the meaning what he has said and then translates into the L1 as well. So the L1 is a useful tool to make students understand important content.

- (5) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
T1: can you look happier than happy? S15.
S15: erm. what?
T1: <L1de> **kannst du noch kannst du noch glücklicher ausschauen wie S16?** <L1de> *can you can you look happier than S16?*
S15: {imitates happy face}
T1: okay. now that's happy.

The situation in extract (5) is slightly different than extract (4). Here. the teacher does not repeat of his own accord but only after he realizes that the students have comprehension problems. In extract (5), S15 explicitly reveals that she does not know what to do by asking the teacher to repeat the instruction. The teacher's reaction in this context is a repetition in or translation into German.

The same applies to multilingual classrooms, as extract (6) below illustrates. The teacher tells a personal story to the students in the target language. When she asks them about the content of the story they give the wrong answer, which prompts her to repeat the information in

German in order to guarantee that they understand. She tells them that she touched moon rocks, but S2 obviously misheard her as he assumed that she was talking about a box instead, which is totally wrong, and prompts her to retell the story in German.

(6) (Class D, 19 June 2015)
 T: they put up a flag on the moon an american flag and they took some samples erm of the rocks and i was in washington dc in a museum called national air and space museum and there i touched moon rocks. {T imitates touching} i touched the moon rocks. do you understand that? i touched the moon rocks in washington in the museum. did you understand that? (3)
 <L1de> was hab ich gemacht? ich hab?<L1de> {what did i do?}
 S2: <LQde> also sie haben die box - <LQde> {the box - }
 T: <L1de> die box? <L1de> @@ {the box?}
 S2: <LQde> die box die auf dem mond war. <LQde> {the box that was on the moon.}
 T: <L1de> na nit die box. <L1de> {no not the box.} rocks rocks. what are rocks?
 S7: <LQde> steine. <LQde> {rocks.}
 T: <L1de> das mondgestein. in washington gibt's ein museum das air und space museum das behandelt luftfahrt und raumfahrt das ist ganz toll gemacht und erm da kann man da sind die ganzen originalanzuege von den astronauten und dann kann man das mondgestein angreifen. <L1de>

Check understanding

Üstünel and Seedhouse call this function “check comprehension” which means that the teacher switches to German in order to check whether or not the learners understand what was said in the target language (2005: 305). In this research, the teachers mainly switch to German to find out whether their students understand their instructions or instructions in the book. The teachers ask the students explicitly to explain what they have to do and expect an answer from them as in (7) below. Here, S10 reads out the instruction for an activity and the teacher asks her in German what the task is. After a long pause of about 8 seconds the teacher repeats the instruction in the L1, since she assumes that the student does not know what to do. After the teacher’s repetition, the student produces a correct sentence, so the teacher’s switch was helpful and facilitated understanding. In example (8), the teacher first gives an instruction in English and then, to check whether they have understood, asks the students in German to explain what they are expected to do. S13 has obviously understood the content in the target language and gives the correct answer in German.

(7) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
 T: page seventy nine number two. S10 you try.
 S10: complete another text from the wonderman files. use ing forms.
 T: use ing forms. <L1de> was musst du jetzt tuan? (8) verben finden und die in der ing form verwenden. ja. so. probier amol. <L1de> {what do you have to do? find verbs and use the ing form. yes. so. try.}
 S10: when i was a kid i liked (5) going –
 T: going.
 S10: to school.

- (8) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
 T: so erm what you quickly do is you work in pairs so you look at the plan of the house and try to remember the names and the rooms where the people are. okay? <L1de> **also die (.) was sollt ihr euch merken?** <L1de> {so the (.) what should you remember?}
 S13: <L1de> **die rauume und die nomen.** <L1de> {the rooms and the names.}

Extract (6) above contains an example of the ‘check understanding’ function. After having told a personal story about a visit to a museum, the teacher checks the learners’ understanding by asking them about the content of the story.

6.1.1.2 Render assistance

Another function that code-switching fulfils is to render assistance to students by giving them hints. It is an umbrella term for two different sub-functions, namely ‘provide a prompt’ and ‘deal with a lack of response’. Both these functions can be traced back to Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 322) and were only found in the observational data of monolingual classrooms.

Provide a prompt

Üstünel and Seedhouse’s function “provide a prompt for L2 use” implies that the teacher uses the L1 “to guide the learners” to produce content in the target code (2005: 318). Their examples all concern whole sentences rather than just single words or phrases. In the observational data for this research, however, the teacher tries to elicit both sentences and single words from the students by switching to the L1. Examples (9) and (10) illustrate what is meant by ‘providing a prompt’. In example (9), the teacher wants the students to tell her the rules in their school using ‘must’ and ‘must not’ and she wants them to produce a certain sentence. By switching to the L1, she provides a prompt and in this way elicits the target language content. S6 then says the correct sentence in English. In extract (10), the teacher applies the same strategy and switches to German in order to elicit a certain target language vocabulary.

- (9) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
 T: we must clean the board. okay. what about shoes? are you (2) what about your shoes? (3)
 <L1de> **wie sagt man das wir dürfen keine schuhe in der klasse haben? (3) was heißt denn schuhe tragen?** <L1de> {how do you say ‘we mustn’t wear shoes in the class’? what is wear shoes?}
 S6: we mustn’t wear shoes in the class.
 T: super. we mustn’t wear shoes in the class. S8 what must we wear in the class?

(10)

(Class A, 6 May 2015)

T: what is <L1de> **kaempfen**? <L1de> {what is fight?}

S6: ring.

T: mmm no. fight.

Deal with lack of response

According to Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 314), teachers switch to the L1 “to repeat a question after a pause of more than one second.” In extract (11), the teacher poses a question to her students in the target language but does not get an answer which could be due to comprehension problems. After five seconds she repeats the question in German in the hope that the learners will react to her question. One of them finally does, so the teacher’s strategy was successful – although only in part, because the student answers in German rather than in English. Nevertheless, the switch to the L1 caused the student to add something to the lesson.

(11)

(Class A, 6 May 2015)

T: what mustn’t you do in a park for example? (5) <L1de> **wos darf man in an park nit tuan zum beispiel?** <L1de> {what mustn’t you do in a park for example?}

S5: <L1de> **sochn beschaedigen.** <L1de> {damage things.}

T: <L1de> **bitte?** <L1de> {pardon?}

S5: <L1de> **sochn beschaedigen.** <L1de> {damage things.}

T: <L1de> **wie sogstn do?** <L1de> you mustn’t? {how do you say this in english?}

S5: you mustn’t (2) in the park.

T: what? you mustn’t destroy or damage things in the park.

In the data of multilingual classrooms instances of the ‘render assistance’ function do not occur, which can be due to different reasons. Firstly, teacher C is an advocate of the ‘English-only approach’ and tries to speak in the target language as much as possible. Therefore, the data contains very few instances of code-switching on the part of the teacher in class C. Secondly, as already mentioned, the research is not representative, since only two lessons were observed in multilingual classrooms. These two lessons neither provide reliable data nor do they allow for a generalisation, meaning that instances of ‘render assistance’ might very well occur in other lessons taught by the same teachers. Thirdly, class D is a fourth form with an A2 proficiency level while classes A and B – the monolingual classes – have an A1 level. In this context, one can conclude that teachers in lower proficiency classes make more use of the L1 than teachers in higher proficiency classes in order to meet their students’ needs and enable them to make sense of the target language. This conclusion is consistent with previous research, as the following quote by Butzkamm illustrates: “with growing proficiency in the foreign language, the use of the MT becomes largely redundant [...]” (2007: 36). Mirza’s findings, which are based on interviews, also reveal that teachers vary the amount of the target language depending on the level of their learners (2012: 75).

6.1.1.3 Give feedback

Üstünel and Seedhouse mention the function ‘giving feedback’, although they do not elaborate on it or provide a definition (2005: 322). For the purpose of this, thesis feedback is given in various forms either by confirming an answer, negating an answer or praising students for a statement.

Confirm

The observational data revealed that confirming students’ responses accounts for most switches in monolingual classrooms. This confirmation is implemented in the form of the German discourse particle ‘ja’. Teacher B, in particular, makes extensive use of this particle and uses it not only for confirmation but also for another purpose which will be addressed in more detail below. In extract (12), the teacher asks the students what the time is and confirms their responses with a ‘ja’. He is probably not aware of his extensive use of this particular discourse particle but rather uses it unconsciously since he immediately switches back to the target language to proceed with the subject matter. The students probably do not even notice the German ‘ja’ – and if they notice it they are believed to understand its affirmative function.

- (12) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
T1: erm let’s see. (5) so what’s the time.
S5: it’s twenty-five past nine am.
T1: it’s twenty-five past nine am. <L1de> **ja**. <L1de> {yes} erm what about now. S7.
S7: it’s quarter past eleven am.
T1: okay. <L1de> **ja**. <L1de> {yes} then we have (.) erm let me see erm –

As mentioned before, teacher C uses the target language almost exclusively and rarely switches to German. When she does use German, her switches often function as confirmation of students’ responses as in example (13). Here the teacher approves the student’s statement by switching to German. However, when she elaborates on the student’s answer, she switches back to the target language, which is why one can assume that the switch happens unconsciously.

- (13) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
T: yeah. there is a garden. and what can you see?
S10: vegetables.
T: vegetables. <L1de> **ja**. <L1de> there are some carrots erm pears and potatoes. yes. right. okay. now i want you to put the correct cards to the pictures.

Another form of positive feedback is given in the form of praise, which is expressed in a single word in German as in extract (14). Here the students had to put words into the correct

order to form a sentence. S12 formulates a proper sentence whereupon the teacher expresses praise in the L1. She probably chooses German to give emphasis to the compliment.

(14)

(Class B, 3 June 2015)

S12: we arrive at the party early in the evening.

T2: <L1de> **bravo.** <L1de> {*well done.*}

Negate

The teachers also provide students with feedback in the form of negations, using the German word ‘nein’, or ‘na’ in dialect. In example (15) the students have to form sentences using ‘must’ and ‘must not’ with the help of pictures and words in a box. When S13 forms a sentence, the teacher signals to him that his sentence is not correct by switching to German. Then the teacher switches back to English to explain exactly what is wrong and gives further instructions in the target language, so one can again assume that the teacher’s switch was unconscious.

(15)

(Class A, 6 May 2015)

T: you mustn’t run downstairs. okay. you mustn’t run downstairs. S13 can you try number five?

S13: you mustn’t (2) phone

T: <L1de> **na** <L1de> what what word is missing? look there are some words in the grey box next to the –

Extract (16) is taken from a multilingual class. The teacher’s switch to German fulfils the same function as in example (15), which stems from a monolingual class. Here, the teacher wants to know the German word for ‘harvester’. A number of students try to provide answers to the teacher’s question – none of which is correct though – and the teacher responds to the students by negating their answers in German. However, after another wrong translation, the teacher responds in English, which is why her previous switch is likely to be unconscious.

(16)

(Class C, 27 May 2015)

T: do you know the german word of it [harvester]?

SS: bulldozer.

SX: a biggest tractor.

T: <L1de> **nein.** <LQde>

SX: <LQde> **rasenmaeher** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **rasenmaeher?** <L1de> no. no. i think it’s <L1de> **maehdrescher.**

6.1.1.4 Talk about language

The function ‘providing metalanguage information’ or ‘explaining grammar’ was determined by various researchers, among them Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 322), Jingxia (2010: 19) and Tariq et al. (2013). In this thesis, the phrase ‘to talk about language’ is used because ‘explaining grammar’ implies that a new grammar point is introduced which does not apply to

the observational data. In the observed lessons, the teachers do not introduce a new grammar point but rather they talk about grammar rules that have already been introduced and that students should be familiar with. In other words, it is more a revision rather than an explanation of grammar. According to Duff and Polio, teachers claim to prefer the L1 to explain grammar because it facilitates understanding and saves time (1990: 161). This also holds true for grammar revisions, as shown in extract (17).

- (17) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
- T: i mustn't <L1de>und dann kommt immer das verb in der? <L1de> S17 <L1de> was kommt dann noch mustn't? oder must? was kommt do? was passiert mitn verb? was kommt do danach? <L1de> {and then follows the verb in the? what follows on mustn't? or must? what follows? what happens to the verb? what follows?}
- S17: <L1de> das verändert sich. <L1de> {it changes.}
- T: <L1de> was verändert sich? das must oder das mustn't das is richtig. das eine mal is es positiv und das andere mal is es negativ. oba was passiert mit dem verb? was isn a verb? <L1de> {what changes? must or mustn't that's right. it is either positive or negative. but what happens to the verb? what is a verb?}
- S17: <L1de> a verb? <L1de> {a verb?}
- T: <L1de> sag mir a verb. <L1de> {tell me a verb.}
- S17. go.
- T: go. <L1de> jo. <L1de> {yes.} what else?
- S17: went.
- T: what is went? (.) what is went? (.) what is go and what is went? (3) what is go and what is went? (2) <L1de> die past form von? <L1de> {the past form of?}
- S17: go.
- T: <L1de> von go. und was brauch ma bei must und mustn't? <L1de> {of go. and what do we need with must and mustn't?}
- S17: go.
- T: <L1de> was haßt das die – was is denn das fuer a form? die? (2) <L1de> {what does it mean? which form is it? the?}
- S17: base form.
- T: <L1de> die base form. aufpassen goe. mit must und mustn't immer die base form verwenden. jo. <L1de> {the base form. careful okay. with must and mustn't you always have to use the base form. okay.}

In extract (17), the teacher asks the students how sentences with 'must' and 'must not' are formed, or, more exactly, which verb form follows on from 'must' and 'must not'. This grammar point has already been dealt with in detail and practised intensively so the students should know it. It is assumed that the actual explanation of the grammar point was done in German which is why the revision is done in German as well. This serves various purposes: Firstly, students are used to the German explanation. Secondly, it is easier for them to understand. Thirdly, it is easier for them to reply and talk about language in German. Moreover, the time factor may be of no small concern.

In multilingual classrooms the ‘talk about language’ function was not found, which does not mean that it does not occur in multilingual classes in general. Quite the contrary – although grammar is not part of the lesson content in the observed lessons both teacher C and teacher D claim to switch to German when they talk about grammar. So the fact that no instances of this function occurred under observation is due to the limitations of the research.

6.1.1.5 Fill a linguistic gap

Flyman-Mattson and Burenhult (1999: 4) call this function “linguistic insecurity” and claim that it is a phenomenon which is typical for student speech. Teachers, however, should avoid switching because of linguistic insecurity since “this might damage the students’ confidence in the teacher’s proficiency of the foreign language”. So switching to the L1 in order to fill a linguistic gap seems to be very rare on the parts of the teachers since they should control the language they teach to their students. Indeed, only one case of linguistic insecurity is discernible in the observational data from monolingual classes.

- (18) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
T: i mustn’t miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht**. <L1de> {remedial teaching} write it behind
your ears because tomorrow i want to see you here. is that clear? and the same to S10. i
mustn’t miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht** <L1de> {remedial teaching}

In extract (18), the teacher herself forms a statement with ‘must’. However, since the vocabulary she intends to use is not part of the second year syllabus, she lacks the corresponding term in English. One can assume that the sentence occurs to her spontaneously since she switches to German to fill the linguistic gap. What is interesting is that the teacher uses the term four times during the lesson so it is very likely that she simply does not know its English translation. The linguistic gap neither threatens her authority nor linguistic competence, though, because of her severe tone of voice and the fact that her statement is not only used as a sample sentence but also reflects a real-life situation – a request for the pupil to attend the remedial teaching the following day. What is conspicuous in her statement is the idiom that she uses – *write it behind your ears* – which is wrong as it is simply a verbatim translation of the German idiom ‘Schreibt euch das hinter die Ohren’. Yet idioms are a complicated issue and are rarely translatable word for word, so instead of assuming a translation it would be better to use the German idiom instead or to rephrase the whole statement.

As far as multilingual classes are concerned, no case of ‘filling a linguistic gap’ was found, so Flyman-Mattson and Burenhult’s (1999: 5) claim that linguistic insecurity is typical for students but not for teachers also proves to be true in multilingual settings.

6.1.1.6 Mention proper nouns

‘Mention proper nouns’ is not labelled as a function explicitly in the literature consulted, so it can be regarded as a new, additional function. Clyne mentions “trigger words” which are “words at the intersection of two language systems, which, consequently, may cause speakers to [...] continue the sentence in the other language”. Among those trigger words are proper nouns which have no equivalent in another language and are thus non-translatable (Clyne 1991: 193). However, in this research proper nouns do not cause the teacher to express the rest of the sentence in the foreign language. The teacher just switches to the L1 to name the proper noun, because there is no equivalent in English, and then switches back to the target language as in example (19). Here, a student forms a sentence with ‘must not’ which is *i mustn’t fish in the fish tank*. The two teachers are surprised at this statement. T2 has expected the student to say ‘i mustn’t fish in the lieser’ which is a river in Upper Carinthia. Then T1 corrects her and tells her that the student lives near another river, the Malta. As there is no English equivalent for either river, the only way to talk about this circumstance is to switch to the L1.

- (19) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
- S4: i mustn’t not fishing in the <L1de> **aquarium** <L1de>.
- T1: i mustn’t fish in the fish tank. have you got a fish tank at home?
- S4: mhm.
- T1: oh i see. fish in the fish tank. @ i have never heard about that. have you?
- T2: No i thought he would say in the <L1de> **lieser** <L1de> @@@
- T1: oh no he is near the <L1de> **malta** <L1de> not near the <L1de> **lieser** <L1de>

‘Naming proper nouns’ also accounts for a switch to German in a multilingual classroom. In extract (20), the teacher tells the students about the explosion of a space shuttle, which she saw on television. The television news programme is called ‘Zeit im Bild’ and does not have an English equivalent so the teacher has no choice but to switch and name the proper noun in German. Right after she mentions the proper noun she switches back to the target language to continue with the story.

(20) (Class D, 19 June 2015)
 T: thirty years ago in nineteen eighty six the challenger a space shuttle exploded one minute after it's start. i remember that i was at home it was the beginning of my teaching career and i was sitting at home in front of the news <L1de> **zeit im bild** <L1de> and they showed it. it was really terrible.

6.1.1.7 Attract attention

Merrit et al. (1992: 115) name various types of switches, among them code-switching as a communicative strategy to get the learners' attention. According to the authors, "[c]ode-switching [...] often functions as an attention getting or attention focusing device. This may occur when there is a behavioural objective such as having the students shift their focus of attention or change their activity." (1992: 117). Momenian et al. (2011: 777) assume that teachers code switch to attract attention to take the floor. However, in the observational data, the motive behind the switches is different to the ones just mentioned. Here, the teachers neither want to take the floor nor do they want the students to shift their focus: they want to draw their students' attention to a mistake.

(21) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
 S10: where were bob and bill? erm S8.
 S8: in the living room.
 T1: <L1de> **aufpassen.** <L1de> {*be careful.*}
 T2: whole sentence. a whole sentence.
 S8: <L1de> **aso.** <L1de> {*oh. okay.*} they were in the living room.

In example (21), the students have to form questions and answers in the past tense and the teacher tells them to produce whole sentences. When S8 answers S10's question, he does not form a whole sentence but only a phrase. The teacher immediately intervenes and says 'aufpassen', which is a kind of warning in German and attracts people's attention. Moreover, it adds emphasis to the teacher's utterance. After T2 explains what is wrong in English, the student produces a correct sentence. In this case, it is important for the teacher to step in, since students are meant to be practicing the past tense. S8 does not include a verb in his utterance though, which makes the whole exercise redundant.

The 'attract attention' function also occurs in multilingual classes and serves the same purpose as in example (21). In example (22) below, the teacher says 'aufpassen' in order to make the student aware of a mistake in his statement – in this case the wrong plural form of sheep. However, she only says this one word in German and then carries on in English. Her switch is probably done unconsciously but still adds emphasis to the warning.

(22) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
 S10: there are five sheeps.
 T: <L1de> **aufpassen.** <LQde> {careful.} one two three four five six. and what's the plural form of sheep?
 S10: sheep.

6.1.2 Non-content-related functions

Non-content related functions are those which are not relevant for the respective subject matter but concern other matters. Discussing organisational matters and including fillers fall into this category, since they are neither related to target language content nor do they add any meaning to it.

6.1.2.1 Discuss organisational matters

This function is similar to what Horasan calls “classroom routine”, which implies that teachers switch to German “to talk about the classroom routines, generally in the beginning and in the end of the lesson” (2014: 37). In the observations, however, the issue that the teacher is addressing at the beginning of the lesson is not part of the usual classroom routine, which is why the function ‘discuss organisational matters’ is more appropriate. In example (23), the teacher greets the pupils in English and then switches to German to ask them for the signatures that are needed in order to participate in this study. As this research and the bureaucratic issues that go along with it are just a one-off occurrence, the content that the teacher is talking about in German cannot be regarded as classroom routine. After clarifying the situation, the teacher switches back to the target language to start with the actual English lesson.

(23) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
 T: <L1de> **so. hom olle die unterschritten obgeben? wer sie heite nit hot muss zur frau [last name] in die nebenklasse gehen.** <L1de> {do you all have the signatures? those who haven't got them have to leave the classroom and go to misses [last name]}
 S1: <L1de> **i hob se vergessn oba i kann di mama frogn ob sie dos schnoe unterschreibt**
 <L1de> {i forgot it but i can go and ask my mum to sign it.}
 T: <L1de> **jo donn frog sie schnoe.** <L1de> {then go and ask her.} okay. let's start. can we move the board up a little bit because I am not as tall as you are.

(24)

(Class D, 19 June 2015)

T: <L1de> so zuerst einmal das ist die frau koch die schreibt gerade ihre abschlussarbeit und schaut sich heute unseren unterricht an. es ist ganz sicher anonymisiert also das heisst es erfahrt niemand wer ihr seid nicht einmal die schule. jedenfalls das sieht nur die frau koch die schaut sich das an und dann wird geschrieben schueler eins antwortet oder was weiss ich und der lehrer sagt das und das. also nicht irgendwie mit name oder schule oder sonst was. okay? und auch die aufnahmen die gemacht werden sind nur zum auswerten fuer die fuer die frau koch. also nicht dass ihr glaubt das kommt jetzt ins netz und alle wissen holladaro ja im facebook also das ueberhaupt nicht. okay?
<L1de> {this is miss koch. she is writing on her thesis and is observing our lesson today. the study is anonymous meaning that no names are mentioned. miss koch is the only one who will see the data for evaluative purposes. the video will not be published online okay?}. now open your student's books please on page twenty eight. today we are going to talk about space

The same applies to multilingual classes. Here, the teacher introduces the researcher and explains her intentions to the students. She makes them aware that the study is anonymous and that nobody will see the data except for the researcher. This organizational introduction is done in German whereas the content that deals with the actual English lesson is done in English. The teacher's decision to describe the research in German is probably due to the fact that it is easier for her to explain and for the students to understand. If she had explained it in the target language, it would probably have lead to comprehension problems and it was important for the students to know what was happening and what to expect.

6.1.2.2 Use fillers

As mentioned above, some teachers make extensive use of the discourse particle 'ja'. In most cases, this particle fulfils a confirming function, explained in detail earlier, in 6.1.1.3. Yet, there are also other instances where it just serves as a filler word, which can be regarded as a habit and interference from the first language, and used unintentionally.

(25)

(Class B, 3 June 2015)

T1: good. okay guys. listen up. erm now we do it together. <L1de> ja. <L1de> and we start with somebody (2) erm we start with S19. okay? so you do the first one. just any. <L1de> ja. <L1de> just pick one.

(26)

(Class C, 27 May 2015)

T: so please finish your farms until tomorrow. <L1de> ja. <L1de> tomorrow i am going to write down if you have your homework or not. <L1de> ja. <L1de> so please do it.

In examples (25) and (26), the teachers are not confirming a statement made by their learners: they just include the 'ja' randomly as a filler word. The discourse particle does not add any meaning to the teachers' utterance in this context.

Excursus

Another interesting code-switch occurred in a monolingual setting. It was not a switch from English to German, but a switch from Carinthian dialect to standard German. Teacher A speaks in her Carinthian dialect during the lesson except for two occasions, where she begins her utterance in Carinthian and then switches to standard German. She seems to do so because the sentence that she speaks is a general rule in their school. This rule is formulated in High German which is why the teacher is believed to use the standard code as well.

(27)

(Class A, 6 May 2015)

T: <L1de> wie sogt man dos wir duerfen keine schuhe in der klasse haben? (3) was heißt denn schuhe tragen? <L1de>

6.2 Code-switching on the part of the students

This sub-section presents and investigates the code-switching functions of students. Each term is defined before the actual analysis begins. Information that relates to multilingual classes is highlighted in grey in order to differentiate it from monolingual classes.

6.2.1 Content-related functions

6.2.2.1 Ensure comprehension

The function ‘ensure comprehension’ is used in cases where students switch to German not only to check that they have understood what was said in the target language, but also to ensure that the teacher understands their intended meaning. Another reason for them to switch is to ask for an equivalent in German, which facilitates comprehension.

Clarify one’s message

Both Momenian and Samar (2011: 776) and Horasan (2014: 37) mention the clarifying function of code-switching, although, as they do not define the term, it is not clear what the function entails. For the purpose of this thesis, ‘clarify one’s message’ means that students have made a statement in the target language and explain it or elaborate on it in German to communicate their idea successfully, as shown in example (28). S15 clarifies his message by switching to German because he probably fears that he did not get across his intended meaning. His first sentence, which he formulated in English, indicates that he is not allowed to take his mobile phone to his room – and this is not the message that he wanted to convey. What he wanted to say is that he is not allowed to take his mobile phone with him when he is

on his way to bed (i.e., he is allowed to take it into his room at other times). Therefore, he switches to the L1 to avoid any misunderstanding.

(28)

(Class A, 6 May 2015)

S15: i mustn't erm i must put the mobile phone in the bed.

T: oh you mustn't put your mobile in your room. yes. okay.

S15: <L1de> **also beim schlofn gehen** <L1de> {when going to sleep}

Example (29) is taken from a multilingual classroom where students are asked to name animals on a farm and form sentences using those nouns. S8 says 'pig' but the teacher does not understand her correctly. She obviously heard S8 say 'big' and thought that the girl had made reference to the previous statement. S8 reacts to this misconception by naming the term in German and hereby clarifies her message.

(29)

(Class C, 27 May 2015)

T: okay. the duck is too sm- ah too big so let's put it next to the farm. [...] okay. S8.

S8: pig.

T: the duck is big?

S8: <LQde> **schwein.** <LQde> {pig.}

T: a pig?

S8: <LQde> **jo.** <LQde> {yes.}

Ask for equivalent meaning

This function is based on Greggio and Gil (2007: 389) and means that students switch to German to ask for a translation of target language vocabulary. Extract (30) is an example of 'ask for equivalent meaning': S2 wants to know what the term 'pick up' means in German. He asks for a translation in order to make sense of the word and the preceding utterance.

(30)

(Class A, 6 May 2015)

S2: <L1de> **wos haßt denn pick up?** <L1de> {what does pick up mean?}

T: <L1de> **pick up heißt aufheben.** <L1de> {pick up means to lift something up}

(31)

(Class D, 19 June 2015)

S1: <LQde> **was ist damage?** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **damage heißt beschädigen.** <L1de>

In example (31), the situation is the same as in example (30): a student asks for the German translation of an English term that has occurred in a text.

Check understanding

Although Horasan (2014: 37) mentions the function 'checking', she does not elaborate on it or provide an example, probably because it is somehow self-explanatory. As far as this

research is concerned, the function suggests that students switch to German to check whether they have understood a concept or an instruction correctly. In extract (32), S2 is asked to tell the teacher what he does not like. As they have learned the construction ‘like’ and ‘do not like’ plus gerund only recently, S2 seems to be unsure what ‘do not like’ means, which prompts him to check whether his assumption is correct by switching to German and asking the teacher.

(32)

(Class B, 3 June 2015)

T: S2 (.) can you think of anything you really don't like?

S2: <L1de> **wos i nit mog?** <L1de> {*what i don't like?*}

6.2.1.2 Constitute a bridging structure

‘To constitute a bridging structure’ was invented as an umbrella term for three functions that have already been discussed by various authors, including Eldridge (1996: 305) and Anton and Dica-milla (1999:243). The functions, ‘to fill a linguistic gap’, ‘to hold the floor’ and ‘to direct one’s own thinking’ are listed by the authors as independent categories, but in fact, all of them have something in common: the fact that students switch to German to bridge a language gap, either because they lack the respective term in the target language or the term just does not come to them at a given moment.

Fill a linguistic gap

The function ‘fill a linguistic gap’ is based on Greggio and Gil (2007: 89) and Eldridge (1996: 305) (the latter refers to it as “equivalence”). The function implies that a switch is made because “the target language code [is] simply unknown” (Eldridge 1996: 305). This is the case in extract (33), for example. Prior to this pair-work, the students were given five minutes to memorise a picture. Afterwards they had to remember and tell each other which room the people were in in the picture and what they were doing. S9 actually wants to communicate that they were in the kitchen and were washing the dishes. However, the phrase ‘wash the dishes’ is not part of the first year syllabus though, so she lacks this phrase in the target language. Instead she fills the linguistic gap with an L1 phrase so she does not disrupt the flow of the conversation.

(33)

(Class B, 3 June 2015)

S9: they were in the kitchen

S7: yes

S9: and washed the erm <L1de> **waß i nit.** <L1de> {*i do not know*}

In extract (34), the student does not know the English term 'harvester' because he has not learned it yet. Therefore, he switches to German to fill the linguistic gap. Moreover, he points at the object in the picture on the board in order to get his intended meaning across. What is also worth mentioning is that the teacher does not provide the English equivalent but just asks for the German word. In this context one could assume that the teacher lacks the term as well.

(34) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
S7: erm i can see <LQde> **das da.** <LQde> {this.} {S points at harvester}
T: yeah what is it?
S7: i don't know.
T: do you know the german word of it?

Hold the floor

The category 'hold the floor' is similar to 'fill a linguistic gap' but is not the same. As far as 'hold the floor is concerned', the student does not lack the target language word but just cannot retrieve the term from memory at that given moment. Eldridge claims that "if [...] retrieval is slower for certain items in the target code than in the native code, then the use of the latter may be said to function as a kind of stopgap while the former is being retrieved" (1996: 306). Gregg and Gil's call this function "maintain the flow of conversation".

(35) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
S10: henry is in the (2)<L1de> **jo schlof-** <L1de> bedroom. he is sad.

Extract (35) above is a perfect example of 'hold the floor'. Here, the term 'bedroom' does not come to S10's mind immediately, so she bridges the gap by naming the German word to maintain the flow of conversation. However, before she finishes the word in German, the English equivalent occurs to her.

(36) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
S11: i can see a white sheep.
T: is there only one?
SS: sheep.
T: is there only one? how many are there? can you count them?
S1: many. <LQde> **sechs.** <LQde>

The student in example (36) also switches to German because the target language term does not come to mind. The vocabulary he is missing is not difficult though, and should actually know it. It is assumed that he uses the German word because he wants to answer the teachers question first – before other classmates do – and just cannot retrieve the English equivalent so fast.

Direct one's own thinking

This function is based on Anton and Dicamilla (1999: 243) who claim that “private speech” or “talk that regulates thinking” is important in terms of code-switching, because it is used as self-evaluation of one's own statements. In the observational data, this private speech is implemented in the form of single words which are uttered in another language than the target code and which help the learners to process and direct their thoughts. Since these words are believed to act as some kind of buffer, the function is listed under the umbrella term ‘provide a bridging structure’.

In extract (37) below, S15 tries to answer a question raised by S16 and obviously has trouble producing a correct sentence in the target language. She first refers to Kate and Mary as ‘she’ but then settles her thoughts and notices that Kate and Mary are two people who are referred to as ‘they’. According to Anton and Dicamilla (1999: 243) the L1 words that she articulates in the middle of the sentence are addressed to herself. By conversing with herself she reflects upon what she has said, directs her thoughts and recalls grammatical knowledge. In addition, the switch to German serves the purpose of self-correction and expression of understanding.

(37) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
S16: where were kate and mary?
S15: erm she was were (.) they. <L1de> **aso** they (.) **aso. ok.** <L1de> they were in the kitchen.

‘Directing one's own thinking’ also caused S7 to shift to German in example (38). He starts his sentence with ‘a duck’ but the teacher interrupts and obviously distracts him so he loses the thread and suddenly restarts with ‘the dog’. At that moment, he code-switches and utters some German words which function as a buffer and allow him to gather his thoughts and correct himself.

(38) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
T: what else is on the farm? S7.
S7: a duck.
T: yes. can you say a whole sentence please. (5) can you say a sentence please? a duck –
S7: a duck –
T: can you turn round? come to me. so and now you talk to the class. yes very good.
S7: the dog erm <LQde> **ich mein** <LQde> the duck is hungry.

6.2.1.3 Give feedback

Although the function ‘give feedback’ was only mentioned in the context of the teachers’ switches so far, it is also relevant for students who give feedback either by confirming or refuting a question raised by the teacher.

Confirm

It was concluded from the observational data that students tend to switch to German to confirm a question asked by the teacher, as in example (39), where the teacher asks the students if they have cyber-homework and the students respond in German. As with teachers' switches, the shift to the L1 is assumed to happen unconsciously. Extract (29) above also exhibits a switch to confirm the teacher's question.

- (39) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
T1: do you have a homework? cyber-homework?
SX: <L1de> jo. <L1de> {yes.}

Negate

Apart from confirming a teacher's question, students also switch to German to refute a question. In the case of example (40) the teacher asks for the current date and S7 replies in English. The teacher obviously misheard the student's response and thus asks for confirmation or negation. S7 then negates his question in German – most likely unintentionally.

- (40) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
T1: what date is today?
S7: the third of june.
T1: june the first?
S7: <L1de> na. <L1de> {no.} the third.

7.2.1.4 Provide an equivalent

Greggio and Gil (2007: 389) number “providing equivalent meanings in the L1” among the functions of code-switching for students. In this thesis, the category is called ‘provide an equivalent’ and the phrase ‘in the L1’ is left out, since German might not be considered the first language of all students. Moreover, the function here implies that students do not volunteer to provide an equivalent but only respond to the teacher's request for translation. Extract (41) below illustrates this function.

- (41) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
T: you read the text. number eleven. when i was a kid.
S12: when i was a kid.
T: what is this? when i was a kid? S1 what does this mean in German when i was a kid?
S12: <L1de> als ich ein kind war. <L1de> {when i was a kid.}
T: <L1de> als ich ein kind war. richtig. <L1de> {when i was a kid. correct.}

In example (34) the student neither asks for nor provides an equivalent of her own accord, but only translates into the L1 when asked to do so by the teacher. Responses like these are rather frequent in the observational data. In these cases, the teachers elicit a translation from their learners, hereby ensuring comprehension of target language content. After the student has provided the translation, the teacher repeats it and confirms her statement.

(42) (Class D, 19 June 2015)
T: the soviet union sent a dog called laika into space and laika survived. what does survive mean in german?
SX: <LQde> ueberleben. <LQde> {survive.}
T: {nods.} she was the first living creature that survived the trip into space and back. before that they sent different other animals a dog and i think once a monkey but they died.

Before teacher D elicits a German equivalent from her learners she always uses the English word in context, as in example (42) above. Only then does she ask for a translation in order to guarantee comprehension. After the student reacts to the teacher's request and provides the German equivalent for 'survive' the teacher confirms the reply and uses the term in a sentence again. Moreover, the second sentence includes the antonym 'died', which is another strategy to make the meaning of an unknown word clear.

6.2.1.5 Talk about language

Greggio and Gil's list the two functions "asking about grammatical rules or structures" and "clarifying understanding of grammatical rules and structures" as independent categories. The umbrella term 'talk about language' groups them together and includes both checking and clarifying the understanding of a grammar point. Extracts (43) and (44) below show two different examples of 'talk about language'.

Check understanding

When a student checks understanding, he or she communicates his or her interpretation of a grammatical structure and expects either approval or refusal or he or she asks for a grammatical rule. In example (43) the student checks understanding of a grammar point or, more specifically, the formation of a 'must/must not' construction by switching to the L1. Although the teacher explained the rule to the students only a short time before, obviously S2 got it wrong. What is interesting is that both the student and the teacher discuss grammatical points in German.

- (43) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
 T: <L1de> **mit must und mustn't immer die base form verwenden. jo.** <L1de> S2? *{with must and mustn't you always have to use the base form.}*
 S2: <L1de> **also go plus verb plus mustn't plus verb plus ing?** <L1de> *{so go plus verb plus mustn't plus verb plus ing}*
 T: <L1de> **na. do hob ma ka ing. hob ma do jetzt irgendwo a ing ghobt?** <L1de> *{no. there is no ing. did we have an ing here?}* mustn't sing, mustn't go, mustn't put, mustn't use. (.)

Clarify understanding

The function 'clarify understanding' differs from 'check understanding' in that students do not ask for grammatical rules or structures, but rather provide explanations – usually at the request of the teacher – and thereby clarify their level of comprehension. In example (44), the students respond to the teacher's question and provide evidence of their grammatical knowledge, in that they explain the rule of a structure in the L1.

- (44) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
 T1: so what do we have to do when we form a question? just?
 S12: was henry in the hall?
 T1: <L1de> **ja was muess ma tun? wir brauchen nur dos?** <L1de> *{yes but what do we have to do? we need to?}*
 S12: <L1de> **was an die erste stelle setzen.** <L1de> *{put the was in front of the sentence.}*
 T1: <L1de> **genau. woher kennen wir denn das schon?** <L1de> *{yes. we have come to expect that from?}*
 S13: <L1de> **am is are can may must have got oder has got. wenn man des im sozt hot muss man es an die erste stelle setzen.** <L1de> *{am is are can may must have got or has got have to be put in front of a sentence.}*
 T1: okay. good. perfect.

In multilingual classes, no grammar was dealt with while the observational data was being collected. The focus was rather on speaking and vocabulary, which is why there is no adequate example of a switch to clarify comprehension. However, one can assume though that students generally do switch for this reason. Although extract (45) is just a very short example, it confirms this assumption. In this case, the teacher is addressing the irregular plural of sheep. A student then adds in German that the irregular plural also applies to 'fish', thereby proving that he mastered this grammar point.

- (45) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
 T: do you know the plural form of sheep?
 SS: sheeps.
 SX: sheep.
 T: sheep sheep yes right. can you put it on the farm please?
 SX: <LQde> **wie bei fish** <LQde> *{the same applies to fish.}*
 T: yes. right.

6.2.1.6 Talk about a task

Apart from talking about language, students also tend to talk about a task or an activity in their first language. Eldridge refers to this function as “metalanguage”, which is rather misleading, though (1996: 306). He claims that “whilst tasks themselves should be performed in the target code, comment, evaluation, and talk about the task may legitimately take place in the mother tongue”. In this case, the label ‘talk about a task’ is more appropriate, since it is not language that is discussed but the task itself or the approach to the task. The observational data shows that the discussion mainly takes place between the learners when they do pair-work, but not between the teacher and the learners. Various functions are grouped under the term ‘talk about a task’ and explained in more detail below.

Discuss role allocation

In example (46) the students are asked to form a sentence in the past tense and formulate a question and a negation afterwards. Before the students start with the actual task, they talk about the distribution of roles or who should take which part in German. In this case, they agree that S1 will form the sentence and S2 the negation. Just as claimed by Eldridge, they perform the task in English but talk about it in their first language.

- (46) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
S2: <L1de> **soll i oder du?** <L1de> *{should i start or would you like to start?}*
S1: valentina and (3) valentina and (3) laura were in the (2) bathroom.
S2: <L1de> **i moch die verneinung jetzt.** <L1de> valentina and laura weren’t in the bathroom.
{i do the negation.}

Talk about further action

When the learners talk about further action, they tend to speak in German as well. It emerges from the observational data that they do so when they have finished an activity: in this case they switch to German and talk about how to proceed further. In extract (47), for example, a student asks his partner whether they should do the activity again. He probably speaks in German because it goes without saying that although they perform the actual task in English, he is used to talking about organisational matters in the L1 which is more convenient and easier.

- (47) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
S15: okay. <L1de> **moch mas noch mol?** <L1de> *{shall we do it again?}*
S16: okay.
S15: erm. <L1de> **du frogst oba diesmol.** <L1de> *{you ask this time.}*
S16: <L1de> **jo.** <L1de> *{yes.}* who erm were (.) where were sophie?

Give instructions

Another conspicuous instance of code switching to German occurs when students give instructions to each other concerning a task or activity. In the collected data, these instructions often represent commands, as illustrated by example (47). After having agreed to repeat the activity, S15 tells S16 in a firm tone of voice what he has to do. Students probably switch to German in this context for the same reasons as outlined above.

In multilingual classes, students did not work in pairs, which is why the two functions outlined above were not detected. However, they do switch to German to give instructions to each another. What is striking in this context is that students often repeat the instructions of their teachers in German. One student in extract (48), for example, acts this way probably because he fears that S13 has not understood the teacher's prompt, since his classmate did not react to it. Therefore, the student switches to German and repeats the instruction.

(48) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
T: please ask her (2). can you ask her?
SX: <LQde> **du musst sie fragen.** <LQde>
S13: erm what can you see?

Ask for/offer help

'Ask for/offer help' also accounts for a few switches to German. The observational data shows that the students usually ask their colleagues what the task is because either they did not hear the teacher, were not paying attention or did not understand the instructions in the target language. Moreover, students offer their classmates help in German. The instances of 'asking for/offering help' only occurred in multilingual classes. The student in extract (49) probably did not understand the word 'spell' which causes him to switch and ask his colleague for help or a translation of the teacher's instruction.

(49) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
T: okay now i want (.) now i want you to spell the name of the animal. okay? let's try that.
SX: <LQde> **was müss ma machen?** <LQde>
SX: <LQde> **buchstabieren.** <LQde>

6.2.1.7 Discuss homework

What is also quite common among students is to use German when talking about homework. They might do so because they either lack the appropriate vocabulary or just cannot retrieve the words they need at that given moment. In any case it is easier for the learners to express themselves in German when discussing issues related to homework. In extract (50), the

teachers speak in the target code when it comes to assignment and S7 switches to the L1 in order to clarify the submission date. Normally the cyber-homework is due on a Thursday, which would have been the June 4th, which in this case was a national holiday, so the deadline was postponed until Monday June 8th. The students have a discussion on this issue in German probably because they adjust themselves to the code used by S7.

- (50) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
- T1: do you have a homework? cyber-homework?
- SX: <L1de> **jo.** <L1de> {yes.}
- T1: so i'm gonna open that for you.
- S9: until tomorrow?
- T2: tomorrow? are you at school tomorrow? until monday. till monday. cyber-homework.
- S7: <L1de> **oba de cyberhomework de hetz is de geht bis vierten sechsten.** <L1de> {but the cyber-homework is maturing on the fourth of june, isn't it?}
- SX: <L1de> **na bis -** <L1de> {no on-}
- S11: <L1de> **doch.** <L1de> {yes.}
- SX: <L1de> **morgen is jo da vierte.** <L1de> {tomorrow is the fourth.}

Class C, where extract (51) is taken from, is a first form and obviously lacks the appropriate vocabulary to clarify what to do as homework. Therefore, the students use German as a medium to talk about this issue.

- (51) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
- T: those who haven't finished the farm (3) please finish the farm until tomorrow.
- SX: <LQde> **muessen wir nur den hintergrund malen?** <LQde> {do we just have to draw the surroundings of a farm?}
- SX: <LQde> **den hintergrund. genau.** <LQde> {the surroundings. yes.}

6.2.2 Non-content-related functions

6.2.2.1 Express emotions

The data reveals that students very often switch to German when they want to express various emotions. It seems that emotions are automatically related to the learners' first language or German since they are not articulated in the target code. Emotions that students displayed during the four observations are delight, curiosity and anger. In extract (51), for example, students express curiosity about the recording device that was placed on their desks. Right after their short discussion they fulfil the task – a pair-work – in the target language though, so the L1 was just a device to voice their feelings at a given moment.

- (51) (Class B, 3 June 2015)
- S8: <L1de> **wos muessts ihr do tuan?** <L1de> {what do you have to do?}
- S16: <L1de> **wos soll denn des sein? wos is des?** <L1de> {what was that supposed to be?}
- S15: {shrugs her shoulders}

In extract (52,) S4 code-switches to express anger. When he wants to pass a magnifying glass to S7, S5 suddenly tries to grab it, whereupon S4 gets upset and expresses his anger in German. This is another proof that feelings are not voiced in the foreign language, because right after his emotional outburst the student continues in English.

(52) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
S4: there are four cows.
T: super. good. next one.
S4: <LQde>S5 halt dich raus! <LQde> {stay out of this!}
T: can you say the question please.
S4: what can you see?
S7: erm i can see chicken.

6.2.2.2 Add humour

The assertion that students code-switch to add “a sense of humour” or “create a comic sense” has been made by various researchers, among them Horasan (2014: 37) and Momenian and Samar (2007: 772). The same conclusion can be drawn from the observational data from both monolingual and multilingual classes. According to Horasan, the learners apply this strategy to express their thoughts without losing meaning (2014: 37). As far as extract (53) is concerned, the teacher teases some of her sporty students because they were moaning about a short physical activity. Then S2 jokes about the reason for S5’s moaning in German. S5, who is 12 years old, plays football and painful joints seem to be a common side effect of this sport. The fact that S5 is too young to suffer from painful joints is the punch line of this joke. S2 probably speaks German in this context because he lacks the appropriate vocabulary and hence his gag would have lost its intended meaning when told in English.

(53) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
T: okay. so now we touch our leg with the right hand and the other way round. okay. very quickly. quick, quick, quick, quick, quick, quick, quick. okay. and then take a seat again. oh i thought you were football players. and you say o::::h.
SS: @@@
T: S5.
S2: <L1de> der is jo schon zu olt. <L1de> {he is too old already.}
T: oh. he is too old for this. oh i know.
S2: : <L1de> die gelenke. @ <L1de> {the joints.}

S18 in extract (54) did not bring his exercise book to class, so he does not have anything to write on. S19 consequently hands him a sheet of paper that he can do the exercise and makes a teasing comment in German which creates a comic moment.

(54) (Class D, 19 June 2015)
 T: S18 go write down the exercise please (3) on a sheet of paper (3) on a sheet of paper.
 S19: {to S18} <LQde> **bitteschoen sir.** <LQde> {here you are sir.}

6.2.2.3 Talk about classroom discourse

When talking about classroom discourse students almost exclusively use German. For the purpose of this thesis, classroom discourse includes talking about organisational matters of any kind, talking about other school subjects, asking for school supplies etc., so all speech that is related to school and that might just as well occur in other subjects. It is assumed that the learners prefer to speak in German because they do not associate the usual classroom talk with the English lesson and probably regard it as off-topic – which it is. Extract (55) is an example of the function ‘talk about classroom discourse’, where S4 addresses an organisational matter in German. He tells the teacher that the whole class will not be at school the following day because of a field trip and other students negate this statement. The short conversation between the learners is held in the L1 while the teacher initiates and responds in the target code.

(55) (Class A, 6 May 2015)
 T: i mustn't miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht.** <L1de> write it behind your ears because tomorrow i want to see you here. is that clear? and the same to S10. i mustn't miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht.** <L1de>
 S4: <L1de> **wir seima morgen oba nix do.** <L1de> {we are not at school tomorrow.}
 SS: <L1de> **sicher.** <L1de> {of course we are.}
 T: why? you leave after the fourth lesson. not before.

In extract (56) the teacher had worksheets handed out. The organisational questions that arise on the parts of the students are asked in German and relate to whether the worksheet should be stuck into the exercise book and whether a student who is missing that day should also get one.

(56) (Class C, 27 May 2015)
 T: erm please pass them out. and then you write the date. yellow exercise book. so open your yellow exercise book please and you write down the date.
 S16: <LQde> **muess ma des ins heft geben?** <LQde> {should we stick it into the exercise book?}
 S1: <nods>
 T: open your yellow exercise book.
 S25: <LQde> **soll ich auch dem [first name] einen geben?** <LQde> {should [first name] also get a worksheet?}

6.2.2.4 Attract attention

Not only the teachers shift to German when they want to attract attention: the students do too. According to Horasan, the learners want to gain the attention of either their teachers or of their fellow students (2014: 37). In the observational it is mainly the teacher's attention that they want to attract, as illustrated by example (57).

Several students raise their hands and volunteer to read out an exercise. By shifting to German, S4 succeeds in attracting the teacher's attention and is chosen to read. In this case, the student's switch fulfils its purpose – to draw attention to oneself.

(57) (Class D, 19 June 2015)
T: who wants to read the correct order? who wants to read the numbers.
S4: <LQde> darf ich? <LQde> {may i?}
T: alright.

6.3 Code-switching by absolute numbers

The overall number of switches by both teachers and students is represented in Tables 9 and 11 and discussed briefly. A switch was considered and classified when it occurred at least twice in either the monolingual or multilingual classes, or both. Switches that were found only once were listed in the category 'other', which includes shifts of different functions.

Number of teachers' switches			
	functions	monolingual	multilingual
content-related			
	ensure comprehension	17	19
	- <i>clarify</i>	2	3
	- <i>provide an equivalent</i>	1	12
	- <i>repeat</i>	11	3
	- <i>check understanding</i>	3	1
	render assistance	9	0
	- <i>provide a prompt for L2 use</i>	7	0
	- <i>deal with lack of response</i>	2	0
	give feedback	33	27
	- <i>confirm</i>	30	25
	- <i>negate</i>	3	2
	talk about language	8	0
	fill a linguistic gap	1	0
	name proper nouns	3	2

	attract attention	2	1
		73	49
non content-related			
	discuss organisational matters	1	1
	include fillers	19	7
		20	8
other		3	3
total		96	60

Table 9: Number of teachers' switches

Table 9 illustrates the number of switches made by teachers and clearly shows that teachers of monolingual classes – teachers A and B – shift to German more often than teachers of multilingual classes – teachers C and D. While multilingual classrooms exhibit 96 switches overall, multilingual classrooms only display 60 switches. In many cases, the number is almost even, for example in terms of switching ‘to ensure comprehension’, ‘to give feedback’, ‘to name proper nouns’ etc. In others, however, there is quite a discrepancy between teachers of monolingual and multilingual classes which particularly applies to the following functions: ‘to render assistance’, ‘to talk about language’ and ‘to include fillers’. There are multiple reasons for this. Firstly, teacher C is an advocate for the English-only approach and tries to speak in the target language as much as possible. Therefore, the data shows few instances of code-switching on the part of the teacher in class C. Secondly, the research is affected by limitations, since only two lessons were observed in multilingual classrooms. These two lessons do not allow for a generalisation, since switching to render assistance and to talk about language might very well occur in other lessons taught by the same teachers. At the same time the analysis of the interview data reveals that both teachers C and D tend to switch to German when dealing with grammar issues: it was just not part of the lesson content when the lesson was observed and the data was collected. Thirdly, class D is a fourth form with an A2 proficiency level while classes A and B – the monolingual classes – have an A1 level. In this context, one can conclude that teachers of lower proficiency classes make more use of the L1 than teachers in higher proficiency classes in order to meet their students’ needs and enable them to make sense of the target language. Fourthly, teacher B makes extensive use of the German discourse particle ‘ja’ and includes it as a filler word much more often than the other participants. This function, however, is regarded as the least important one, since the switch is unconscious and does not serve any specific purpose. The filler is probably a habit of the teacher which he uses not only when he is teaching English but also when he speaks his first language.

As far as the frequency of the individual functions in both classes is concerned, one can claim that ‘giving feedback’ accounts for the most switches, followed by ‘ensuring comprehension’ and ‘including fillers’. Less common are L1 instances ‘to fill a linguistic gap’, ‘to discuss organisational matters’, ‘to attract attention’, ‘to name proper nouns’ and ‘to talk about language’.

Content-related and non-content-related language used by teachers				
	content-related		non-content-related	
	English	German	English	German
monolingual	80,12 %	19,88 %	82,35 %	17,65 %
multilingual	92,23 %	7,77 %	7,80 %	92,20 %

Table 10: Content related and non-content-related language used by teachers

What is also worth mentioning is whether teachers more frequently switch to German to fulfil content-related rather than non-content-related functions, as presented in Table 10. Among teachers of monolingual classes language switching for content-related and non-content-related purposes is almost equal. As far as the exact percentage is concerned, 80 per cent of content-related words spoken during the two lessons were produced in English and 20 percent in German. Non-content related words spoken in English constituted for 82 per cent while those produced in German represented 18 percent.

In multilingual classes the situation is different and a sharp contrast is evident between content-related and non-content related speech. 92 per cent of content-related speech was produced in English and only 8 per cent in German. Non-content related language, however, was mostly expressed in German (92 per cent) rather than in English (8 per cent). So in this case, teachers more often switched to German in non-content-related situations and for non-content-related purposes.

In conclusion, the results of this research show that code-switching to German is more frequent among teachers in monolingual than in multilingual classes. It is assumed that the students’ L1 plays a central role in this context, meaning that when students and teachers share a first language teachers are more likely to switch to this shared code. The data collected in the form of interviews will show whether or not this assumption is true.

Number of students' switches			
	functions	monolingual	multilingual
content-related			
	ensure comprehension	6	4
	- <i>clarify one's message</i>	3	1
	- <i>ask for equivalent meaning</i>	1	2
	- <i>check understanding</i>	2	1
	constitute a bridging structure	23	12
	- <i>fill a linguistic gap</i>	7	5
	- <i>hold the floor</i>	5	3
	- <i>direct one's own thinking</i>	11	4
	give feedback	10	4
	- <i>confirm</i>	7	4
	- <i>negate</i>	3	0
	provide an equivalent	9	21
	talk about language	9	3
	- <i>check comprehension</i>	2	0
	- <i>clarify comprehension</i>	7	3
	talk about a task	11	11
	- <i>discuss role allocation</i>	2	0
	- <i>talk about further action</i>	3	0
	- <i>give instructions</i>	8	4
	- <i>ask for/provide help</i>	0	6
	discuss homework	3	2
		73	57
non content-related			
	express emotions	1	10
	add humour	2	3
	talk about classroom discourse	6	16
	attract attention	2	3
		13	32
other		6	5
total		92	94

Table 11: Number of students' switches

Table 11 shows the number of switches made by students. What is striking is that the total numbers of switches are almost equal, meaning that learners in both monolingual and multilingual classes switched to German about ninety times. However, there are evident variations within the individual functions.

Regarding the switches in monolingual classes, most of them occurred to constitute a bridging structure and to give feedback. Other important functions that the L1 fulfils are 'to provide an equivalent', 'to talk about language' and 'to talk about a task'. In multilingual classes students mainly shift to German to provide an equivalent when requested by the teacher. At this point, it is worth mentioning that the majority of these switches are made in

class D. The teacher of class C, on the other hand, rarely asked for a German translation. ‘Talking about classroom discourse’, ‘constituting a bridging structure’ and “talking about a task” also caused students of multilingual classes to switch to German frequently. This was followed by ‘ensuring comprehension’ and ‘giving feedback’. In both classes it was very rare that the learners code-switched to create a humorous effect, to attract attention or to talk about homework. In some cases, functions only occurred in either monolingual or multilingual settings which may be due to the small sample size of the study. Students in multilingual classes probably also switch to German to check comprehension of a grammar item or to talk about further actions when engaging in pair-work. The same pertains to students in monolingual classrooms, who are also likely to speak in their first language when asking their classmates for help.

Content-related and non-content-related language used by students				
	content-related		non-content-related	
	English	German	English	German
monolingual	83,95 %	16,05 %	3,67 %	96,33 %
multilingual	86,23 %	14,77 %	0,00 %	100,00 %

Table 12: Content related and non-content-related language used by students

As far as switching for content- and non-content-related purposes is concerned, the results are similar in both settings, as Table 12 illustrates. In both classes 80 or 84 per cent of content-related language was produced in English and 20 or 16 per cent in German. Non-content-related words in English only represented about 4 per cent at the maximum, meaning that the vast majority of non content-related language was expressed in German in both settings. With regard to non-content-related switches, the number is probably much higher, since students talk among themselves during the lesson. This conversation is not held in the target code but in German or another language and concerns personal as well as other issues. Further research would be necessary to gain insights into this subject matter and recording devices would have to be put on every desk in order to capture the whole range of students’ code-switching.

In conclusion, students in both settings code-switch to German no matter what L1 they speak and what teaching approach their teacher prefers. The reason that students in multilingual classes do not use their first languages more often during the lessons will be addressed in more detail in the following chapter. Anyway, the assumption that learners in multilingual settings need to rely more on English than their colleagues in monolingual settings turned out to be wrong.

7. Analysis of interviews

As far as the analysis of interviews with the teachers is concerned, content analysis was applied, which required coding of interview data (Dörnyei 2007: 246). Prior to coding, categories and themes were established. Table 13 below represents an analytical framework and serves as the basis for analysis. It shows the categories, themes and codes which were identified in the interview data and which are investigated in detail in this chapter. In tables 14 to 19 the various responses or codes are allocated to the participants. Alice and Bill are teachers of monolingual classes while Claire and Diana teach in a multilingual environment.

Coding interview data		
Categories	Themes	Codes
Personal information	number of languages	two more than two
	proficiency in English	B2 C1
	teaching experience	15 years 30 years
Multilingual students	number of languages present in classroom	7 10
	proficiency in German	relevant irrelevant
Classroom practice	language(s) of instruction	English English and German
	TL use in percentage terms	approx. 60 % approx. 80 %
	code-switching instances	grammar vocabulary instructions comprehension complex issues
	approach of colleagues	more L1 less L1 same
	tolerance of L1(s)	tolerance disapproval
Classroom experience	code-switching instances of students	laziness tiredness lack of knowledge lack of interest when unwatched talk with neighbour

	reaction	elicitation of TL translation
	performance of mono- and multilingual students	comparison impossible
(Advanced) training	school days	English only English and German
	teacher training	English only multilingualism as non-issue need for awareness raising
	curriculum	no idea rough idea L1 as resource
	recent developments	rare pursuance participation in seminars
Personal view	L1 as asset or hindrance	asset hindrance
	multilingual approach	difficult implementation no experience opportunity necessity
	different settings	multilingual is more difficult monolingual is different no difference
	level of students	lower level more L1 lower level less L1 higher level more L1 higher level less L1

Table 13: Coding interview data

7.1 Personal information

Themes	Codes	Participants
number of languages	two more than two	Alice, Bill, Claire Diana
proficiency in English	B2 C1	Alice, Claire Bill, Diana
teaching experience	15 years 30 years	Claire Alice, Bill, Diana

Table 14: Personal information

The first three questions are introductory questions and mostly provide quantitative data. The responses show that three out of four teachers speak German as their first language and English as their only foreign language. The fourth teacher, Diana, was raised bilingually with German and Persian and in addition to English she can speak French and Italian. By her own account, she considers herself multicultural. The analysis will show which influence this circumstance has on her teaching of multilingual students.

As far as the teachers' proficiency in English is concerned, Alice and Claire claim to have a B2 level, while Diana and Bill report that they have a C1 level. Bill has been involved with the English language since he was a teenager, when he was a ski instructor during the school holidays and often supervised children from English-speaking countries. Moreover, he often visited his relatives who live in the USA and spent a year abroad, teaching science in an American high school. Diana's level is due to her being in regular contact with American friends.

Alice, Bill and Diana have been working as teachers for thirty years, whereas Claire has less experience. What is interesting is that Claire is the only one who favours an English-only approach. The teaching experience does not seem to play a role in this context though, since Claire has already been teaching for fifteen years. Her approach is attributable to other factors, which will be addressed below.

7.2 Multilingual students

Themes	Codes	Participants
number of languages	seven ten	Diana Claire
proficiency in German	irrelevant	Claire, Diana

Table 15: Multilingual students

As far as the multilingual classrooms are concerned, class D features seven different languages and class C a total of ten different tongues, among them mainly Turkish, Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian, so one can conclude that the body of pupils is very heterogeneous and has varying levels of proficiency in German. Moreover, both teachers remark that they do not have a single student in their classes who speaks German only as his or her first language. All of their learners have a multicultural background and are able to speak at least two languages. This fact must be considered when teaching a foreign language in this sort of setting. With regard to the language of instruction, for instance, teachers have to give thought to whether they follow an English-only approach or use both English and German. In a multilingual setting, however, it is not enough to just consider these two languages, meaning that efforts should be made to include all the students' first languages. One needs to be aware that German may not always be the right choice, especially when students' proficiency in German is limited.

Claire mentions that her pupils' German is rather bad and that some of them can hardly follow the lessons at school. Therefore, she only speaks the target language, which makes the student's knowledge of German irrelevant. Claire says that "ich versuche kaum ein deutsches wort zu verwenden also es gibt bei mir keine deutschen wörter. auch an der tafel nur ganz ganz selten. wir machen alles mit bild und wort [...]"⁴. So, in this case, even students who are not so proficient in German are able to follow her lessons and are not disadvantaged because of their poor knowledge of German. On the one hand, this approach is perfectly reasonable because everybody starts from scratch, but on the other hand, the students' existing language abilities, which are important resources even if limited, are ignored.

Diana also asserts that her students' level of proficiency in German is irrelevant to the English class. The observational data, however, is not consistent with her assertion, revealing that Diana often switches to German and frequently elicits a German translation from her learners which necessarily requires some knowledge of the language.

7.3 Classroom practice

Themes	Codes	Participants
language(s) of instruction	English English and German	Claire Alice, Bill, Diana
TL use in percentage terms	approx. 60 % approx. 80 %	Diana, Bill Alice, Claire
approach of colleagues	more L1 less L1 same	Alice, Claire Alice Diana
code-switching instances	grammar vocabulary instructions comprehension problems complex issues convenience	Alice, Bill, Claire, Diana Alice, Bill, Claire Bill Alice, Claire Diana Alice, Diana
tolerance of L1(s)	tolerance disapproval	Alice, Bill, Claire, Diana Claire

Table 16: Classroom practice

In terms of the actual classroom practices, there is no difference between teachers of monolingual and multilingual classrooms, meaning that their responses cannot be assigned to either the one or the other setting. What is evident, though, is that Claire's responses deviate

⁴ Translation: I try to avoid using German; there are no German words in my classes. Even on the blackboard very very rarely. We rely on pictures and English words.

from those of her colleagues twice – firstly, with regard to the language(s) of instruction and secondly, concerning the tolerance of the students’ first language(s).

Three participants chose to use both English and German as the languages of instruction and they are believed to do so consciously – at least partially – because they mentioned various situations in which they switched code. One of the participants, Claire, prefers to limit the medium of instruction to only one language, namely the target code. One reason for her approach has already been mentioned in 7.2. The others will be addressed in more detail below.

The ratio of target language and first language use may vary considerably, according to Duff and Polio (1990: 161). Although their results show a mean of around 70 per cent of TL use, the percentage ranged from only 10% to 100%. In this context, Macaro (1997: 96) claims that a “virtually all designation” of target language use is only found in classrooms with mixed L1 students. Claire is one of the teachers who use the target code almost exclusively, or more exactly 98% in the observed lesson. When she is asked about the average TL use she assumes it to be around 80%. In this case, she even underestimates her use of English, which differs from findings of other authors. According to Rabbidge and Chappell (2014: 5), for example, several studies show that teachers underestimate the amount of first language use during their foreign language classes. Their findings, however, prove the opposite, “with the teachers here underestimating their use of English rather than that of the L1” (2014: 13). They mainly ascribe this result to the small sample size. In the data for this thesis, there was also a discrepancy between the participants’ perceptions and the actual language use in the sense that three out of four teachers underestimated their use of the target code. Diana and Bill, for example, estimate their English use at about 60% while their actual use was 80-85% percent. This variance may be due to the limitations of the study – after all, only one lesson was observed. Moreover, the choice of language is dependent on various factors, especially the subject matter, so it is possible that the teachers use more L1 and less TL in other lessons. Duff and Polio (1990: 161) list five things among the variables which influence TL use: language type, policy, lesson content, materials and formal teacher training. As far as Alice is concerned, her estimate matches the observational data.

The participants were also requested to provide information on their colleagues’ attitude towards first language use and their code-switching practices. Alice reports that some of her colleagues do not take the target language so seriously and very much rely on the students’ first language, while others are intent on using English as much as possible. Therefore, one

can see that even in monolingual settings where teachers and students share a common tongue, the monolingual habit is still anchored in some teachers' minds whilst at the same time, teachers of multilingual classes, whose student body is linguistically heterogeneous and may not be proficient in German, make considerable use of German, as is the case with Claire's colleagues. Claire justifies their approach as follows: they only have two certified English teachers at their disposal and they are not able to cover all the English lessons in the school. Therefore, teachers of other subjects are forced to teach English. As their knowledge of English is limited compared to a certified English teacher, they have no alternative but to rely on German. In this case there seems to be a relation between the choice to use the target language and the teachers' proficiency – although this idea is disputed by other researchers, among them Duff and Polio (1990: 161) who claim that “we can discount the role of the teachers' English proficiency as a factor influencing the amount of L2 use in classes”. However, the correlation between proficiency and target language use only seems to apply to uncertified English teachers, not English teachers in general. Further research would be necessary to verify this hypothesis.

When the participants were asked to specify situations in which they shift to German they all mentioned various instances, which may be interpreted as a conscious awareness of code-switching. Yet this does not imply that teachers always realise when they code-switch and which functions their switching fulfils. What all teachers are aware of is switching to German to explain grammar. Diana, for instance, says “wenn ich eine grammatik erkläre [...] geht's nicht auf englisch [...] das habe ich früher probiert das ist völlig über die kinder hinweg [...]”⁵. Other reasons for her to switch are to explain vocabulary and to simplify complex issues. Sometimes, convenience is the reason, because she does not want to explain or paraphrase something at great length when a German translation is much more efficient. Alice is of the same opinion, and, in addition, makes use of the first language to teach grammar and vocabulary and to counteract comprehension problems. Another reason for code-switching, not mentioned by the other participants, was addressed by Bill, who says he resorts to German when giving instructions. Although the six functions described by the participants do not cover the whole range of code-switching incidents that occurred during their lessons, as proven by the observational data in Chapter 6, they do show that teachers notice when they shift code – at least in certain situations.

⁵ Translation: In the past I tried to teach grammar in English but this is impossible because it is far beyond the students' level.

The assertion of some authors that teachers often feel guilty “for straying from the [TL] path” (Cook 2001: 405) when switching to the L1 cannot be supported. On the contrary, three of the teachers in this study encourage first language use and shift to German themselves for various reasons. So, the hostile attitude towards L1 use in the EFL classroom no longer seems to be so prevalent among teachers. Claire is an exception, in the sense that she tries to avoid speaking German herself – although she allows her students to speak in German when necessary. She does not allow the use of languages other than German because, as she puts it:

also prinzipiell haben wir hier in der schule die regel dass wir deutsch miteinander sprechen. [...] alles was mit schule zu tun hat sprechen die kinder deutsch miteinander und werden auch von uns darauf hingewiesen quasi nicht in ihrer muttersprache zu sprechen⁶.

So the school regulates issues concerning language use and prescribes the use of German. According to the headmistress, the idea here is to improve the students’ skills in German because they do not have an opportunity to learn the language outside the school setting. However, Diana, who is multilingual herself, tolerates and even promotes the use of other first languages, because she knows from personal experience the difficulties that people face when being in a country whose language one does not command. Moreover, she is a firm believer in the first language as a resource, which is why she integrates other languages into her lessons, allowing her students to switch to their L1s and talk to each other when they have comprehension problems, or by having students read out stories in their own language. In the next breath, however, she adds that some of her colleagues hold the view that students must code-switch to German only.

es gibt kollegen bei uns die das nicht so sehen die sagen nein die müssen das auf deutsch können [...] ich sehe das nicht so weil ich mir denke erm ich kann etwas nur in meiner muttersprache verstehen. ich geh immer von mir selber aus wenn ich in der mongolei sitze und da habe ich einen zweiten österreichischer oder deutschen sitzen und ich kenne mich überhaupt nicht aus was der da von mir auf mongolisch will und der erklärt mir das auf deutsch bin ich ja heilfroh [...] und genauso projiziere ich das auf die kinder [...]⁷.

⁶ Translation: We have a rule in our school which says that students have to speak German so we make them aware they are not allowed to use their first languages.

⁷ Translation: Some of my colleagues think that students must be able understand anything in German. I do not share this view because certain things can only be understood in one’s first language. I always go by what I would do. If I’m sitting in Mongolia and there is another Austrian or a German sitting there and I do not have a clue what is going on and what the Mongolian-speaking guy is saying, I am really happy if someone explains that to me in German [...]and I tend to project this onto my students. [...]

7.4 Classroom experience

Themes	Codes	Participants
code-switching instances of students	convenience tiredness lack of knowledge lack of interest when unwatched talk with neighbour	Alice, Claire, Bill Diana Alice Diana Alice Alice, Bill
reaction	elicitation of TL translation	Alice, Bill, Claire
performance of mono- and multilingual students	comparison impossible	Claire, Diana

Table 17: Classroom experience

When it comes to instances of students' code-switching, the majority of teachers reduce these to convenience or laziness on the part of the learners. Alice, Claire and Bill believe that the learners mainly switch to German because it is easier for them and because they do not want to think. Certainly, this is a possible motive, but surely not the only one, as illustrated in Chapter 6. Other reasons that the participants came up with include tiredness, lack of interest and lack of knowledge. Moreover, Alice and Bill claim that their learners always speak in German when talking with their neighbours about non-content related affairs. However, not only off-topic issues were discussed in German, but also issues concerning a task or an activity. These estimations are consistent with the observational data described above. Apart from that, Alice experienced that students tend to use their L1 when they do not think they are being observed and Bill noticed that his learners speak in German when they are not told explicitly to use the target code. A strategy that is adopted by teachers to get the students to use the target language is to elicit an English translation. Alice, for example, acts if she cannot hear or pretends to not understand the students' language when she is sure that her learners are able to produce the intended meaning in English – if not they are allowed to speak in German and she helps with the translation.

Drawing a comparison between the performances of monolingual and multilingual students is impossible in the context of this study because the multilingual classes do not include a single monolingual person. According to both Claire and Diana, they hardly have any students at their schools whose first language is German only, which means that the vast majority of their student body has a multilingual background.

7.5 (Advanced) training

Themes	Codes	Participants
school days	English only English and German	Diana Alice, Bill, Claire
teacher training	English only multilingualism as non-issue need for awareness raising	Alice, Bill Claire, Diana Claire, Diana
curriculum	no idea rough idea L1 as resource	Bill, Diana Claire Alice
recent developments	rare pursuance participation in seminars	Bill, Diana Alice, Claire

Table 18: (Advanced) training

During their own school days, Alice's, Bill's and Claire's teachers seem to have applied the Grammar translation method, putting much emphasis on grammar and the translation of texts and sentences from English to German and vice versa. Moreover, the language of instruction was restricted to German while the target language was neglected. None of the teachers in this study teach according to the Grammar translation method though, so one can conclude that their former teachers did not have a strong influence on their beliefs about teaching and teaching practices. This also applies to Diana, as she was taught in English only, but does not adopt this approach in her own teaching.

When it comes to teacher training in the colleges of education (Pädagogische Hochschulen), it seems that lecturers preferred to speak in the target code only and so have conveyed the feeling that this is the only way to teach a language. Alice, for example, was told explicitly to reduce the medium of instruction to the target code and to teach her students to think in English – an instruction which is totally unreasonable, according to her. Diana did not even have any didactic courses in English because she had originally finished her degree for primary school teachers. Only later did she take some additional courses in English and Geography to be authorised to teach in new middle schools. One can again assume that the teacher training was not determinative of the participants' teaching values because both Alice and Bill are dubious about the English-only approach. Claire did not provide information on this question.

With regard to multilingualism in schools, lecturers at the colleges of education did not pay attention to this topic. Neither Claire nor Diana was prepared for teaching in multilingual environments or how to handle a linguistically diverse body of students and both of them would wish for prospective teachers to be better prepared in this respect. Diana, for instance,

expects much of prospective teachers and teacher education and says that “ich hoff dass das jetzt in der neuen lehrerausbildung eben auch ein großes thema ist [...] dass man auf das auch einen fokus legt. weil das ist die realität“⁸. She is convinced that multilingualism is an integral part of today’s schools and that teachers must be prepared to deal with multilingual classes. So it is the universities’ and colleges’ responsibility to train prospective teachers adequately and make them aware of these issues.

In order to detect whether the curriculum has an influence on teachers’ practices, the participants were asked about the anchorage of students’ first language and multilingualism. Bill and Diana did not know anything about the reference to L1 use in the curriculum while Claire had at least a rough idea. She is aware that it is mentioned as a criterion, but does not elaborate on it. Alice is the only participant who can contribute anything to the issue of L1 use in the foreign language classroom. She is of the opinion that teachers should always link to existing knowledge, which is also realised through the integration of students’ first language. In terms of multilingualism, the educational principle of intercultural learning is mentioned briefly by Diana, who reports that it should be applied in all subjects. However, she neither defines the principle nor does she specify what the principle entails. In conclusion, the curriculum and its guidelines do not seem to affect the participating teachers’ views on first language use and their way of teaching.

As the issues of first language use and multilingualism have enjoyed great popularity among researchers in applied linguistics for years, it would be interesting to learn whether teachers trace advancements in language teaching and learning. By their own account, Bill and Diana are not currently concerned with issues related to didactics and foreign language teaching, but focus on other areas. Alice and Claire, on the other hand, participate in seminars regularly. Additionally, Alice states that they have advanced training sessions in school within which certain colleagues cover developments in terms of foreign language teaching. The use of the first language has not yet been addressed, though. What one can conclude here is that seminars for teachers must take these issues into account provide information about developments in applied linguistics as well as the practical feasibility in the foreign language classroom. Moreover, teachers’ awareness must be raised so that they regard multilingualism or students’ first language(s) as assets and exploit their full potential during their English lessons.

⁸ Translation: I hope that the issue of multilingualism will be addressed in prospective teacher trainings because multilingual school settings are the reality.

7.6 Personal view

Themes	Codes	Participants
L1 as asset or hindrance	asset hindrance	Alice, Bill, Diana Claire
multilingual approach	difficult implementation no experience opportunity necessity	Alice, Bill Claire Alice, Bill Diana
different settings	multilingual is more difficult monolingual is different	Alice, Bill Claire, Diana
level of students	lower level more L1 lower level less L1 higher level more L1 higher level less L1	Alice, Bill Claire, Diana Claire, Diana Alice, Bill

Table 19: Personal view

More and more teachers seem to consider the students' first language as an asset, as proven by the responses of the majority of participants – Alice, Bill and Diana value the advantages of the L1 and make use of it in their lessons. Alice, for instance states that “die muttersprache ist immer ein vorteil⁹” because students have learnt this language for at least ten years and it enables communication at a different or higher level. Moreover, she and Bill regard it as a good alternative option to the target code when the intended meaning does not come across for various reasons. Both of them mean German as an L1 in this context. Diana is not only an advocate for the integration of German but also of other first languages. In her experience, when students have acquired a first language before coming to Austria they have fewer difficulties learning English because they know how language works. So she regards these various tongues as important resources to draw on when learning another language.

Claire tried to evade this question and does not provide a clear answer. Her response, however, suggests that her attitude towards L1 use is rather negative, as she states that „also ich bin eher eine die sagt wir sprechen wenn wir englisch haben nur englisch. also keine andere sprache. weder deutsch noch eine andere muttersprache¹⁰“. As justification she refers to the regulations within their school, which stipulate the use of English or German and ‘prohibit’ the use of other first languages. It is assumed, however, that her own attitude towards language teaching and learning is a crucial factor as well – if not the most important one.

⁹ Translation: A first language is always an asset.

¹⁰ Translation: I personally prefer using English only during the English lesson – no other languages. Neither German nor any other first languages.

When the participants were asked about the feasibility of integrating different first languages into the EFL classroom, the responses were rather diverse. As far as Alice and Bill are concerned, they expect a multilingual approach to be difficult to realise but at the same time see certain opportunities for incorporating other L1s. While Bill does not elaborate on these opportunities, Alice suggests restricting the first languages to very short sequences, for instance when comprehension problems arise. On the whole, however, they seem to be sceptical about a multilingual approach because they fear that teachers might lose control of the learners as they do not speak the various L1s and hence do not know what the students are talking about. Moreover, the effort on the side of the teachers is assumed to be very high, because language sometimes has to be paraphrased and simplified to a very low level which costs precious time. Although Claire is convinced that the students' cultures and backgrounds should be appreciated and integrated into the lessons, she refers to other subjects and not foreign language classes. During the English lesson, she insists on speaking English and – if necessary – German and is unfamiliar with multilingual approaches. Diana, who is multilingual herself, regards a multilingual approach as an absolute necessity and tries to take the students' first languages into account, allowing her students to switch to their L1s and talk to each other when they have comprehension problems or by having students read out stories in their languages. She also mentions that her school is going to set up a multilingual interdisciplinary project which fosters students' first languages. Not all of her colleagues back this project though and want the students to speak German only. Diana obviously sees multilingualism from a different angle – she regards it as a huge asset and emphasises the need to appreciate other languages and cultures. According to her, students and their cultural and linguistic background must be valued and teachers cannot just ignore the fact that the body of learners will become more and more diverse, but need to meet this challenge. Banning first languages from the classroom is the wrong way to proceed.

With respect to possible differences in teaching monolingual and multilingual classes, the teachers' responses were again quite diverse. While Alice and Bill, who teach monolingual classes, assume that teaching in multilingual settings would be more difficult, Diana, the teacher of multilingual classes, considers teaching multilingual classes to be different but not difficult and Claire sees no difference at all. So it seems that Claire and Diana have learnt how to handle multilingual students and do not regard teaching in that context as a burden. However, Diana is well aware that a monolingual setting entails certain advantages, among them the fact that one can take certain things for granted. In this context, she mentions that some of her students do not even know what a verb is in German, which slows down

communication and progress. According to Claire, everybody starts from scratch in foreign language classes so it makes no difference whether students have a common or different L1. Alice and Bill, who are not used to a heterogeneous body of pupils, imagine that teaching in multilingual settings would be challenging because of the many different first languages. They assume that the medium of instruction is reduced to English only and that the effort for teachers is very high as they cannot use German as an alternative in the same way as they do. Bill also doubts that monolingual and multilingual classes are comparable in terms of performance. Further research will be necessary to explore this assumption.

As far as the relationship between target language proficiency and code-switching is concerned, there seems to be disagreement among both scholars and among teachers. Whereas Sampson (2011: 296), for instance, claims that there is no link between these two variables, Mirza's findings (2012: 76) show the opposite. When the participants of the present study were asked to give their opinion on this issue, they too disagreed. Alice and Bill claimed that code-switching or L1 use is more common in lower level classes, because students lack the respective knowledge to rely on the target code exclusively. Claire and Diana, on the other hand, feel certain that code-switching plays a major role in higher level classes as the complexity of the subject matter is greater. In summary, it can be stated that there is no clear cut indication either way when it comes to the correlation between code-switching and students' proficiency.

8. Discussion

The aim of the present study was to analyse L1 use or code-switching occurrences in monolingual and multilingual classrooms and thereby provide new insights into foreign language teaching and learning. It was hoped to detect similarities and differences between the two settings and to learn about classroom practices and teachers' attitudes.

Regarding the functions of code-switching, the observational data did not show major differences between monolingual and multilingual classrooms. In both settings, switching to German mostly fulfils the same functions. For teachers these include 'to ensure comprehension', 'to render assistance', 'to give feedback', 'to talk about language', 'to fill a linguistic gap', 'to mention proper nouns', 'to attract attention', 'to discuss organisational matters' and 'use of filler words'. The students switch to German to fulfil the functions listed as: 'to ensure comprehension', 'to constitute a bridging structure', 'to give feedback', 'to provide an equivalent', 'to talk about language', 'to talk about a task', 'to discuss homework', 'to express emotions', 'to add humour', 'to talk about classroom discourse' and 'to attract attention'. However, it is assumed that these functions do not cover the whole range of code-switching instances that occur during foreign language lessons. More research and in particular a larger sample would be necessary to identify further functions. The fact that certain functions were found in either monolingual or multilingual classes is also assumed to be due to the restrictions of the study. Switching to German to talk about language, for example, was not found in multilingual classes, which does not, however, mean that it does not occur in these classes. On the contrary: both teachers C and D claim to switch to German when they talk about grammar. Thus, the fact that no instances of this function occurred probably results from the limitations of the research.

So although code-switching fulfils the same functions in both settings, differences in distribution across the different categories are evident. In teachers' discourse, switches to repeat something, to render assistance, to talk about language and to use fillers were made much more often than in multilingual classes. At the same time teachers in multilingual classes switched to German to provide an equivalent more frequently than their colleagues in monolingual classes. The same point can be made for students's switches. In monolingual environments the rate of switches to constitute a bridging, to give feedback and to talk about a task was markedly higher than in multilingual environments in which, however, switches to

provide an equivalent and to talk about classroom discourse were more important. For more detailed information on differences in distribution see Tables 9 and 10.

As far as code-switching in absolute numbers is concerned, teachers of monolingual classes shift to German more often than their colleagues who teach multilingual classes. It is assumed that the shared L1 between students and teachers is the prime motive in this context, because it allows for a shared alternative to the target code. At the same time, most switches in multilingual classes were made by only one teacher, which is why the result may be biased. The other teacher, Claire, follows an English-only approach and keeps the use of German to a minimum. Moreover, the two settings differ in terms of content-related and non-content related speech. Teachers in multilingual classes switch to German more often for non-content-related rather than for content-related purposes, meaning that their use of German was very high (92 per cent) when talking about off-topic affairs. In monolingual classes both content-related and non-content related words in German only accounted for about 20 per cent.

As for Claire, the teacher of multilingual classes who tries to avoid code-switching to German, paraphrasing to convey meaning and to clarify messages plays a major role. The following example illustrates this point: when she wants to elicit the English word ‘puppy’ from the students she does not use the German word ‘Welpen’ but paraphrases and asks the students to tell her what a young dog is called. The observational data revealed several of these incidents during her lesson, whereas no paraphrasing occurred in the classes of the other three teachers who rely more on code-switching to support communication.

Regarding the number of students’ switches, students of monolingual and multilingual classes produced almost the same number of switches irrespective of their first language(s) and the teachers’ approach. Therefore, the assumption that the issue of English as a lingua franca, addressed in Chapter 2, is relevant especially in connection with multilingualism and multilingual classroom practices, turned out to be wrong, because learners in multilingual settings do not seem to use communication strategies differently, meaning that they neither rely more on paraphrasing nor do they code-switch less than their colleagues in monolingual settings.

With regard to switching for content and non-content-related purposes, both settings show very similar results. In both classes the vast majority of content-related language was produced in English. Non-content-related speech, on the other hand, was mostly expressed in German.

The interview data did not reveal any difference between the two settings either, meaning that no distinct boundary can be drawn between the responses of teachers of monolingual and multilingual classes. The attitude towards code-switching and L1 use is very positive in general, and the majority of teachers tolerate and employ German as the medium of instruction during their English lessons. Therefore, it can be claimed that the negative image of the first language in the foreign language classroom is no longer firmly anchored in the people's minds – rather, the L1 is regarded and used as a resource and alternative to the target code more and more frequently, which is also reflected in the fact that all participants were able to mention various incidents and functions of code-switching. This again implies that they code-switch consciously in certain situations. Moreover, the assertion that teachers often feel guilty “for straying from the [TL] path” (Cook 2001: 405) when switching to the L1 cannot be supported by the research.

The responses of one participant differed from the majority in the sense that she reduces the medium of instruction to English only, or at least, intends to do so. One could conclude that an English-only approach is more common in multilingual settings because of the variety of first languages present in the classroom. However, in order to support this assumption, more research would be necessary.

The teachers mentioned a variety of examples of students' code-switching, which implies that they consciously notice when their learners shift to German. Mostly, they tolerate this switching, but when they are sure that their learners are able to produce the intended meaning in English, they draw their attention to the target code and try to elicit a translation. The tolerance of first languages other than German, however, is only given in one of the two multilingual classes. Certain regulations within the school which stipulate the use of English or German and ‘prohibit’ the use of other L1s are said to be one of the main reasons for this intolerance.

Neither the teachers' own language learning experiences nor their teacher training seem to have an impact on teachers' classroom practices and their attitude towards L1 use. The same applies to the guidelines set out in the curriculum, as only one teacher was aware of the anchorage of the first language.

Although the participants generally regard the students' L1 as an asset, some of the teachers consider the integration of first languages other than German to be very difficult and are not aware of the possibilities and potential of a multilingual approach. Moreover, they fear that

they might lose control of the learners if they do not speak their L1s. The main problem here is that teachers are unfamiliar with a multilingual approach and hence do not know how to put it into practice. So it is the universities' and colleges' responsibility to train prospective teachers adequately and make them aware of these issues. Gearon (2009: 210) also claims that "[t]he preparation of language teachers can no longer include just linguistic knowledge, theories of SLA and pedagogical practices that assume a homogenous grouping of students [...]". Seminars for teachers must take these issues into account too and inform them about developments in applied linguistics as well as their practical feasibility in the foreign language classroom. In chapter 2.1.4 different ideas of what a multilingual approach can consist of are presented.

As far as the correlation between code-switching and students' foreign language proficiency is concerned, there seems to be disagreement among scholars and among teachers. Some claim that there is no link between these variables and that students code-switch at any level, whereas others assert that switching is more common at lower levels.

As mentioned above, further research and a larger sample would be necessary in order to enable a generalisation across different EFL settings. The data gathered in the course of thesis only suggest possible tendencies, which would require additional investigation. Further research is also needed because of the changes that society at large and the educational system will face in the next few years. More and more people, among them many children and adolescents, with various cultural and linguistic backgrounds will migrate to Austria and attend local schools, so the number of students who have no knowledge of German will increase. In this context, the question arises whether teachers in multilingual settings will adopt a monolingual instruction strategy or come to follow a multilingual approach. Both scenarios would lead to different results from those obtained in the present study and would differentiate monolingual and multilingual settings in terms of language use.

9. Conclusion

The phenomenon of code-switching or first language use in the foreign language classroom has received considerable attention over the past decades and has provoked discussion among proponents and opponents. While advocates stress the advantages of the L1, opponents emphasise its negative effect on the development of the target code (Jingxia 2010: 10). Nowadays, however, the attitude towards this issue seems to be rather positive, as proven by both the observational and the interview data.

As far as the functions of code-switching for teachers and students are concerned, monolingual and multilingual classes show similar results. In both settings, switching to German fulfilled broadly the same functions. However, differences in distribution across the different functions were found. With regard to frequencies, more switches were made by teachers of monolingual than of multilingual classes. It is assumed that this is due to having the same first language, because it allows for an alternative to the target code and one which is spoken by all participants. Finally, the students produced the same number of switches in both settings.

The majority of the teachers use both English and German as the medium of instruction during their lessons and have a positive attitude towards L1 use, so the negative view held for many years is no longer so prevalent among teachers. When it comes to the integration of other first languages, teachers – except for one participant – are still sceptical because they are unfamiliar with multilingual approaches. Therefore, it is the responsibility of universities, colleges and the ministries of education to address this issue and inform (prospective) teachers on developments in applied linguistics as well as their practical applicability in the foreign language classroom. Moreover, teachers' awareness must be raised in the sense that they learn to regard multilingualism or students' first language(s) as assets and exploit their full potential during the English lessons.

Language policies, such as the curriculum, do not tend to influence teachers' practices, as the majority do not even know about the reference to the first language in the curriculum. Neither teachers' own language learning experiences nor their teacher training seem to affect their teaching and their attitude towards L1 use, or only in the reverse case, meaning that their way of teaching is the opposite of their former teacher's practice.

In conclusion, the students' first language is an important asset and is regarded as such by the majority of teachers in both monolingual and multilingual settings. The realisation of a more multilingual approach must be expedited though. Just as claimed by Coelho (2012: 194) "[w]hile it is essential that all students become proficient in the language of the school, students' own languages also have a role to play in schooling." Code-switching in general is "a normal feature [...] when the participants share two languages" (Cook 2001: 418), so there is a strong need to tolerate L1 use in the EFL classroom as a resource and support system for both teachers and students.

10. Bibliography

- Asher, J. J. 1969. "The Total Physical Response Approach to Second Language Learning". *Modern Language Journal* 53, 3-17.
- Amorin, R. 2012. "Code switching in student-student interaction: functions and reasons". *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Univerdade do Porto* 7, 177 - 195
- Annamalai, E. 1989. "The language factor in code mixing". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 75, 47-54.
- Anton, M. and Dicamilla, F. 1999. "Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom". *The Modern Language Journal* 83(2), 233-247.
- Anthony, E. M. 1963. "Approach, method and technique". *ELT Journal* 17, 63-67.
- Atkinson, D. 1987. "The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource?". *ELT Journal* 41(4), 241-247.
- Atkinson, D. 1993. *Teaching Monolingual Classes*. Harlow: Longman Group.
- Auer, P. 1995. "The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach". In Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 115-135.
- Auerbach, E. 1993. "Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom". *TESOL Quarterly* 27(1), 9-32.
- Baker, C and Jones, S. 1998. *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. 2006. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. (4th edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bell, R. T. 1981. *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd.
- Berlitz Austria GmbH. 2013. *The Berlitz Method*. http://www.berlitz.at/en/berlitz_company/quality_management/berlitz_method/ (10 April 2015)
- Bhatia, T. and Ritchie W. 2013. *Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. (2nd edition). Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bhooth, A., Azman, H. and Ismail, K. 2014. "The role of the L1 as a scaffolding tool in the EFL reading classroom". *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences* 118, 76-84.
- Blair, A. and Catwallader, J. 1993. "Using Total Physical Response With Younger Learners". *Encuentro* 6, 34-39.
- Blom, J-P. and Gumperz, J.J. 1972. "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code Switching in Norway". In Gumperz J.J. (ed.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 407-435.
- Bloomfield. 1933. *Language*. New York NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- BMBF 2012: *Lehrplan der Neuen Mittelschule*. https://www.bmbf.gv.at/schulen/recht/erk/bgbla_2012_ii_185_anl1_22513.pdf?4dzi3h (25 April 2015)

- Braine, G. 2006. "A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers". In. Llurda, E. (ed.), *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*, 13-25. New York: Springer.
- Brown, H. D. 1977. "Some Limitations of C-L/CLL Models of Second Language Teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 11(4), 365-372.
- Brown, H. D. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (4th edition). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd edition). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Butzkamm, W. 2003. "We only learn language once: The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma". *Language Learning Journal* 28, 29-39.
- Butzkamm, W. and Caldwell, J.A.W. 2009. *The Bilingual Reform: A Paradigm Shift in Foreign Language Teaching*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Byrne, D. 1980. *English Teaching Perspectives*. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Ltd.
- Cameron, D. 2001. *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage.
- Carless, D. 2008. "Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom". *ELT Journal* 62(4), 331-338.
- Cattell, A. G. 2009. *Re-evaluating Communicative Language Teaching: Wittgenstein and Postmethod Pedagogy*. M.A. Thesis. Waterloo, Canada.
- Celce-Murcia, M. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (3rd edition). Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cenoz, J. 2009. *Towards Multilingual Education: Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cheng, X. 2013. "Research on Chinese College English Teachers' Classroom Code-switching: Beliefs and Attitudes". *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 4(6), 1277-1284.
- Clyne, M. G. 1991. *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coelho, E. 2012. *Language and Learning in Multilingual Classrooms: A Practical Approach*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cogo, A. and Dewey, M. 2006. "Efficiency in ELF Communication: From Pragmatic Motives to Lexico-grammatical Innovation". *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 5(2), 59-93.
- Cogo, A. 2012. "English as a Lingua Franca: concepts, use, and implications". *ELT Journal* 66(1), 97-105.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morris K. 2001. (5th edition). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, V. 1999. "Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 33(2), 185-209.
- Cook, V. 2001. "Using the First Language in the Classroom". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(3). 402-423.

- Cook, V. 2006. "Basing Teaching on the L2 User". In Llurda, E. (ed.). *Non-Native Language Teachers. Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. New York: Springer. 47-61.
- Cook, V. 2008. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. (4th edition). London: Hodder Education.
- Cook, V. and Singleton, D. 2014. *Key Topics in Second Language Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Copland, F. and Neokleous, G. 2011. "L1 to teach L2: complexities and contradictions". *ELT Journal* 65(3), 270-280.
- Council of Europe. 2001: *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf (25 April 2015)
- Cowie, N. 2009. "Observation". In Heigham, J. and Croker, R.A. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics. A Practical Introduction*. Basingstoke [u.a.]: Palgrave Macmillan, 165-181.
- Croker, R. A. 2009. "An Introduction to Qualitative Research". In Heigham, J. and Croker, R. A. (eds.). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics. A Practical Introduction*. Basingstoke [u.a.]: Palgrave Macmillan, 3-24.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge
- Crystal, D. 1997. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. 2010. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. (3rd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curran, C.A. 1972. *Counseling-Learning. A Whole-Person Model for Education*. New York: Grune and Stratton.
- Davies, A. 2003. *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Diller, K. C. 1978. *The Language Teaching Controversy*. (3rd edition). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Dörnyei Z. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Duff, P. and Polio, Ch. 1990. "How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom?". *The Modern Language Journal* 74(2), 154-166.
- Edwards, J. 2010: *Language Diversity in the Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Eldridge, J. 1996. "Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school". *ELT Journal* 50(4), 303-311.
- Ellis, R. 1985. *Understanding SLA*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 2005. "Principles of instructed language learning". *System* 33, 209-224.
- Ellis, R. and Barkhuizen, G. P. 2005. *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, E. 2006. "Monolingualism: The unmarked case". *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 7(2), 173-196.
- Ellis, R. and Shintani, N. 2014. *Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Routledge.

- Firth, A. 1996 "The discursive accomplishment of normality: on lingua franca English and conversation analysis". *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 237-259.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A. and Burenhult, N. 1999. "Code-switching in Second Language Teaching of French". *Working Papers* 47, 59-72.
- Garcia, O. and Sylvan, C. 2011. "Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities". *The Modern Language Journal* 95, 385-400.
- Gattegno, C. 1972. *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: The Silent Way*. (2nd edition). New York: Educational Solutions.
- Gattegno, C. 1983. "The Silent Way". In Oller, J. W. and Richard-Amato, P. A. (eds.). *Methods That Work: a Smorgasbord of Ideas for Language Teachers*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers. 72-88.
- Gearon, M. 2009. "Educating Languages Teachers for Multilingual and Multicultural Settings". In: Miller, J., Kostogriz, A. and Gearon, M. (eds.). *Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms: New Dilemmas for Teachers*. 196-214.
- Gold, R. 1958. "Roles in Sociological Field Observations". *Social Forces* 36(3), 217-223.
- Greggio, S. and Gil, G. 2007. "Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: a qualitative study". *Linguagem & Ensino* 10(2), 371-393.
- Gulzar, M. A. 2010. "Code-switching: Awareness about Its Utility in Bilingual Classrooms". *Bulletin of Education and Research* 32(2), 23-44.
- Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gyi, K. K. 1994. "Teaching English as a Second Language: The Silent Way". *ABAC Journal* 14(3), 39-46.
- Hall, G. 2011. *Exploring English Language Teaching: Language In Action*. London: Routledge.
- Harbord, J. 1992. "The use of the mother tongue in the classroom". *ELT Journal* 46(4), 350-355.
- Haugen, E. 1953. *The Norwegian Language in America: A study in Bilingual Behaviour*. Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Haugen, E. 1959. "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing". *Linguistic Society of America* 26(2), 210-231.
- Hawkins, E.W. 1987. *Modern Languages in the Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman, Ch. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman.
- Horasan, S. 2014. "Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers". *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 31-45.
- House, J. 1999. "Misunderstandings in intercultural communication: interactions in English as a lingua franca and the myth of mutual intelligibility". In Gnutzmann, C. (ed.). *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language*, 73-89. Tübingen: Narr.
- Huda, M. 2013. "Post-Method Pedagogy and ELT in Bangladesh". *Global Journal of Human Social Science, Linguistics and Education* 13(7), 6-14.

- Hughes, C. E., Shaunessy, E. S., Brice, A. R., Ratliff, M. A., Alvarez McHatton, P. 2006. "Code Switching Among Bilingual and Limited English Proficient Students: Possible Indicators of Giftedness". *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 30(1), 7–28.
- Hung, N. V. 2012. "Mother Tongue Use in Task-Based Language Teaching Model". *English Language Teaching* 5(8), 23-30.
- Ibrahim, E., Shah, M. and Armia N. 2013. "Code-switching in English as a Foreign Language Classroom. Teachers' Attitudes". *English Language Teaching* 6(7), 139-150.
- Jenkins, J. 2006. "Current Perspectives on Teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca". *TESOL Quarterly* 40(1), 157-181.
- Jenkins, J. 2009. "English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes". *World Englishes* 28(2), 200-207.
- Jingxia, L. 2010. "Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom". *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 3, 10-23.
- Juarez, C. and Oxbrow, G. 2007. "L1 in the ELF classroom: more a help than a hindrance?". *Porta Linguarum* 9, 93-109.
- Kachru, B. 1983. *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. (1992). "Mixers and Mixing: English Across Cultures". *World Englishes* Vol. 11, 173-181.
- Kemp, Ch. 2009. "Defining multilingualism". In Aronin, L. and Hufeisen, B. (eds.). *The exploration of multilingualism*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 11-27.
- King, R. 2000. *The Lexical Basis of Grammatical Borrowing: A Prince Edward Island French Case Study*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kitao S.T. and Kitao K. 1999. *Fundamentals of English Language Teaching*. Tokyo: Eichosha.
- Krashen, S. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. and Terrell, T. 1983. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kravchenko, A. 2010. "Native speakers, mother tongues and other objects of wonder". *Language Sciences* 32, 677-685.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 1990. "Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy". *TESOL Quarterly* 35 (4), 537-560.
- La Forge, P. 1971. "Community Language Learning: A Pilot Study". *Language Learning* 21(1), 45-61.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. (2nd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, W. 1968. "Thoughts on contrastive linguistics in the context of language teaching". In Alatis, J. (ed.). *Contrastive Linguistics and its Pedagogical Implications*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 185-194.

- Levine, G. 2011. *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Lin, A. and Li, D. 2012. "Codeswitching". In Martin-Jones, M., Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.
- Lin, A. 2013. "Classroom code-switching: three decades of research". *Applied Linguistics Review* 4(1), 195-218.
- Littlewood, W. and Yu, B. 2011. "First language and target language in the foreign language classroom". *Language Teaching* 44(1), 64-77.
- Love, A. and Ansaldo, U. 2010. "The native speaker and the mother tongue". *Language Sciences* 32, 589-593.
- Llurda, E. 2004. "Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 14(3), 314-323.
- Ma, J. 2014. "Students' Attitudes towards Code-switching in the Bilingual Classroom of Accounting English". *Journal of Education and Practice* 5(20), 177-188.
- Macaro, E. 1997. *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mackey, W. F. 1962. "The description of bilingualism". *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 7: 51-85.
- MacKenzie, I. 2014. *English as a lingua franca: theorizing and teaching English*. London: Routledge.
- Madonsela, S. 2014. "Monolingualism When Practised in a Multilingual Classroom Can Become a Source of Stress to Learners". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(9), 627-631.
- Medgyes, P. 1992. "Native or non-native: who's worth more". *ELT Journal* 46(4), 340-349.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 2015. Monolingual.
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/monolingual> (15 March 2015)
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi J. O. and Bunyi, G. "Socialising Multilingualism. Determinants of Codeswitching in Kenyan Primary Classrooms". In Estman, C. M. (ed.). *Codeswitching*. Clevedon [u.a.]: Multilingual Matters, 103-122.
- Mesthrie, R. 2010. "New Englishes and the native speaker debate". *Language Sciences* 32, 594-601.
- Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. 1995. "Introduction: code-switching and bilingualism research". In Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.1-15.
- Mirza, G.H., Mahmud, K. and Jabbar, J. 2012. "Use of Other Languages in English Language Teaching at Tertiary Level: A Case Study on Bangladesh". *English Language Teaching* 5(9), 71-77.
- Molina, G.T, Perez Canado, M.L. and Luque Agullo G. 2005. "Current Approaches and Teaching Methods. Bilingual Programmes". In Mc.Laren, N., Madrid, D. and Bueno, A. (eds.) *TEFL in Secondary Education*. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- Momenian, M. and Samar, R. G. 2011. "Functions of code-switching among Iranian advanced and elementary teachers and students". *Educational Research and Reviews* 6(13), 769-777.

- Muller, A. and Beardsmore, B. 2004. "Multilingual Interaction in Plurilingual Classes – European School Practice". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7(1), 24-42.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-switching*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newby, D., Allan, R., Fenner, A.-B., Jones, B., Komorowska, H. and Soghikyan, K. 2007. *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages: A reflection tool for language teacher education*. http://archive.ecml.at/mtp2/ft/pdf/C3_Epostl_E.pdf (25 April 2015)
- Nunan, D. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum. *Bildungsstandards für Fremdsprachen (Englisch), 8. Schulstufe. Praxishandbuch* (Neuaufgabe 2009). ÖSZ Praxisreihe 4. Wolfgang Moser (ed). Graz: ÖSZ.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poudel, P. 2010. "Teaching English in Multilingual Classrooms of Higher Education: The Present Scenario". *Journal of NELTA* 15(1-2), 121-133.
- Poplack, S. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: toward a typology of code-switching". *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.
- Poplack, S. and Meechan, M. 1995. "Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse". In Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 199-233.
- Prabhu, N. S. 1990. "There Is No Best Method – Why?". *TESOL Quarterly* 24(2), 161-176.
- Rabidge, M. and Chappell P. 2014. "Exploring Non-native English Speaker Teachers' Classroom Language Use in South Korean Elementary Schools". *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language* 17(4), 1-18.
- Redouane, R. 2005. "Linguistic Constraints on Codeswitching and Codemixing of Bilingual Moroccan Arabic-French Speakers in Canada". In Cohen J., McAlister, K. T., Rolstad, K. and MacSwan, J. (eds.). *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Press. 1921-1933.
- Richards, J. C. and Rogers T. S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. 2006. *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, K. 2009. "Interviews". In Heigham, J. and Croker, R.A. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics. A Practical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 182-199.
- Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. 2010. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (4th edition). Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.
- Rivers, W. 1981. *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. (2nd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sampson, A. 2012. "Learner code-switching vs. English only". *ELT Journal* 66(3), 293-303.

- Saville-Troike, M. 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schachter, J. and Gass, S. (eds.). 1996. *Second Language Classroom Research. Issues and Opportunities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schimek, F. 2004. *Europäisches Sprachenportfolio für die mitteleuropäische Region*. Wien: Cernet Zentrum.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2004. "Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 209-239.
- Silverman, D. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods for Analyzing Text, Talk and Interaction*. (3rd edition). London: Sage.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1988. "Multilingualism and the education of minority children". In Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and Cummins J. (eds.). *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. 9-45
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and Phillipson, R. 1989. "Mother tongue: The Theoretical and Sociopolitical Construction of a Concept". In Ammon, U. (ed.). *Status and Function of Languages and Language Varieties*. 450,478.
- Smit, U. 2010. *English as a lingua franca in higher education: A longitudinal study of classroom discourse*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Stadler, H. 2005. „Physikunterricht am Anfang der Oberstufe – Analysen und ein Neubeginn: Innovation am Gymnasium der Kreuzschwestern in Linz“. In Krainer, K., Dörfler, W., Jungwirth, H., Kühnelt, H., Rauch, F. and Stern, T. (eds.). *Lernen im Aufbruch: Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften: Pilotprojekt*. Wien: Studien-Verlag.
- Statistik Austria. 2015. Registerzählung 2011: Gemeindetabelle Wien. http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bevoelkerung/volk_szaehlungen_registerzaehlungen_abgestimmte_erwerbsstatistik/index.html (12 July 2015)
- Tariq, A. R., Bilal, H. A. and Abbas, N. 2013. "Functions of Code-switching in Bilingual Classrooms". *Golden Research Thoughts* 3.
- Terrell, T. 1977. "A Natural Approach to Second Language Acquisition". *Modern Language Journal* 61, 325-337.
- Thakur, S., Dutta, K. and Thakur, A. 2007. "Hinglish: code switching, code mixing and indigenization in multilingual environment". In Davis, G. and Bernhardt, K. (eds.). *Lingua et Linguistica 1.2*. Lulu Enterprises. 109-121.
- Thornbury, S. 2006. *An A-Z of ELT*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Turnbull, M. 2001. "There is a Role for the L1 in Second and Foreign Language Teaching, But ... ". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(4), 531-540.
- Turnbull, M. and Arnett, K. 2002. "Teachers' Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, 204-218.
- UNESCO. 1953. *The use of the vernacular languages in education*. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000028/002897eb.pdf> (12 April 2015)
- Üstünel, E. and Seedhouse, P. 2005. "Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15(3), 302-325.

- Valdès, G., Brooks, H. and Chàvez, C. 2003. "Bilinguals and Bilingualism. In Valdès, G. (ed.) *Expanding Definitions of Giftedness. The Case of Young Interpreters from Immigrant Communities*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Van der Walt, Ch. 2009. "The functions of code switching in English language learning classes". *Per Linguam* 25(1), 30-43.
- Van Els, T., Bongaerts, T., Extra, G., van Os, Ch. and Janssen-van Dieten, A.M. 1984. *Applied Linguistics and the Learning and Teaching of Foreign Languages*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- VOICE. 2007. *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English*. (version 2.1 online). <http://voice.univie.ac.at> (29 June 2015)
- Walwadkar, S. B. 2013. *Code Mixing and Code Switching in Indian English Speech: an ICE (International Corpus of English) study*. Dissertation. Shivaji University, Kolhapur.
- Weinreich, U. 1968. *Languages in Contact*. The Hauge: Mouton.
- Widdowson, H. G. 2003. *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widodo, H. P. 2005. "Teaching Children Using a Total Physical Response (TPR) Method: Rethinking". *BAHASA DAN SENI* 33(2), 235-248.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. 1985. "When does teacher talk work as input?". In Gass, S. M. and Madden C. G. (eds.). *Input In Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers. 17-51.
- Younas, M., Arshad, S., Akram, K., Faisal, M., Akhtar, M., Sarfraz, K. and Umar, A. 2014. "Code Switching and Code Mixing: A Case of EFL Teachers Affecting L2 Learners' Learning". *Language in India* 14(6), 516-530.

Appendix

1. Interview questions

The following questions were directed to all teachers. However, the ones written in italics were only relevant in multilingual settings. The interview questions are based on studies carried out by Poudel (2010) and Duff and Polio (1990).

Personal information

- Male/female
- Which languages do you speak?
- Do you feel proficient in those languages?
- For how many years have you been practising the teaching profession?

Classroom practice and experience

- *How many different languages are spoken by your students?*
- *Are all of your students proficient in German? Does their knowledge of German have an impact on your English lesson?*
- Which language(s) do you use as the medium of instruction? How do you justify your practice?
- How much English do you speak during a lesson (in percent)?
- In which contexts do you code-switch?
- Does your classroom practice differ from other colleagues?
- *Do you tolerate or even promote the use of other languages than German during your lesson?*
- In which contexts do your students use or switch to their first languages?
- What functions does code-switching fulfil?
- *Do multilingual students perform differently compared to students who speak only German as a first language?*
- How did you experience language learning at school?
- Was first language use an issue during your teacher training?
- *Were you prepared for teaching multilingual classes during your teacher training? Do you think more importance should be attached to this issue?*
- Do you know how the use of students' first languages or multilingualism are anchored in the curriculum?
- Do you pursue current issues in second language learning and teaching?

Personal view

- Do you regard the use of students' L1 as an asset or a hindrance to foreign language learning?
- *Could you imagine adopting a more multilingual approach?*
- Do you think that there is a huge difference in teaching monolingual and multilingual classes?
- Do you think code switching is only a phenomenon of lower proficiency levels?
- Is there anything you would like to add in this context?

German Version:

Informationen zur Person

- Weiblich/männlich
- Wie viele Sprachen sprechen Sie?
- Wie schätzen Sie Ihre Englischkenntnisse ein?
- Wie lange unterrichten Sie schon?

Vorgehensweisen und Erfahrungen im Klassenzimmer

- Wie viele verschiedene Sprachen werden von Ihren SchülerInnen gesprochen?
- *Wie stufen Sie die Deutschkenntnisse Ihrer SchülerInnen ein? Sind deren Deutschkenntnisse relevant für Ihren Englischunterricht?*
- Welche Sprachen(n) verwenden Sie im Englischunterricht?
- Wie viel Englisch sprechen Sie durchschnittlich pro Stunde?
- In welchen Situationen switchen Sie ins Deutsche?
- Wissen Sie wie Ihre KollegInnen diesbezüglich vorgehen?
- *Tolerieren bzw. fördern Sie die Verwendung andere Muttersprachen im Englischunterricht?*
- In welchen Situationen switchen Ihre SchülerInnen auf ihre Muttersprache(n)?
- Wie reagieren Sie, wenn Ihre SchülerInnen in ihrer(n) Muttersprachen(n) sprechen?
- *Unterscheiden sich SchülerInnen mit nicht Deutsch als Muttersprache von jenen mit Deutsch als Muttersprache leistungsmäßig?*
- Wie haben Sie den Englischunterricht während Ihrer Schulzeit erlebt? War die Verwendung von Deutsch ein Thema?
- Ist die Verwendung der Muttersprache im Englischunterricht während Ihrer LehrerInnenausbildung thematisiert worden?
- *Sind Sie darauf vorbereitet worden, dass Sie hauptsächlich multilinguale Klassen unterrichten werden? Glauben Sie, dass darauf mehr Wert gelegt werden sollte?*
- Wissen Sie, wie die Verwendung der Muttersprache *und Mehrsprachigkeit* im Lehrplan verankert sind?
- Verfolgen Sie Trends und Entwicklungen im Bereich Fachdidaktik und Fremdsprachenunterricht?

Persönliche Meinung

- Sehen Sie die Verwendung der Muttersprache im Englischunterricht prinzipiell als Vorteil oder Nachteil?
- Glauben Sie, dass die Integration andere Muttersprachen im Englischunterricht umsetzbar ist?
- Glauben Sie, dass es Unterschiede gibt, was den Englischunterricht in monolingualen und multilingualen Klassen betrifft?
- Glauben Sie, dass code-switching in einer ersten oder zweiten Klasse eher eine Rolle spielt als in einer dritten oder vierten Klasse?
- Haben Sie noch irgendwelche Fragen oder Anmerkungen?

2. Transcription Conventions

The classroom observations were transcribed according to the VOICE (2007) transcription conventions.

abc	only alphabetic roman characters are used
english	no capital letters are used
british spelling	British English spelling is used
<L1de oesterreich </L1de>	no umlauts are used
missis	titles and terms of address are fully spelled out
i'm	all standard contractions are rendered
erm	discourse markers are represented in orthography
S1, S2	speakers are generally numbered in the order they first speak
SS	utterances assigned to more than one speaker
SX	utterances that cannot be assigned to a particular speaker
EMphasis	if a speaker gives a syllable, word or phrase particular prominence, this is written in capital letters
(.)	brief pause
(2)	longer pauses are timed and marked with the number of seconds in parentheses
S1: <1> case </1> S2: <1> yeah </1>	whenever two or more utterances happen at the same time, the overlaps are marked with numbered tags:
mo:re	lengthened sounds are marked with a colon “:”
participa-	a hyphen marks where a part of the word is missing
@	all laughter and laughter-like sounds are transcribed with the @ symbol
<L1de> haus </L1de>	utterances in a participant's first language (L1) are put between tags indicating the speaker's L1
<LQit> haus </LQit>	non-English utterances where it cannot be ascertained whether the language is the speaker's first language
<nods>	nonverbal feedback is transcribed as part of the running text and put between pointed brackets < >
[first name] [last name]	names of people are replaced by aliases and these aliases are put into square brackets []
{S1 enters room}	Contextual information is added between curly brackets { } only if it is relevant to the understanding
<un> xxx </un>	Unintelligible speech is represented by x's and placed between <un> </un> tags.

The interview data was transcribed according to the conventions by Stadler (2002: 204), because the interviews were carried out in German.

deutsch	no capital letters are used
österreich	umlauts are used
(.)	short pause (1 second)
(x)	pause of x seconds
MUSS	if a speaker gives a syllable, word or phrase particular prominence, this is written in capital letters
[hallo] [hey]	whenever two or more utterances happen at the same time, the overlaps are marked with square brackets []
<lacht>	nonverbal actions are put between pointed brackets < >
A	interviewer
B	interviewee

3. Classroom observations

Class A
6 May 2015

T: good morning class.

SS: good morning teacher.

T: <L1de> **so. hom olle die unterschritten obgeben? wer sie heite nit hot muss zur frau [last name] in die nebenklasse gehen.** <L1de>

S1: <L1de> **i hob se vergessn oba i konn di mama frogn ob sie dos schnoe unterschreibt** <L1de>

T: <L1de> **jo donn frog sie schnoe.** <L1de> okay. let's start. can we move the board up a little bit because I am not as tall as you are.

SS: @@@@

O: of course, no problem.

T: why are you laughing? what did i say to sabrina? (4) who can help me? (3) why were you laughing then? you don't know why?

S2: <L1de> **doss se englisch und geographie studiert** <L1de>

T: <L1de> **jo, oba warum hobts jetzt glocht?** <L1de> why did you laugh? what was so funny? (4) what did i say to miss koch? (3) what did we talk about we talked about the (3)

S2: erm, erm

T: what is this in english? {T points at blackboard}

SS: board.

T: yes we talked about the board. what did we say about the board? what did i tell miss Koch?

S2: <L1de> **doss sie nit so groß sind wie sie** <L1de>

T: yes super. that i'm not as tall as miss koch and i need the board so she put it down. okay? so now i want to know (3) what rules do we have at school? S3 can you remember one rule that we have what we must do or what we must not do at school. can you remember? it is a long time that misses [last name] talked about it. (.) what are the rules in our school? S3.

S4: erm (.) we must (.) erm (.) put the <L1de> **handy** <L1de>

T: the mobile

S4: the mobile out

T: yes we must switch the mobile off. switch off. can you remember i think misses [last name] wrote it on the board. switch off (3) switch off the mobile okay what else do we have to do or must we do or we mustn't do?

S2: we must learn.

T: we must learn or we must study yes. what else? (.) shut your books.

S4: we mustn't forgot the homework.

T: we mustn't (2)

S2: forget

T: forget the homework. S6 what can you remember? shut your books. (3) S3?

S3: we must do what the teacher say

T: oh yes we must do what the teacher says.

S5: we must clean the board.

T: we must clean the board. okay. what about shoes? are you (2) what about your shoes? (3) <L1de> **wie sogt man dos wir duerfen keine schuhe in der klasse haben? (3) was heißt denn schuhe tragen?** <L1de>

S6: we mustn't wear shoes in the class.

T: super. we mustn't wear shoes in the class. S8 what must we wear in the class?

S7: we must wear (.) house shoes.

T: slippers or house shoes yes. ok. slippers i would say. slippers. yes. we must wear slippers in the classroom.

S2: we mustn't (.) we mustn't run in the **aula** <L1de>

T: in the corridors or in the (.)

SX: in the classroom

T: we mustn't run.

S8: we must clean the board.
T: what about the window ceiling? what mustn't you do?
S2: we mustn't sit on the (2) window.
T: window ceiling. yes. we mustn't sit.
S9: we must raise our hands.
T: we must raise our hands to answer or to tell or to talk to the teacher yes. okay. S3 what about you?
can you tell me one thing what we must do in class or what we mustn't do?
S10: we mustn't (11)
T: what's that? {T hits S6}
S11: we mustn't hit
T: hit yes our classmates. or we mustn't (2) what is another word for hit?
SX: <L1de> **i waß es.** <L1de>
T: what is <L1de> **kaempfen** <L1de> ?
S6: ring
T: mmm no. fight. we mustn't fight.
S12. <L1de> **ajo genau.** <L1de>
T: we mustn't fight in (.) in our classroom okay. or we mustn't hit our neighbour.
S6: we mustn't run in the school.
S2: we must to do what the teacher say.
T: we must do what the teacher says okay.
S13: we mustn't chit with (.)
T: we mustn't chat with our?
S13: neighbour.
T: we mustn't chat with our neighbour. super. one more. (2) does anybody know anything else? S12 i
didn't hear a thing of you today? are you still sleeping?
S12: <shakes his head>
T: No? Can you think of another rule? (2) what about the desks? what are you not allowed to do on
our desks? (8) <T climbs on to the desk> what is <L1de> **auf bauume klettern** <L1de> ?
S12: climb on <L1de> **waß i nit** <L1de>
T: to climb trees or in the class we mustn't climb (2)
S12: desks
T: climb desks. or we mustn't stand on the (.) the desks or on the chair. so and now we go to the rules
at home. what rules do you have at home? (2) can you tell me? what about you S15? what must or
mustn't you do at home? (2) can you tell me one rule?
S13: we mustn't (2) not
SS: @@@@
T: so who can tell me if S13 can't think.
S13: we mustn't
T: shhhhh. (3) S3 what about you?
S3: I must do the washing-up.
T: must do the washing up. okay. must do the washing up.
S2: we must to do (.) erm (.) i must to put the rubbish out.
T: i must put the rubbish out.
S5: i must go to bed at ten o'clock.
T: i must go to bed a ten. okay. another one.
S: we must tidy our room.
T: tidy our room. what else? S10 what must you do at home or you mustn't do?
S10: we must (.) i mustn't
T: you can say i.
T2: can you speak louder?
S10: i must learn.
T: i okay i must study the english words. okay. study. (3) or learn. okay.
S11: i must do the homework.
T. do the homework. but that's more or less a rule for school not really for home but of course you
must do it at home.
S5: feed the dog.

T: feed the dog. super. what else? S4.
S4: i mustn't not fishing in the <L1de> **aquarium** <L1de>.
T: i mustn't fish in the fish tank. have you got a fish tank at home?
S4: mhm.
T: oh and you mustn't fish. do you like to fish there?
S4: <nods>
SS: @@@@
T: oh and you mustn't do that. that's what your mum tells you.
S4: yes.
T: oh i see. fish in the fish tank. @ i have never heard about that. have you?
T2: No i thought he would say in the <L1de> **lieser** <L1de> @@@
T: oh no he is near the <L1de> **malta** <L1de> not near the <L1de> **lieser** <L1de> okay.
S2: I mustn't cook.
T: you mustn't cook? why? is your cooking so terrible?
SS: @@@@
S2: my grandmother.
T: oh your grandma cooks so you mustn't cook. but i don't think that that that we put this on because
T2: it's not really a rule.
T: it's not really a rule no.
S5: go to a walk with the dog.
T: what is go for a walk with a dog? there is another word. take the dog for a walk. yes. i must take the
dog for a walk. yes. that's a rule. take the dog for a walk. So S14 what about you? one more rule.
S14: you mustn't (.) i mustn't (2)
T2: {imitates listening to loud music}
S14: we mustn't (.) i mustn't loud play the (2) listen to the music.
T: yes, say it again. it was correct.
S14: i mustn't listen the music.
T: i mustn't listen to loud music or i mustn't play loud music. you can also say i mustn't or you
mustn't play loud music. S1 what about you? (3) S8 don't smile. think. (5) what about you? (5)
what must or mustn't you do?
S1: i mustn't dance very loudly.
T: i mustn't dance on the kitchen desk. yes. okay. so what is misses [last name] trying to do? {T2
imitates talking on the phone}
T2: well i think it should be a strict rule everywhere. what shouldn't you do or what mustn't you do at
home?
S1: <L1de> **telefonieren** <L1de> ?
T2: no. talk too long on the phone.
T: or talk on the mobile while you are eating that's also a strict rule. you are not allowed to or you
mustn't talk on the phone while you are eating or what is sending a text message? what is that?
what is sending a text message?
SX: <L1de> **sms schreiben**. <L1de>
T: yes. send an sms or send a message. S15 can you think of one more rule when you are at the table
having meal (.) having a meal?
S15: i mustn't erm i must put the mobile phone in the bed.
T: oh you mustn't put your mobile in your room. yes. okay.
S15: <L1de> **also beim schlofn gehen?** <L1de>
T: you mustn't take you mobile into the bedroom. okay.
S2: i mustn't (.) erm watch tv.
T: try to say it in the correct order.
S2: i mustn't watch long.
T: i mustn't watch TV long or late. yes. okay. so now take out your workbooks. you had lots of
homework to do in your workbook. I think there was an exercise with must and mustn't. can you
remember?
T2: page seventy-seven.
T: page seventy-seven yes and seventy-six. i think you did seventy-six and seventy-seven.
T2. erm

T: you have done this?
T2: yes we have done this.
T: page seventy-seven.
T2: we have corrected these two exercises erm twelve and thirteen.
T: okay you have done twelve and thirteen so we do number fourteen. number fourteen yes.
SX: <L1de> **vierzehn homa oba nit ghobt oder?** <L1de>
T: you didn't have to do number fourteen?
SX: <L1de> **Nö.** <L1de>
T: so we do it together then. okay? it's not very difficult. S14 can you start. number one. what do you think does this mean?
S14: we mustn't but your
T: PUT. you mustn't PUT
S14: put the <un> xxx </un>
T: sorry you mustn't?
S14: you mustn't put your <un> xxx </un>
T: what can you see in the picture? there are boots on the bed. erm sabrina do you need a book?
O: no no no.
T: what can you see at the picture? (2) what is picture number one? what can you see?
S14: erm <un> xxx </un> die Schuhe <un> xxx </un>
T: shoes on the bed. so now can you say a sentence?
S14: you mustn't put the shoes on the bed.
T: yes. you mustn't put your shoes on the bed. can you put it down or do i have to write it on the board. no i think that's ok. you mustn't put your shoes on the bed. okay number two. S6 can you try?
S6: you mustn't listen to music.
T: to music on your? what is this? where is he lying? he is on the bed. you mustn't listen to music on your bed or in your bedroom. i think both is correct. you mustn't listen to music on the bed or in your bedroom. S8 can you do number three?
S8: you mustn't (3) take the cheese out the (.) <L1de> **kühl-** <L1de>
T: out of the fridge.
S8: fridge.
T: yes. you mustn't take the food i would say food but if you say cheese. you mustn't take food out of the fridge. i would say food. you mustn't take out food of the fridge. you mustn't take out food of the fridge.
S5: <L1de> **wie schreibt man des** <L1de> ?
T: here here. fridge. look it's on the board. S16 can you do number four?
S16: you mustn't run downstairs.
T: you mustn't run downstairs. okay. you mustn't run downstairs. S13 can you try number five?
S13: you mustn't (2) phone
T: <L1de> **na** <L1de> what what word is missing? look there are some words in the grey box next to the –
S13: you mustn't use (3) phone –
T: you mustn't use the?
S13: the phone mobile.
T: you mustn't use the (.) no that's not a mobile. that's a phone. what what is a mobile?
S13: <L1de> **a handy** <L1de>
T: yes. and this is a phone. we mustn't use the phone. we mustn't use the phone . okay. S10 can you read out the sentences again (3) from one to five?
S10: you mustn't put your shoes on the bed. you mustn't listen to music in your bedroom. you mustn't take food out of the fridge. you mustn't run downstairs. you mustn't us the phone.
T: you mustn't ?
S10: USE the phone.
T: use the phone. what is you mustn't use the phone in german? can you translate that? (3) i would like to know what this means. you mustn't use the phone. what is this in german? you mustn't -
S10: <L1de> **du (3) darfst** <L1de>
T: yes okay <L1de> **du darfst** <L1de>

S10: <L1de> du darfst (2) nicht das telefon (4) <L1de>

T: use (2) what is use? (.) i use a pen to write in my book. (4) i use chalk to write on the board. (2) i use a sponge to clean the board. so what is use? i use a car to drive from malta to gmuend. you use your legs to walk to school. i don't know. what else can i think of? you use your pencil to write.

T2: you should use your brain to think.

SX: <L1de> du brauchst <L1de>

T: <L1de> du brauchst (.) verwenden. ja. verwenden. also du sollst ? <L1de>

SX: <L1de> du sollst das telefon nicht verwenden. <L1de>

T: <L1de> nicht verwenden. ja. you mustn't use your or the phone. du sollst es nicht verwenden. <L1de> okay? S14 can you form another sentence about yourself.

S14: i mustn't (6) <un> xxx </un>

T: i mustn't?

S14: go to (6)

T: go to the park very (3) late. or i mustn't go to see my friend late at night or after ten. i mustn't <L1de>und dann kommt immer das verb in der <L1de>? S17 <L1de> was kommt dann noch mustn't? oder must? was kommt do? was passiert mitn verb? was kommt do danach? <L1de>

S17: <L1de> das verändert sich <L1de>

T: <L1de> was verändert sich? das must oder das mustn't das is richtig. das eine mal is es positiv und das andere mal is es negativ. oba was passiert mit dem verb? was is a verb? <L1de>

S17: <L1de> a verb? <L1de>

T: <L1de> sag mir a verb. <L1de>

S17: go.

T: go. <L1de> jo. <L1de> what else?

S17: went.

T: what is went? (.) what is went? (.) what is go and what is went? (3) what is go and what is went? (2) <L1de> die past form von? <L1de>

S17: go.

T: <L1de> von go. und was brauch ma bei must und mustn't? <L1de>

S17: go.

T: <L1de> was hasst das die – was is denn das fuer a form? die? (2) <L1de>

S17: base form.

T: <L1de> die base form. aufpassen goe. mit must und mustn't immer die base form verwenden. jo. <L1de> S2?

S2: <L1de> also go plus verb plus mustn't plus verb plus ing. <L1de>

T: <L1de> na. do homa ka ing. hob ma do jetzt irgendwo a ing ghobt? <L1de> mustn't sing, mustn't go, mustn't put, mustn't use. (.) <L1de> wo brauch ma das ing? i weiß es is jetzt für euch a bissl verwirrend weil ma das gemeinsam in der stunde gmocht hom <L1de>

S8: <L1de> das is oba mit ing oder? : <L1de>

T: : <L1de> was is mit ing? <L1de>

S8: <L1de> das mit like und doesn't like. <L1de>

T: <L1de> homa do a mustn't oder a must? ha? S8? <L1de>

S8: <L1de> na <L1de>

T: <L1de> also. das is gonz a anderes kapitel. was heißtn das like und likes? was heißtn das? <L1de>

S8: <L1de> mögen <L1de>

T: <L1de> jo. könnte man sogn. oba i tua etwas gerne. jo. und wie kummst du do jetzt aufs ing? wie kommst du jetzt von mustn't auf das? <L1de>

S8: <L1de> i hob gmant do homa must dazua geton. <L1de>

T: <L1de> aha. aso. jetzt hom ma die gonze oder fost a halbe stund homa jetzt nur über rules und must und mustn't gredet und du bist jetzt beim like und likes <L1de>

S8: @

T: <L1de> also S8 do bist jetzt oba gonz weit weg gwesen. (.) oda? <L1de>

S8: mhm.

T: mhm. <L1de> S17 jetzt noch amol. was heißt jetzt dieses must or mustn't? was heißt dos übersetzt? wie übersetzt du dos must und mustn't? <L1de>

S17: <L1de> mustn't doss ma nit dürfen und must doss ma tuan dürfen. <L1de>

T: <L1de> jo. und jetzt form du amol an satz. <L1de>

T2: must not. strictly forbidden.

T: <L1de> also das darf man nicht tun.jo. <L1de> you mustn't swim where? you mustn't swim?

SX: in the pool.

T: you mustn't swim in the pool? is that a strict rule?

S17: <L1de>na im Aquarium @ <L1de>

T: you mustn't swim in a fish tank. okay. because S4 has got a fish tank and he says you mustn't swim @ or you mustn't take out the fish from the fish tank. or what are you – what mustn't you do in a park for example? (5) <L1de> was darf man in an park nit tuan zum beispiel? <L1de>

S5: <L1de> sochn beschadigen <L1de>

T: <L1de> bitte? <L1de>

S5: <L1de> sochn beschadigen <L1de>

T: <L1de> wie sogstn do? <L1de> you mustn't?

S5: you mustn't (2) in the park.

T: what? you mustn't (5) destroy or damage things in the park. <L1de> oder was heißt denn blumen pfluecken? man darf keine blumen pfluecken? (3) was heisst denn blumen pfluecken? (2) was heißt denn aufheben? <L1de>

S5: pick up.

T: pick up. <L1de> und was heißt jetzt blumen pfluecken? <L1de>

S5: picking up flowers.

T: pick flowers. <L1de> einfach <L1de> pick flowers. you mustn't pick flowers in a park for example. you mustn't pick flowers in a park.

S2: <L1de> was haßt denn pick up? <L1de>

T: <L1de> pick up heißt aufheben. <L1de>

S2: <L1de> oba es gibt jo a auto des hasst a pick up. <L1de>

T: <L1de> jo und warum? do is hinten a ladeflaeche und do konn man dinge aufetuan und deswegen is es a pick up. <L1de>

S5: <L1de> es gibt a so a keks a des hasst pick up. <L1de>

T: sorry?

S5: <L1de> es gibt a so a keks a des hasst pick up. <L1de>

S2: <L1de> jo des is so wie a milchschnitte holt <L1de>

T2: it's a biscuit.

T: i don't know it. so you are better than me. i have never heard about it.

T2: my my children like it.

T: oh i see. that's why you know. what does it taste then? what does it taste like?

T2: a pick up is like a a biscuit with chocolate in-between. two pieces of biscuit and then chocolate.

T: so like a <L1de> milchschnitte <L1de>

T2: no it's it's not that soft.

T: oh. it's hard.

T2: it's a little bit more to bite.

T: oh. i see. thank you very much.

T2: you are welcome. i I will bring you one so you can taste it. @@@

T: @@ so pick up. yes. and the car probably is because you can pick up things and put them on the back of the car. that's what i think why it is called pick up. or do you think that there is another -?

O: no i think that's logical.

T: i think you can put things on the back of the car and that's why it is called pick up.

S2: a pick up is a <L1de> benzinschluerfer <L1de>

T: sorry. is a?

S2: <L1de>benzinschluerfer<L1de>

T: a petrol eater. yes he uses you need a lot of of petrol when you have got a pick up. that's true. yes. that's true. so now here we have got a lot of rules with must and mustn't. okay S17. can you form now a sentence with must and mustn't? can you form a sentence? try. not one from the board.

S17: i mustn't erm (3)
T: <L1de> **ich darf den foerderunterricht nicht versaeumen.** <L1de>
S17: i must
T: i mustn't
S17: i mustn't the
T: i mustn't MISS the?
S17: <L1de> **foerderunterricht** <L1de>
T: i mustn't miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht.** <L1de> write it behind your ears because tomorrow i want to see you here. is that clear? and the same to S10. i mustn't miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht** <L1de>
S4: <L1de> **wir seima morgen oba nix do** <L1de>
SS: <L1de> **sicher** <L1de>
T: why? you leave after the fourth lesson. not before.
S2: <L1de> **olta do hob i geschichte pruefung** <L1de> {to his neighbour}
T: <un> xxx </un> so now S17.
S17: i must go erm i must swimming -
T: i mustn't swim in – you must swim or you mustn't?
S17: must.
T: i must swim in a?
S17: pool.
T: okay. what else? one more. what you mustn't do. (6) S10 think of a sentence what you mustn't do. (2) then S17. think very hard.
S17: i mustn't miss (2) <L1de> **woat** <L1de>
T: you mustn't miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht** <L1de>. okay and you one sentence with mustn't.
S10: i mustn't miss the <L1de> **foerderunterricht.** <L1de>
T: okay. the same. and i hope you don't forget it until tomorrow is that okay? I think we can leave it.
T2: i think so too.
T: and i want now that we get back to with what S8 started. yes? likes hates doesn't likes loves. yes. and there we need the verb and (2) the verb and?
S8: the ing.
T: the ing. yes. true. can you form a sentence?
S8: yes.
T: try. tell me about you. about yourself. what can you tell me about yourself. i hate i love i don't like and i like. can you form a sentence with each of these verbs. like love don't like and hate. (2) S8 try to form a sentence.
S8: i like cooking.
T: i like cooking. yes. okay.
S8: but i don't like dancing.
T: okay. S15 what does S8 like and what doesn't he like?
S15: S8 likes cooking but he don't like
T: but he?
S15: but he doesn't like dancing.
T: dancing. okay. S4 what about you?
S4: i like riding my bike.
T: okay.
S4: but i don't like erm (2) rules at home.
T: you don't like rules at home? oh. S18 can you tell me what S4 likes?
S18: S4 likes riding his bike but he but he don't like but he doesn't like rules at home.
T: but he doesn't like rules. S9 what about you?
S9: i like playing football but i don't like (.) hm (.) reading a book.
T: reading a book. S5 can you tell me what S9 likes and what he doesn't like?
S5: yes. S9 likes erm playing football but he doesn't like reading a book.
T: reading a book. S1 can you tell me what you really hate doing? tell me. you really hate doing the homework. i bet that's true.
S1: erm (5)

T: so i was not right? you like doing homework? (5) just form a sentence. i hate (.) what you really don't like. S2 (.) can you think of anything you really don't like?

S2: <L1de> **wos i nit mog?** <L1de>

S4: smoke.

T: sorry i hate?

S4: smoke.

T: i hate smoking. is that true? is that true S4? you really hate smoking? have you ever tried? (.) have you tried?

S4: yes.

T: oh and you don't like it?

S4: yes.

T: oh that's good. i hate smoking. super. what about you?

S17: i hate the subject music.

T: you hate the subject music? then you hate singing?

S17: <L1de> **jo des a.** <L1de>

T: @@

SS: @@@@

T: but we want to have verbs with ing. yes? (.) i hate singing. i hate dancing. yes? smoking. yes? S10 what what about you? what do you love? what do you really like very much? what do you love?

S10: i love chocolate.

T: oh. @@ that's good. but i want a verb plus ing an activity. <L1de> **also eine aktivitaet hätt i gern.** <L1de> i love?

S10: i love reading a book.

T: you love reading a book. yes.

S2: i love sports.

T: doing sports. okay. S12 what about you? what do you really love and what do you really hate?

S12: i love swimming.

T: but i hate?

S12: but i hate roller skating.

T: roller skating. okay. S19 what about you? you love and you hate? can you form a sentence?

S19: i love erm playing football.

T: yes.

S19: but i hate erm (3) read a book.

T: reading a book. S18 what does S19 hate and love? can you tell me? he?

S18: S19 loves (.) erm (.) playing football.

T: playing football. yes. but he?

S18: but he doesn't

T: but he hates

S18: hates read a book

T: reading a book. what about you S17? can you tell me what you hate and what you love?

S17: i love reading the bike.

T: riding my bike. okay.

S17: and i doesn't

T: i hate

S17: i hate (5)

T: coming to the <L1de> **foerderunterricht.** <L1de>

SS: @@@@

T: is that true?

S17: <shakes his head>

T: no? then what do you hate?

S17: reading a book.

T: reading a book? S8 what does S17 like or hate and love?

S8: erm S17 loves erm (5) erm (3) riding a bike but he hates to riding a book.

T: reading a book.

S8: reading a book.

T: reading a book. yes. okay now you open your workbook page seventy-five. seventy-five. and here we have number seven an exercise with like and likes. (2) okay? S15 can you start with the first sentence? {students just compare homework and read out sentences for about 6 minutes. this is not included in the transcription} number eleven you have already done with misses [last name] is that correct? no? number 12? okay then we <un> xxx </un> number eleven S12. you read the text. number eleven. when i was a kid.

S12: when i was a kid.

T: what is this? when i was a kid? S1 what does this mean in German when i was a kid?

S12: <L1de>als ich ein kind war. <L1de>

T: <L1de> als ich ein kind war. richtig. <L1de>

S12: erm i liked all kinds of sports. i liked football.

T: oh oh.

SX: playing.

S12: playing.

T: i liked playing football.

S12: i liked swimming.

T: i liked swimming.

S12: and i even liked rock climbing.

T: rock climbing. yes.

SX: <L1de> geht nur climbing a? <L1de>

T: yes. okay. and i even liked rock climbing or climbing. that's okay. S9 can you go on?

S9: today i'm a bit lazy. i don't like sleeping.

SX: getting up.

T: <L1de> aufpassen! <L1de> what does this mean when i sit on the bed and -

SX: standing up.

T: ah. standing up?

SX: getting up.

S: i don't like getting up. getting up. <L1de> warum verdoppel ma do des t? kann mir des jemand erklären? warum homa do jetzt auf amol weil get erinnert euch des schreibt man jo so {T writes get on board} warum homa do jetzt a doppel to auf amol? <L1de>

SX: <L1de> weil do hinten a ing dazua kummt. <L1de>

T: <L1de> jo oba was muss denn schau wir homa jo jumping. wieso schreib ma do ka doppel p? (2) hm? wieso schreib ma do auf amol jetzt a doppel t? (3) was is denn vorher? <L1de>

SX: <L1de> a selbstlaut. <L1de>

T: mhm. <L1de> richtig. jo. wer kann mir denn noch a anderes wort nennen wo des auch so is? <L1de>

S19: hate.

T: hate? <L1de> na. schau mol. was is denn do des letzte -? <L1de>

SX: swimming.

T: swimming. super.

SX: sleeping.

T: <L1de> schreibt man sleeping mit doppel p? <L1de>

SX: <L1de> na. <L1de>

T: <L1de> na. was denn noch? was is denn noch für a wort? swimming is super <L1de>. {T imitates running}

SX: running.

T: running. <L1de> jo. <L1de> {T imitates sitting}

SX: sitting.

T: sitting. <L1de> jo. also immer wenn vor dem mitlaut ein selbstlaut ist dann wird der verdoppelt. jo. dos homa in der ersten klasse kennts euch erinnern bei der present simple homa des kennen glernt. jo. olles weg? homa vergessen geoe?

SX: <un> xxx </un>

T: <L1de> jo. oba in der ersten klasse moch ma dos. in ollen ersten klassen. ich weiß schon dass i nit bei euch war aber ihr hobts dos sicher a gmocht. goe? und was passiert denn bei ride? bei write? was passiert denn wenn do? schauts amol was homa denn do geton? writing? was homa denn do geton? was homa denn do wegglossn? <L1de>

SX: <L1de> dos e. <L1de>

T: <L1de> dos e. bei welchen wörtern tuama denn a noch dos e weglossn? follt euch kans ein? (2) was is denn bei ride? reiten? (3) wie schreib ma denn riding?

SX: <L1de> ohne e. <L1de>

T: <L1de> ohne e. jo. also dos is auch eine regel. goe bei der ing form muss man dos e weglossn. schauts noch amol noch goe. bei der grammatik von der ersten klasse. les ma noch amol noch goe. grammar folder homa olle zu hause donn schau ma olle noch mol noch bis zum nächsten mol okay? <L1de> so. next one. S9 it was your turn wasn't it. getting up.

S9: getting up (3) in the morning. i don't like running –

T: <L1de> was passiert do (2) mit running? <L1de>

S9: <L1de> doppel n. <L1de>

T: <L1de> doppel n. super. <L1de>

S9: running or riding my bike.

T: yes. what is another word for riding my bike?

S9: <L1de> geht a bike a? <L1de>

T: riding a bike. what is another word for riding a bike. can you remember cycling? cycling (.) cycling is also riding a bike. yes. that's just one word. cycling or riding a bike. okay? S9 can you finish it?

S9: what do i like? erm i like watching tv.

T: yes. tv or television. i like television.

S9: and eating and sleeping.

T: eating and sleeping. yes. eating and sleeping.

S4: <L1de> i hob erm i like playing computer games. <L1de>

T: where did you use computer games? oh when watching tv? i like playing computer games but then you have to use playing. yes? (.) but here it says television so you can't say <L1de> goe. S4 wenn du weiter liest steht jo do television. do ghört watching. musst des ondere weg tuan. <L1de> i like watching television, eating and sleeping. so and now a last exercise with ing on page seventy-nine. turn over to page seventy-nine. i know you haven't done this but we do this very quickly. (4) page seventy nine number two. S10 you try.

S10: complete another text from the wonderman files. use ing forms.

T: use ing forms. <L1de> was musst du jetzt tuan? (8) verben finden und die in der ing form verwenden. ja. so. probier amol. <L1de>

S10: when i was a kid i liked (5) going –

T: going.

S10: to school.

T: going to school. okay. S7.

S7: i liked riding.

T: writing. careful. no e. writing. i liked writing.

S7: i liked (4) –

T: <L1de> was heißt sprechen? <L1de>

S7: speaking.

T: mhm. okay. speaking. speaking french. yes. talking french. speaking french. and the next one.

S7: and i liked painting a picture.

T: yes. painting or drawing pictures. you can use paint or draw. painting or drawing. okay? painting or drawing pictures. S9 can you go on.

S9: these days i'm a bit lazy. i don't like reading a book.

T: i don't like reading.

S9: and i don't like singing.

T: erm to concerts.

S9: <L1de> aso. <L1de> erm. going.

T: going to concerts. okay. S18.

S18: i like watching tv. i like playing computer games.

T: yes. and most of all i like?

S18: and most of all i like doing nothing.

T: i like doing nothing. so and now we all get up very quickly. open the windows please. open the windows. get up. so let's do some exercises. okay? we raise our arms and we pick apples. all of us. they are very high up in the trees. we pick them and we put them on the floor. yes? we pick them and

we put them on the floor. okay. up. we pick them and we put them on the floor. on the floor. S2 where do you put them? in the air? {S9 did not pick but just raised his arm}

S2: <L1de> **jo wenn i sie aufe hau donn folln sie eh oba.** <L1de>

T: yes. but i said put them on the floor. pick them and put them on the floor.

S2: <L1de> **i hob sie jo wohl geklaubt.** <L1de>

T: okay. you did. okay. so now we touch our leg with the right hand and the other way round. okay. very quickly. quick, quick, quick, quick, quick, quick, quick. okay. and then take a seat again. oh. i thought you were football players. and you say ooooooh.

SS: @@@

T: S5.

S5: <un> xxx </un>

S2: <L1de> **der is jo schon zu olt.** <L1de>

T: oh. he is too old for this. oh i know.

S2: : <L1de> **die gelenke @** <L1de>

S5: <L1de> **die gelenke @** <L1de>

T: so and then we finish our must and mustn't and like and doesn't like and do the exercise three very quickly and then we go on with a new chapter.

T1: good morning.
SS: good morning.
T1: okay. as i remember you had a homework.
SS: yes.
T1: take it out.
T2: word order.
T1: yeah i know.
T1: is just <un> xxx </un>. so let's quickly do the first sentence. can you start please? i am just looking with you.
S1: <un> xxx </un>
T: it's gill.
S1: gill reads a nice <un> xxx </un> every day.
T1: what? reads a newspaper every day. <L1de> ja. <L1de> gill reads a newspaper every day. <L1de> ja. <L1de> next one.
S2: i don't like football very much. okay next.
S3: in the morning i always forget my watch in the bathroom. okay. i always forget my watch in the bathroom in the morning is okay as well. <L1de> ja. <L1de> next one.
S4: we the something –
T1: again. we? aha. <L1de> na. <L1de> we do something –
S4: every day.
T: the same thing. okay. we do the same thing every day. we do the same thing every day. <L1de> ja? <L1de> next one.
S5: we don't like this picture very much.
T1: okay.
S6: my mother puts in the morning in her handbag her money.
T: no. we put the - in the morning we put to the end. <L1de> ja? <L1de> that goes to the end. so my mother puts her money in her handbag in the morning. then next one.
S7: she has two cups of coffee for breakfast.
T1: okay.
T2: SX has forgotten his homework mister [last name].
T1: <L1de> ha? <L1de>
T2: SX has forgotten his homework.
T1: you have?
S8: <L1de> i hob mei hausübungsheft daham vergessen. <L1de>
T1: so there is no homework.
T2: no homework for today.
T1: was the weather too hot? so next one.
S9: we meet some –
T1: could you speak up a little bit? i can't hear you.
S9: we meet some friends at the concert this evening.
T1: okay.
S10: he he don't (.) doesn't wear every day the same clothes.
T1: he doesn't wear the same clothes every day. so every day goes to the end. <L1de> ja? <L1de>
S11: george walks to work every morning.
T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de>. next.
S12: we arrive at the party early in the evening.
T2: <L1de> bravo. <L1de>
T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de>
S13: i usually go to bed early in the evening.
T: yes.
S14: <un> xxx </un>

T1: what? it's twelve. (.)<L1de> na. <L1de> thirteen. ah you don't have it. okay could you please do the next one?

S13: <L1de> sie kann von mir. <L1de>

T1: <L1de> na. <L1de>

S15: every day tom goes to italy in summer.

T1: every year.

T2: mhm. every year.

S15: <L1de> aso. <L1de>

T1: it's every year. <L1de> ja. <L1de> every year or you put every year to the end. <L1de> ja. <L1de> it depends. <L1de> ja. es kommt also drauf an wie man es betonen will. ob es etwas besonders ist oder ob es nicht besonders ist. ja.<L1de> okay.

S16: i have my breakfast in the bed (.) in bed in the morning.

T1: okay.

S17: barbara will go to university in october.

T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de>. will go to university in october. <L1de> ja. <L1de> so then the next one is asking for the erm (.) before we start this do this this into your erm exercise book. this is the material for the written test. okay? stick it into your exercise book and erm let your parents sign it. {T imitates writing} where it says signature let your parents sign it. <L1de> also die eltern unterschreiben lassen. <L1de> and you can already start this weekend. (60) so okay when you are finished –

SS: yes.

T1: are you? okay. almost. good then let's have a short revision about what's the time. remember we have am or pm right? so what time is it. erm let's see. (5) so what's the time.

S5: it's twenty-five past nine am.

T1: it's twenty-five past nine am. <L1de> ja. <L1de> erm what about now. S7.

S7: it's quarter past eleven am.

T1: okay. <L1de> ja. <L1de> then we have (.) erm let me see erm –

S13: ten to –

T1: next full hour.

S13: ten to two.

T1: ten to two am or pm?

S13: am. (2) <L1de> aso. <L1de> pm.

T1: it goes from midnight to noon it's am and from noon to midnight it's pm. okay? good. erm (2) what time is it now S11?

S11: it's a quarter to five pm.

T1: pm. <L1de> ja. <L1de> one more. erm (4) S17.

S17: twelve to twelve. erm twelve past twelve.

T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de> twelve past twelve pm. one more. erm S18.

S18: two to ten am.

T1: am. perfect. good. so then we go over and yesterday i promised (.) no it was on monday i promised you to listen to the story. that was on page ninety. i hope this thing works this time. {S listen to recording for 1 minute} so that was the (.) so the story wasn't that long actually. so what erm first of all what do you remember from the tiny little story? or do you want to listen to it once more again? once more? do you want to hear it once more again or do you think –

SS: <SS shake their heads>

T1: no? so you already know what the story is about? okay. so what is the story about? <L1de> um was gehts in der geschichte? <L1de> try to say sentences in english. <L1de> ja. <L1de>

S2: a robbery.

T1: it's about a robbery. okay.

S7: he has the clock

S2: so somebody stole the the clock. okay. what else do we remember? S11.

S11: lady brown has talking inspector clue.

T1: she is talking to inspector clue. <L1de> ja. <L1de> okay.

S13: he is a police man.

T1: okay. <L1de> ja. <L1de> do you remember from what organization?

S13: schotland check.

T1: schotland yard. <L1de> **ja?** <L1de> it's scotland yard. it's scotland yard. okay. anything else.
hanbury hall? whose home is that? who lives there?

S7: from lady brown and lord brown.

T1: good. so the next thing that we're gonna do is you have number two and you have some jobs here.
ja. from the people in hanbury hall so lord and lady brown are the owners of hanbury hall. then
who is henry brown? who's he?

SX: their son.

T1: their son. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> it's their son. and then let's listen who is miss green, misses black
and mister white. and you have this little box on the left side. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> and just listen
and fill in the the jobs okay? {S listen to recording for 40 seconds} okay. so do you need to hear it
again or do you have the jobs already? you have them? finished?

SS: yes.

T1: okay. good. so who is miss green? erm S12.

S12: the cook.

T1: miss green? miss green is not the cook.

S12: the maid.

T1: she is the maid. right. she is the maid. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> what about misses black? S8 what
about misses black?

S8: misses black is cook.

T1: is THE cook. is THE cook. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> and who is mister white? erm S14.

S14: mister white is the butler.

T1: he is the butler. okay. good so then we go over to number five on page ninety-two. <L1de> **ja.**
<L1de> erm and this is about the was and were thing that we were talking about already last
lesson. erm <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> we just listen to the cd first. {S listen to recording for 1 minute}
<L1de> **ja** <L1de> a nice one. good so then you work in pairs erm S8 could you please move over
to S17. to S17. just take the book. take your book and go over to S17. ah he doesn't have a chair.
good. so erm what you quickly do is you work in pairs so you look at the plan of the house and try
to remember the names and the rooms where the people are. okay? <L1de> **also die (.) was sollt
ihr euch merken?** <L1de>

S13: <L1de> **die raume und die nomen.** <L1de>

T1: <L1de> **genau ja.** <L1de> and then you close your book and you ask. <L1de> **ja?** <L1de> for
instance where were bob and bill? <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> or erm and then the other one answers
where bob and bill are. they were in the living room for instance. <L1de> **ja? ist klar was ihr tun
sollt? also ungefaehr eine minute euch anschauen wer ist wo im raum und dann fragt ihr
euch gegenseitig und zwar ich schreib euch die fragen an die tafel. (15) okay? warum? wir
wissen wann -** <L1de> when do we use this one? the was?

SX: <L1de> **waren oder war.** <L1de>

T1: <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> for how many persons people do we use it?

SX: one.

T1: for just one. and we use it normally we use it with erm i

SS: he, she.

T1: <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> and then were. when do we use were?

S2: you, they and –

T1: and?

SX: we.

T1: we <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> and we. so and what does that mean? it's more than one. right. so we use
it when we talk about more than one person. okay? good. erm. now look into your books. try to
remember as much as you can. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> i am gonna work with you or probably misses
[last name]. <L1de> **anschauen und merken.** <L1de>

O: {hands out audio-recorders to two groups}

S8: <L1de> **wos muessts ihr do tuan?** <L1de>

S16: <L1de> **wos soll denn des sein? wos is des?** <L1de>

S15: {shrugs her shoulders}

pairwork 1

group 1

S7: where was lucy?
 S9: she was in the bathroom.
 S7: where were bill and lucy?
 S9: they were in the living room
 S7: erm where was sophie?
 S9: she is in the hall.
 S7: she was in the hall.
 S9: <L1de> jo. <L1de>
 S7: where were kate and mary?
 S9: <L1de> na. aso. <L1de> erm they are in the –
 S7: they were –
 S9: they were in the kitchen
 S7: yes
 S9: and washed the erm <L1de> waß i nit <L1de>
 S7: <L1de> jo irgendwas <L1de> where were daniel? erm where was daniel?
 S9: he was in the bathroom.
 S7: <L1de> soll ma noch amol? <L1de>
 T2: now changes the roles. okay? you ask S7.
 S9: where was lucy?
 S7: she was in the erm bathroom. <L1de> jo. <L1de> (.) in the bathroom.
 S9: <L1de> jo. <L1de> where was (.) where was sophie?
 S7: she was in the hall.
 S9: erm where were kate and mary?
 S7: they are in the kitchen.
 S9: yes. where are daniel?
 S7: where was daniel. he was in the bathroom.
 <L1de> wir hom zwar (.) aso. erm. du - <L1de>

T1: okay. now guys open your books on page ninety-two and let's do it together. erm just with the help of the rooms and the names. who wants to ask the first question? first question. who wants to start? okay S7 and you say who you are asking.

S7: where was trevor?
 T1: okay and who do you want to answer.
 S7: he was –
 T1: <L1de> na wer soll den antworten? <L1de>
 S7: S10.
 S10: he was in the dining room.
 T1: okay now S10 you ask again.
 S10: where were bob and bill? erm S8.
 S8: in the living room.
 T1: <L1de> aufpassen. <L1de>
 T2: whole sentence. a whole sentence.
 S8: <L1de> aso. <L1de> they were in the living room.
 T1: they were in the living room.
 S8: where is –
 T1: careful.
 S8: <L1de> aso. <L1de> trevor is in –

group 2

S15: where was erm (2) where were bob and bill?
 S16: they erm were in the living room.
 S15: yes. where is erm (.) where is erm (.) lucy?
 S16: <L1de> was? <L1de>
 S15: lucy.
 S16: erm (.) she was in the bedroom.
 S15: where are erm (.)? where are bob? where are daniel?
 S16: she is in a (2) he is in a (3) erm (2) in the bathroom.
 S15: yes. where is sophie?
 S16: sophie is in the hall.
 S15: where are kate and (3) and mary?
 S16: they (2) erm was in (3) in (.) they were in the kitchen.
 S15: okay. erm. who is (.) who is trevor?
 S16: trevor is in the dining room.
 S15: okay. erm. who is (3) we have all.
 S16: yes.
 S15: okay. <L1de> mocht mas noch mol? <L1de>
 S16: okay.
 S15: erm. <L1de> du frogst oba diesmol. <L1de>
 S16: <L1de> jo. <L1de> who erm were (.) where were sophie?
 S15: <L1de> sophie is ane. <L1de>
 S16: where were kate and mary?
 S15: erm she was were (.) they. <L1de> aso they (.) aso. ok. <L1de> they were in the kitchen.

T1: no just one. was or were?
 S8: was (3) is –
 T1: @@@@
 SS: @@@
 T1: <L1de> do brauch ma ka is mehr. wenn ma des was schon hom brauch ma ka is mehr.
 <L1de>
 S8: was in the –
 T1: <L1de>na wer was – wer denn? noch wen frogst denn? du brauchst jo jetzt nur an nomen.
 <L1de>
 S10: where was trevor?
 T1: okay.
 S11: in the dining room.
 T1: careful. whole sentence.
 S11: he was in the dining room.
 T1: okay. now you ask.
 S11: where was sophie? S15.
 S15: she was in the hall.
 T1: she was in the hall. <L1de> ja. <L1de>
 S15: erm. S16 erm where (.) where was daniel?
 S16: he was in the bathroom.
 T1: okay.
 S16: where was lucy? S5.
 S5: lucy was in in the bedroom.
 T1: okay.
 S5: where were mary and kate? S4.
 S4: they were in the kitchen.
 T1: so one more and then we are done.
 S4: where were bob and billy? S3.
 S3: they were (.) they were in the living room.
 T1: okay. so they were in the living room. good. then we go over to number seven. <L1de> ja.
 <L1de> look at the picture and talk about the people. use the words in the box. <L1de> ja.
 <L1de> erm so you first do it in pairs. <L1de> ja. **ah und zwar gehts darum da habt ihr eh drunter erm wie sie sich gefühlt haben. wo sie waren also welche zeit. ja?** <L1de> so what time they were in which room. <L1de> ja. **also darueber sprecht ihr einfach einmal untereinander. erm der eine sagt wo er war oder sie war und der andere sagt wie er sich gefuehlt hat. ja?** <L1de> and the feelings you have in this yellow box on the left side. <L1de> ja.
 <L1de> so do you know what is sad? can anybody look sad? what do you look like when you look sad? when you look sad. <L1de> **wie schaust du aus?** <L1de> can you make a sad face?
 SX: {imitates sad face}
 SS: @@@
 T1: okay. yeah that's a sad face. that's a sad face. <L1de> ja. <L1de> erm. can you show us happy?
 S16.
 S16: {imitates happy face}
 T1: can you look happier than happy? S15.
 S15: erm. what?
 T1: <L1de> **kannst du noch kannst du noch gluecklicher ausschauen wie S16?** <L1de>
 S15: {imitates happy face}
 SS: @@@
 T1: okay. now that's happy. <L1de> ja. <L1de> erm what about hungry? S18.
 S18: {imitates hungry}
 SS: @@@
 T1: that's more eating. <L1de> ja. <L1de> okay. so erm. cold what does that mean. S9.
 S9: {imitates cold}
 SS: @@@
 T1: freezing. <L1de> ja. <L1de> erm and scared? okay S7.
 S7: {imitates scared}

SS: @@@

T1: that's scared. <L1de> ja. <L1de> and angry? <L1de> ja <L1de> S1.

SX: <L1de> de muss immer lochn. <L1de>

T1: you don't look angry. you don't look angry. that's not really angry. yes that's angry. that's an angry face. an angry bird.

SS: @@@@

T1: okay. good. so now quickly talk in pairs. <L1de> ja. einer sagt wo er ist und der andere wie er ausschaut. ja? <L1de> {S do pair work}

pairwork 2

group 3

S19: sue is in the bathroom. she is cold

S10: henry is in the bedroom. he is tired.

S19: sally and fred are in the living room. they are excited.

S10: right. Kevin are in the hall. (2) Kevin was in the hall. he is happy.

S19: right. he is happy. happy. Sandra and tony were in the (2) living room. they are angry.

S10: right. <L1de> sog glei noch amol wos. <L1de>

S19: brain in the kitchen. (2) were in the kitchen. <un> xxx </un>

S10: henry is in the bathroom. <L1de> aso. na. <L1de> henry is in the (2) <L1de> jo schlof-. <L1de> bedroom. he is sad.

S19: <L1de> noch amol? <L1de>

T: finished?

S10: <L1de> jo. <L1de>

S19: <L1de> jo. <L1de>

T: okay.

group 4

S8: at five o'clock brain was in the kitchen.

S17: <L1de> darfst jo wohl nachschaun. <L1de>

S8: i am angry.

S17: no.

T: you are talking about whom? about who are you talking?

S8: in the kitchen.

T: ha?

S8: in the kitchen.

T: okay brain. he he is hungry. <L1de> ja.

<L1de> or he was hungry actually.

<L1de> ja. <L1de> he was hungry.

<L1de> ja. <L1de> now you go to the next one.

S17: at eleven (.) at quarter past eleven sue was in the kit- sue was in the bathroom. he (2) he was -

T: careful.

S17: she (.) she was cold.

T: and what time is that? eleven.

T: <L1de> na. <L1de>

S17: a quarter past eleven.

T: yeah it's quarter past eleven.

S8: <L1de> du bist. (5) du bist. <L1de>

S17: <L1de> na. <L1de>

S8: <L1de> i hob di jo grod gfrogt. <L1de>

S17: at half (.) half past ten sally and fred (2) was erm were in the ki (.) were in the living room. they was scared.

T: careful. they (.) it's more than one.

S17: <L1de> aso <L1de> they was.

T: they?

S17: were scared.

S8: <L1de> ajo i bin. <L1de> at a quarter past seven in the (2) living room. (3) they were angry. they were angry.

S17: yes. at quarter to twelve henry in the bedroom. i'm sad.

S8: yes.

T1: good. okay guys. listen up. erm now we do it together. <L1de> ja. <L1de> and we start with somebody (2) erm we start with S19. okay? so you do the first one. just any. <L1de> ja. <L1de> just pick one.

S19: Henry were in the -

T1: careful. how many people are (.) about how many people are you talking when you are talking about henry? how many people are there?

S19: a quarter to twelve.

T1: stop. S12. about how many people are you talking when you are talking about henry? (3) <L1de> von wie vielen leuten sprichst denn da? <L1de>

S19: <L1de> von an. <L1de>

T1: okay. so when you have one then you use?

S19: was.
T1: was. <L1de> ja. <L1de> and were you use for? (3) for more than two.
S19: at a quarter to twelve henry was in the bedroom. he was sad.
T1: okay. good. then who wants to do the next one? erm S8.
S8: at five o'clock brain was in the kitchen. he was hungry.
T1: okay. then S4.
S4: at ten past four was kevin –
T1: careful. kevin (.) fist the name and then the verb.
S4: kevin was in the hall. he was happy.
T1: okay. <L1de> ja. <L1de> then next one. erm who am i gonna take. S15.
S15: at quarter past seven samuel and tony were in the dining room.
T1: in the dining room. <L1de> ja. <L1de> in the dining room. and how did they feel?
S15: and they are –
T1: they?
S15: and they were angry.
T1: they were angry. okay. one more S1.
S1: at half past ten sally and fred was in the –
T1: careful. how many people are there? (3) sally and fred?
S1: sally and fred were (.) were in the (.) dining room. he –
T1: careful.
S1: he was –
T1: careful. sally AND fred. it's more than one and he is just the guy a boy a man.
S1: they were (.) they were scared.
T1: they were scared. <L1de> ja. <L1de> okay S2.
S2: at quarter past eleven was sue –
T1: <L1de> na. <L1de> first the? (.) first the name and then the was.
S2: at quarter past eleven sue was in the bathroom. she was cold.
T1: she was cold. okay. are we finished or do we have one more? one more? okay. S10.
S10: at five (.) at five o'clock brain is in the –
T1: careful. you talk in the past.
S10: at five o'clock pm brain was in the kitchen. he was hungry.
T1: okay. good. so then quickly open your exercise books (5) and we do just a few (.) erm what date is today? what date is today? <L1de> ja. <L1de> S7.
S7: the third of june.
T1: june the first?
S7: <L1de> na. <L1de> the third.
T1. oh the third. so exercise (3) june the third twenty fifteen. past simple. was or were.
S13: <L1de> des homa schon geschriebm. (.) aso. <L1de>
T1: no. (.) we're doing something different. (5) namely positive sentences negative sentences and questions in the past. (10) finished?
SS: yes.
T1: so let's see. a positive sentence (5) henry was in the hall. can you make a negative sentence? S6.
S6: henry wasn't in the hall.
T1: okay. henry wasn't in the hall. <L1de> ja. <L1de> and a question? S5.
S5: was henry in the hall?
T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de> so what do we have to do when we form a question? just?
S12: was henry in the hall?
T1: <L1de> ja was muess ma tun? wir brauchen nur dos? <L1de>
S12: <L1de> was an die erste stelle setzen. <L1de>
T1: <L1de> genau. woher kennen wir denn das schon? <L1de>
S13: <L1de> am is are can may must have got oder has got. wenn man des im soztz hot muss man es an die erste stelle setzen. <L1de>
T1: okay. good. perfect. wow you are so well. but i didn't tell her. so that was goes to the first place. was henry in the hall? <L1de> ja. <L1de> then we have a positive sentence with (3) erm peter and tina were in the bathroom. <L1de> na. <L1de> living room. @@ okay. so let's make this one negative. okay S16.

S16: peter and tina weren't?
T1: <L1de> ja <L1de> weren't.
S16: weren't in the living room.
T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de> peter and tina weren't in the living room. erm question. S9.
S9: were peter and tina in the living room.
T1: <L1de> ja <L1de> were peter and tina (.) and this were goes to the first place (.) were tina and peter in the living room. good. so that's that for the moment. now what i want you to do quickly when your are finished (2) are you ready? okay just raise your hands when you are done. okay? (.) do you have a homework? cyber-homework?
SX: <L1de> jo. <L1de>
T1: so i'm gonna open that for you.
S9: until tomorrow?
T2: tomorrow? are you at school tomorrow? until monday. till monday. cyber-homework.
T1: i'm gonna open it today.
S7: <L1de> oba de cyberhomework de hetz is de geht bis vierten sechsten. <L1de>
SX: <L1de>na bis - <L1de>
S11: <L1de> doch. <L1de>
SX: <L1de> morgen is jo da vierte. <L1de>
T1: because today is the third. that's what it days here. june third. good. so then erm (2) who wants to make a positive sentence for us. <L1de> eine positiven satz. so wie ma es jetzt gehabt haben. <L1de> okay.
S13: dana and alex were in the (3) bedroom.
T1: in the bedroom? or in the bathroom?
S13: bedroom.
T1: bedroom. okay. who? dana and?
S13: alex.
T1: alex. dana and alex. okay. so can you form a question? with her sentence. dana and alex were in the bedroom. (3) form a question.
S10: dana –
T1: a question.
S10: were dana and <L1de> wie haßt er noch mol? <L1de>
SX: alex.
S10: alex in the bedroom.
T1: ja. okay erm the negative sentence. S3.
S3: dana and alex weren't in the bedroom.
T1: okay. so erm a new positive sentence.
S15: erm isabella was in the bathroom.
T1: okay. so you make it negative.
S1: isabella wasn't in the (4) –
T1: bathroom. erm (.) S17 make a question.
S17: isabella –
T1: careful. question.
S17: isabella was –
T1: no no no no no. question. that thing. {T points at the board} this is a question.
S17: was isabella in the bathroom?
T1: <L1de> ja. <L1de> was isabella in the bathroom. erm we had the negative already. a positive sentence. <L1de> ja <L1de>S14.
S14: serena and michelle were in the bedroom.
T1: okay. okay. @@@@
SS: @@@@
T1: okay. erm form a question S5.
S5: were serena and michelle in the bedroom? okay and you make it negative.
SX: <L1de> wer? <L1de>
T2: <L1de> der S11. <L1de>
S11: serena and michelle weren't in the bathroom.

T1: okay. and now you just (.) there are two minutes left and now you ask your partners. make sure that you have positive sentences negative sentences and questions. okay? so one for instance takes a positive then the other one the negative.

pairwork 3

group 5

S13: anika was in the hall.

S14: sere-

S13: <L1de> **du muasst die Verneinung mochn. anika - <L1de>**

S14: serena and samuel were in the bedroom.

S13: serena wasn't (2) serena and samuel weren't in the bedroom.

S14: were serena and samuel in the bathroom?

S13: <L1de> **in bin hetzan.** <L1de> peter and celine were in the dining room.

S14: peter and celine weren't in the dining room.

S13: were peter and celine in the dining room?

S14: valentina and sandro (2) were in the bathroom.

S 13: vanentina and sandro weren't in the bath (.) bathroom.

group 6

S2: <L1de> **soll i oder du? <L1de>**

S1: valentina and (3) valentina and (3) laura were in the (2) bathroom.

S2: <L1de> **i moch die verneinung jetzt.** <L1de> valentina and laura weren't in the bathroom.

S1: erm were valentian and laura in the bathroom?

S2: celine was in (.) the kitchen. <L1de> **na.** <L1de> in the bathroom.

S1: celine wasn't in the bathroom.

S2: was celine in the bathroom?

S1: erm emma and <L1de> na <L1de> hanna (.) was in the (3) bed – living room.

S2: was emma in the living room?

{the bell rings}

SS: noooooo.

T2: shhh. homework for today. cyberhomework until monday.

T1: okay guys. homework – (10) okay guys have a great and long weekend. bye bye. see you next week. don't forget to stay at home.

T: good morning boys and girls.

SS: good morning teacher.

T: sit down please and the boys and girls from the last row can you stand up, please? take a chair with you. yes stand up take a chair with you.

S1: <LQde> dein sessel <L1de>

T: {looks at S1 angrily and shakes her head} they know. take your chair. yes. very good. come on. okay so sit here in a row. move backwards. S2 can you turn round? {S does not know what to do so T takes her chair and places it adequately.} thank you. put your chair next to S2. S3 take your chair please. come to the front. take your chair with you. here we do a next row. yes. hurry up. hurry up. next to S4. good. you two take your chair. sit here or behind them. yes sit down. sit down. sit down. you can move your chairs {T imitates movement to the front}. so our topic for today or for this week (.) yes but move a little bit (3) so our topic for this week is on the farm. okay? now this is a farm. {poster on the blackboard} okay? and this is farmer john. can you see him.

SS: yes.

T: okay.

S5: he is very <LQde> dick. <LQde>

T: no, he is not <L1de> dick. <L1de>. he is?

SX: fat.

T: maybe big. okay. so this is farmer john and that's his farm. okay? and then yesterday we talked about some animals who live on a farm. who can remember an animal on a farm? S6.

S6: goose.

T: a goose. yes right. there is the goose. {T shows picture of a goose} S3 can you put the goose on the farm please. {S3 sticks picture on poster} okay. yeah put it there. can you say a sentence about a goose? where is it.

S3: the goose is on the grass.

T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> and now a little bit louder.

S3: the goose is on the grass.

T: excellent. good. next animal. what else is on the farm? S7.

S7: a duck.

T: yes. can you say a whole sentence please. (5) can you say a sentence please? a duck - {SS are whispering among each other in german}

S7: a duck -

T: can you turn round? come to me. so and now you talk to the class. yes very good.

S7: the dog erm <LQde> ich mein <LQde> the duck is hungry.

T: the duck is hungry. okay. the duck is too sm- ah too big so let's put it next to the farm.

SX: the biggest duck.

T: yeah. the biggest duck. okay. S8.

S8: pig.

T: the duck is big?

S8: <LQde> schwein. <LQde>

T: a pig?

S8: <LQde> jo. <LQde>

T: yes. right. do you want to put it on the farm please (2) and say a sentence. ups.

S8: <LQde> das geht nicht. <LQde>

T: oh yes. good. where is it?

S8: the pig is in the garden.

T: in the garden. excellent well done. yeah. S5.

S5: erm the dog (.) a dog.

T: is on the farm or lives on the farm.

S5: the dog is (.) erm lives on the farm.

T: excellent. good sentence. put it there. where can a dog be? yes. okay. good. yes. very good. thank you. next one. S4.

S4: a horse.
 T: a horse?
 S4: live on the farm.
 T: turn round {T imitates turn around with hand} and talk to the class please.
 S4: a horse life on a farm.
 T: lives.
 S4: lives on the farm.
 T: right. where is the horse. you can put it into the stable. {T points at stable} yeah okay. next to the stable. yes. good. yes. push it. good. <L1de> ja. <L1de> any other animals?
 S9: cow.
 T: can you say a whole sentence please?
 S9: the cow is big.
 T: good. well done. super. yes. can you say a sentence? where is the cow? or what does a cow eat?
 S9: the cow eats grass.
 T: excellent. good sentence. yes. next one. come on. any other animals. S6.
 S6: goat.
 T: yes.
 S6: the goat are white and –
 T: the goat is only one so we say?
 S6: the goat are white (.) is
 T: it's only one (.) is.
 S6: white.
 T: is white. yeah but mine isn't white. it's?
 SS: brown.
 T: okay. do you want to put it on the farm? okay. yeah put it (.) okay. good. so the goat is erm on the meadow. {T points at meadow} do you know what a meadow is?
 SX: <LQde> wiese. <LQde>
 T: no. <L1de> ja. <L1de> little bit. <L1de> weide. <L1de> okay. good. any other animals? S10?
 S10: cat.
 T: yeah. can you say a whole sentence please?
 S10: the cat is next to the man.
 T: okay. very good sentence. yeah. put it there. ja. next to the farmer. yes. very good. <L1de> ja. <L1de> any other animals? {T holds up picture of sheep} do you remember?
 SX: sheep.
 T: raise your arm please.
 S4: sheep.
 T: it's a sheep. yes. do you know the plural form of sheep.
 SS: sheeps.
 SX: sheep.
 T: sheep sheep yes right. can you put it on the farm please?
 SX: <LQde> wie bei fish <LQde>
 T: yes. right. (4) yes so the sheep eats grass on a meadow. good. next animal. {T holds up a mouse} S5.
 S5: a mouse.
 T: yes. okay. what colour is it?
 S5: erm so grey.
 T: grey. <L1de> ja. <L1de> it is grey. good.
 S5: and he has a cheese
 T: she or it. it has –
 S5: it has a cheese.
 T: yes. very good. come. hurry up please.
 S5: <LQde> es ist auf dem dach. <LQde>
 T: yes. and now i have two? {T holds up picture of two chicken}
 SX: chicken.
 T: okay. but yesterday we talked about the female and male one. do you remember the names?
 S10: <LQde> ich. <LQde> cock and hen.
 T: right. or there is another word.

SX: rooster.
T: rooster. right. rooster. okay. can you put the rooster on the farm please?
SX: <LQde> **auf dem dach. die henne ist auf dem dach.** <LQde>
T: on the roof. yeah. okay. yes and the hen. S11. where is the hen? or where goes the hen? do you know what a pond is?
S11: the hen –
S1: <LQde> **ein Teich.** <LQde>
T: can you see the pond on the pic? yes right. put it down. next to the pond. okay very good. well done. any other animals we talked about yesterday?
SX: <un> xxx </un>
T: yes right. {T sticks animals on poster} yes. any other animals?
S9: a rabbit.
T: a rabbit. right. good.
S10: turkey.
T: yes. right. good.
S5: horse.
T: excellent. but there is a horse on the farm. oh yes. there it is. so i think we have all the animals. the pig the cow (.) yes right. okay. erm now can you two erm S4 and S3 can you put down the picture please and i'm going to put another one on. okay. yes. put it on my table. so and now (4) now can you look at the picture (.) can you look at the picture please and now i want you to show us what you can see on the poster. okay? {T has prepared a big loop} for example i can see (2) yes. a brown horse. and then you show us with the loop. {T demonstrates} <L1de> **mit der lupe** <LQde> okay? yes? did you understand?
SS: yes.
T: so let's start. S9 what can you see on the farm?
S10: i can see (5) a dog. {S holds the loop on the dog}
T: yes. what colour is it?
S10: excellent. well done. super.
T: can you now erm hand it over to another child. and now you should ask her what –
S10: what can you see on a farm?
T: excellent. good.
S11: i can see a white sheep.
T: is there only one?
SS: sheep.
T: is there only one? how many are there? can you count them?
S1: many. <LQde> **sechs.** <LQde>
T: shhh.
S10: five.
T: there are?
S10: there are five sheeps.
S1: six {screams loud}
T: <L1de> **aufpassen** <LQde> one two three four five six. and what's the plural form of sheep?
S10: sheep.
T: excellent. so can you erm repeat your sentence please. can you turn round and tell the others. {T imitates turning around} yes.
S10: i can see six white sheeps.
T: sheep. excellent. now hand it over.
S4: what can you see on a farm?
T: yes. what can you see on a farm.
S4: i can see four cow.
T: four cows. okay. can you show us please. there are four cows.
S4: there are four cows.
T: super. good. next one.
S4: <LQde> **S5 halt dich raus!** <LQde> {S4 wants to hand loop over to S 7 and S5 wants to take it}
T: can you say the question please.
S4: what can you see?

S7: erm i can see chicken.
T: you can see some chicken. yes. right. and what is this one. what is it. (3) it's the male chicken.
what's the name of it? yeah. can you help him?
S7: the erm <LQde> **hob i vergessen.** <LQde>
S13: rooster.
T: yes. rooster. and a hen and some little?
SS: chicken.
T: chicks. chicks. <L1de> **ja.** <LQde> do you remember. yes. very good. good. and please ask her
(2). can you ask her?
SX: <LQde> **du musst sie fragen.** <LQde>
S13: erm what can you see?
T: louder. what can you see on a farm.
S14: i can see three cats.
T: yes. very good. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de>
S14: what can you see?
S15: i can see a brown horse.
T: a brown horse.
S1: <LQde> **das war schon.** <LQde>
S16: <LQde> **das war nicht.** <LQde> {S talk to each other}
T: yes. okay. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> hey. stop it.
S16: what can you see?
S8: i can see erm four pig.
T: four pigs. yes. right. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de>
S8: what can you see?
S11: i can see a dog (.) ducks.
T: you can see some ducks. where are they?
S11: they are in the <un> **xxx** </un>
T: they are in the?
SX: river.
T: no. {writes the word pond on the board}
SS: pond.
T: pond. yes. right.
SX: james bond.
T: no.
S1: <LQde> **das schreibt man mit b.** <LQde>
T: yes. right.
S17: i can see a white goat.
T: excellent. very good.
S17: what can you see?
S5: i can see a a car.
T: yes can you say the colour please.
S5: erm blue car.
T: i can see a?
S5: blue car.
T: excellent. very good. next one. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> look at S18.
S5: what do you can see
T: erm can you (.) what can you see?
S5: what can you see?
T: yes. right.
S10: i can see a goat.
S16: <LQde> **des war schon.** <LQde>
T: okay.
S10: no. <LQde> **da nicht. da. du warst schon.** <LQde>
T: come on S16. can you ask him please. wait, wait, wait.
S10: what can you see?
T: shhh. again.

S10: what can you see?
 T: good.
 S10: i can see a tractor.
 T: excellent.
 SS: @@@@
 T: what colour is it?
 S10: red.
 T: so can you say the sentence again please?
 S10: i can see a red tracktor.
 T: excellent. good. next one. come on.
 S10: what can you see?
 T: who? S7?
 S1: <LQde> er war schon. <LQde>
 T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> doesn't matter.
 S7: erm i can see <LQde> das da. <LQde> {S points at harvester}
 T: yeah what is it?
 S7: i don't know.
 T: do you know the german word of it?
 S7: erm <LQde> ich wusste das aber - <LQde>
 T: in german. do you know the german word?
 SS: bulldozer.
 SX: a biggest tractor.
 T: <L1de> nein. <LQde>
 SX: <LQde> rasenmäher <LQde>
 T: <L1de> rasenmäher? <L1de> no. no. i think it's <L1de> maehdrescher. pflug auch. ja. was macht denn der in german? <L1de>
 SX: <LQde>mähen. <LQde>
 S7: <un> xxx </un>
 T: <L1de> ja. okay. koerner. ja. <L1de> okay. what else can you see? S17. yes. stand up please.
 S17: i can see a farmer.
 T: a farmer. yes. very good. yes. now can you look at me. okay. thank you. what can you see here? {T points at foal}
 S1: a little horse.
 SS: a foal. a foal.
 T: S11.
 S11: i can see a foal.
 T: a foal. yes. right. and what about here. there is a dog and? {T points at puppies} (3) do you know the name of the young dog?
 SX: <LQde> suess. <LQde>
 S4: <LQde> welpen. <LQde>
 T: it's puppy. yeah. puppy. very funny. and then here is a cat with two?
 SX: children.
 T: yeah but –
 S1: little cats.
 T: kittens.
 SS: kittens.
 T: and then here are the ducks. with three little?
 SX: duckling.
 T: yes. right. ducklings. good.
 S7: <LQde> bei pigs auch. bei pigs <LQde>
 T: yes. there is a small pig. what's the name?
 S1: pigling.
 T: piglet. yes. piglet.
 S1: <LQde> bei sheep sind auch. <LQde>
 T: yeah. sheep. what else? ah. here is a small cow.
 S11: calf.

T: calf. yes. excellent. super. erm what about this area here? there are no animals.
S15: a garden.
T: yeah. there is a garden. and what can you see?
S15: there are erm animals.
S10: vegetables.
T: yes. S10 again.
S10: vegetables.
T: vegetables. <L1de> ja. <L1de> there are some carrots erm pears and potatoes. yes. right. okay.
SS: <un> xxx </un> {S are whispering among each other in german}
T: now i want you to put the correct cards to the pictures. yeah. like yesterday. okay so can you pass them out. take one and pass it over. okay? yes. take one and pass it around. yes.
SS: <un> xxx </un> {S are whispering among each other in german}
T: okay. now can you stand up and put the words to the correct picture please.
SS: <un> xxx </un> {S are whispering among each other in german}
T: S2 can you stand up please and put your card to the correct picture. S4 the goose is next to the goat. next to the goat.
S4: <LQde> aso. <LQde>
SS: yes.
T: yes. right. please stand up and put your card to the correct picture.
S5: the dog.
SX: <LQde> nicht aussuchen. <LQde>
T: S6. let them choose.
SX: <LQde> das ist schwieriger. <LQde>
T: come on.
SX: <LQde> was suchst du. <LQde>
SX: <LQde> das schwein. <LQde>
SX: piglet.
SX: <LQde> was ist das bei <un> xxx </un> was ist das?
T: take one.
SS {are whispering among each other in german about which animals belongs where}
T: very good. come on. pass them round.
SX: <LQde> es sind zu wenig. <LQde>
T: take one. yes right. so put the last cards. yes right. put it there. good. yes. right. no no no. it goes with yes right. are all the words on the board? okay now let's do a little bit pronunciation. okay. so let's start. i say it first and you repeat after me. okay. {T pronounces words first and SS repeat}
okay now i want (.) now i want you to spell the name of the animal.
SX: yeah.
T: okay? let's try that.
SX: <LQde> was muess ma machen? <LQde>
SX: <LQde> buchstabieren. <LQde>
T: can you spell the word hen. S19 can you spell the word hen?
S19: h e n
T: excellent. well done. S10 can you spell the word turkey?
S10: t u r k e y.
T: perfect. excellent. S11 can you spell the word goose.
S11: g o o s e—
SX: double o.
T: yes. s e . right. S4 erm can you spell the word horse?
S4: horse. h o r s e.
T: yes. very good. super. and S1 can you spell erm gosling?
S1: erm g o s l e (.) i n g.
T: excellent. super. and goat S7.
S7: goat. erm g o a t.
T: very good. yes. duckling.
S9: erm d u c k l i n g.
T: perfect. yes. S13 can you spell erm rabbit

S13: r a double b i t.
 T: very good. well done. super. S6 can you spell erm sheep.
 S6: s h dobbble e p.
 T: very good. yes. you are perfect. S21 what about chicken?
 S21: c h i c k e n.
 T: very good. yes. super. S20 can you spell foal?
 S20: <LQde> wo is des? <LQde>
 T: it's here.
 S20: f o i –
 T: a.
 S20: erm a l.
 T: l. okay. yes. good. calf S 8.
 S8: erm c a l f.
 T: super. very good. S2 cow.
 S2: <LQde> aso. <LQde> c o w.
 T: okay. now you choose a word and the others have to guess what animal it is. okay? you spell one word from the board. <L1de> ja? <L1de> and the others have to guess. S13 can you close the windows please. <L1de> ja. <L1de> S5 do you want to start?
 S5: yes.
 T: okay. but don't look at the word. okay?
 S5: don't look?
 T: yeah. don't look at the word. you spell the word. may- maybe you stand at the back okay? and to it from there. S5 can you start please? spell one word.
 S5: erm sheep.
 SS: @@@@
 T: no. don't say the word. don't say the word only spell the word okay? others have to guess the word.
 S5: ah.
 T: okay.
 S5: c h i c k e n.
 SX: <LQde> darf ich? <LQde>
 T: so it's c h i c k e n. yeah now call a name please.
 S5: erm.
 T: hurry up. hurry up please.
 S21: chicken.
 T: is it chicken?
 S5: yes.
 T: now it's your turn. come on S21.
 S21: g o s l i n g.
 S9: gosling.
 T: yeah. right. it's your turn.
 S9: t u r k e y.
 T: good spelling. super.
 S14: turkey.
 T: so two more. S14 and one more. {T shows two fingers}
 S14: h o r s e.
 T: very good spelling. yeah.
 S14: S11.
 S1: <LQde> ja natuerlich. <LQde>
 S14: horse.
 T: okay. now it's the last turn. yes. please the last word. (3) don't look. go back so they can't see where you are looking.
 S14: d o n k e y.
 SX: donkey.
 T: yes. okay. now. please go back to your place. take your chair with you. shhh. stop talking. okay. thank you. okay. yesterday you had a homework. can you please take out your homework. erm S5. take out your farms please. very good.

SS: {talk to each other in german}

T: so now S22. can you come out and show us your farm? okay. turn round and show us your farm.
you can first (3) very good. now you turn around and now you tell us about your farm. what is on
your farm? what can we see on your farm?

S22: i can see a pig.

T: okay there is a (.) a pig. yes. what else.

S22: i can see a dog.

T: a dog. the dog is next to the?

S22: farmer.

T: yes. okay. good. yes what else? come on. you're good. yeah. what else is on your farm?

S22: i can see a cat on the house.

T: a cat on the house or on the roof. yes. right. okay. thank you. what about the others? who wants to
talk about his or her farm? hm? S9 can you talk about your farm please? you can stand there okay.
show us the picture. yes. show it around please. okay now can you say some sentences about your
farm.

S9: i can see a cat next to the house.

T: okay. yes. good.

S9: erm i can see erm (3) a pig.

T: yes. a pig. (3) yes. what else?

S9: i can see a donkey above the house.

T: okay maybe it's behind the house or the farmyard. yes. good. and one more.

S9: i can see a dog.

T: a dog? yes. okay. <L1de> ja. <L1de> and a tractor? okay. yes. S7. first show us your farm please.
yes. you can come out. on my farm there is or there are?

S7: erm -

T: on my farm there is a?

S7: on my farm there is a erm a dog.

T: a dog. yes. yeah. what else?

S7: a cat.

T: a cat.

S7: chicken.

T: yes.

S7: chicken. a dog.

T: yeah. very good.

S7: a man.

T: a man. <L1de> ja. <L1de>

S7: a horse a donkey a pig -

T: and a?

S7: and a cow.

T: excellent. good. thank you. anyone else?

S23: i can't find it.

T: yeah. it's okay. it doesn't matter today. okay. please stop looking. good. yes S11. please yeah. can
you show us please. very nice drawing.

S11: i can see at the farm a horse.

T: can you stop talking now. stop it please.

S11: i can see on the farm a horse. the horse is next to donkey.

T: the donkey. yeah. good.

S11: the dog is next to house.

T: to n the house. <L1de> ja. <L1de> what about the pond? are there animals in the pond?

S11: there (.) erm here is the duck and the goose.

T: excellent. yes. very good. and where is the rooster?

S11: there is on the -

T: it is on the

S11: <LQde> stall. <L1de>.

T: stable. yes.

S21: where is the turkey?

S11: the sheep is next to the tractor.

T: yes. okay. well done. super. anyone else? no? okay. we are going to listen to a song and now i want you to stop drawing. okay? it was your homework so please stop it now. okay. now put it into your folder please. erm please pass them out. and then you write the date. yellow exercise book. so open your yellow exercise book please and you write down the date.

S16: <LQde> **muess ma des ins heft geben?** <LQde>

S1: <nods>

S16: <LQde> **ja?** <LQde>

S1: <LQde> **ja.** <LQde>

T: open your yellow exercise book.

S25: <LQde> **soll ich auch dem [first name] einen geben?** <LQde>

T: yes. shhh. and you stick in the worksheet please. and then you take a pen or a magic pen or a pencil. stick it in please. write down the date. stick it in. okay. give it back to me. and please hurry up.

S1: <LQde> **ich hab auch keins gekommen.** <LQde>

T: sorry. what about you? stick it in. now please hurry up. yes. please stick it in. write down the date. hurry up please. write down the date. did you write down the date? please hurry up. and then take a pencil a pen or a magic pen. S24 where is your glue?

S24: <un> **xxx** </un>

T: pardon? yes. you have to buy one until tomorrow. can you stick it in please? now. yeah. you have to buy one. so are you ready?

SS: yes.

T: then we listen to the song. okay. you can see you have to fill in some words. okay so please take a pen or a pencil. ready?

SS: yes.

T: yes? please hurry up. S8 are you ready?

S8: <nods>

T: please hurry up. take your pen now. S8. take your pen now and stick it in later. so let's start. {SS listen to a song} so we listen once again. okay. good. let's start. {SS listen to it a second time} do you want to hear it again?

SS: yes.

T: once. okay.

SS: no.

T: only one more okay? {SS listen to it a third time} okay well done. okay. can we next erm can we compare the words. okay. S6 can you start with the first line.

S6: <LQde> **also mit dem refrain?** <LQde>

T: no. not the refrain. no. with the as the –

S6: as the pig go oink and the cows go moo.

T: is there only one?

S6: pigs.

T: pigs. okay. so you have pig and the plural form pigs. good. next sentence. S24.

S24: all the hens go cluck cluck cluck.

T: very good. hen. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> it's hens. not hands. it's an animal. hen and the plural form hens. erm S8.

S24: as the pig go oink and the cows go moo.

T: the pigs. yes. plural form. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> the pigs go oink. and the cows go?

SS: moo.

T: good. next one. S5.

S5: as the duck go quack and the horse go neigh.

T: wait a moment. no, no, no, no.

SX: <LQde> **was?** <LQde>

T: you are wrong. sorry. S21.

S21: all the hens go cluck cluck cluck.

T: yes. right. that's the correct sample. okay. next one. S9.

S9: as the dog go woof.

T: dogs. okay.

S9: dogs.

T: it's always the plural form. okay. S12.
S12: and the cats go meow.
T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> erm S11.
S11: and the shep go baa baa baa.
T: yeah. right. S24.
S24: as the dogs go woof.
T: yeah. S7.
S7: and the cats go meow.
T: good. then S6.
S6: all the sheeps go baa baa baa.
T: all the?
S6: all the sheep go baa baa baa.
T: right. yes. S21.
S21: as the ducks go quack.
T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> S25.
S25: and the horse go neigh.
T: and the? (.) and the (.) horses. plural form. okay? and the horses go neigh.
S1: all the mice go squeak squeak squeak.
T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> do you remember? it's one mouse and and two mice. okay. one mouse and two mice. okay? plural form? it's a special one. <L1de> ja? <L1de> S19.
S19: as the duck go quack.
T: plural form please.
S19: as the ducks go quack.
T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> erm S1. have you got the next one?
S19: <LQde> sind wir bei dem letzten? <LQde>
SX: <LQde> beim vorletzen. <LQde>
S19: and the horse go neigh.
T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> once again with the plural form please.
S19: and the horse -
T: -ES.
S19: horses go neigh.
T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> and the last one. S24.
S24: and the mice go squeak squeak squeak.
T: very good. tomorrow we are going to sing the song. okay?
SS: yes, yes. <LQde> ja. <LQde>
T: for those who want. now erm you write down your homework please.
SS: {are talking among each other in german}
T: okay. so we write homework. (5) so shhh. please write down homework. okay. (5) so S24 and S20 can you pass them out please. and those who haven't finished the farm (3) please finish the farm until tomorrow.
SX: <LQde> muessen wir nur den hintergrund malen? <LQde>
SX: <LQde> den hintergrund. genau. <LQde>
T: so please finish your farms until tomorrow. <L1de> ja. <L1de> tomorrow i am going to write down if you have your homework or not. <L1de> ja. <L1de> so please do it. {SS are talking} so now what do you have to do for homework. listen up. S5 take your glue and stick it in please. thank you. so now on your worksheet you can find a picture. okay? there is a picture with another farm with animals and their youngs. first you have to write on the left side there is a farm animal. the words are on the worksheet. so you have to find the correct one. okay? so for example the first one.
S17: hen.
T: yes. right. and what's the young?
S17: chick.
T: chick. right. that's your homework until tomorrow and to finish your farms okay?
SS: yes.
T: where did you write down the homework? S19 hurry up please. good. when you have finished you can put your english stuff into your school bag.
SS: {talk among each other in german about a test, for example}

T: see you tomorrow. bye bye.
SS: bye bye.

Class D
19 June 2015

T: good morning everybody.
SS: morning.

T: <L1de> so zuerst einmal das ist die frau koch die schreibt gerade ihre abschlussarbeit und schaut sich heute unseren unterricht an. es ist ganz sicher anonymisiert also das heisst es erfahrt niemand wer ihr seid nicht einmal die schule. jedenfalls das sieht nur die frau koch die schaut sich das an und dann wird geschrieben schueler eins antwortet oder was weiss ich und der lehrer sagt das und das. also nicht irgendwie mit name oder schule oder sonst was. okay? und auch die aufnahmen die gemacht werden sind nur zum auswerten fuer die fuer die frau koch. also nicht dass ihr glaubt das kommt jetzt ins netz und alle wissen holladaro ja im facebook also das ueberhaupt nicht. okay. <L1de> now open your student's books please on page twenty eight. today we are going to talk about space. shhh {S talk among each other} (3) today we talk about space. what is space?

SX: <LQde> das haben wir schon gemacht. <LQde>

SX: <LQde> ja. <LQde>

T: alright we did that already. who can tell me who was the first man in space? not on the moon in space. {T makes circling movement with hands}

S1: a russian.

T: a russian man. <L1de> ja. <L1de> do you know his name? juri gagarin. his name was juri gagarin.

S2: juri gagarin.

T: he was the first man in space. he was from russia. at that time (3) at that time erm russia had a different name. it was called the soviet union. soviet union right? he was the first man in space. before him they sent animals into space. a dog. the soviet union sent a dog called laika into space and laika survived. what does survive mean in german?

SX: <LQde> ueberleben <LQde>.

T: {nods.} she was the first living creature that survived the trip into space and back. before that they sent different other animals a dog and i think once a monkey but they died. mhm. and laika was the first living creature that survived the trip to space and back and juri gagarin was the first man in space. he went into orbit. what is orbit?

SS: <LQde> weltraum. <LQde>

T: what's an orbit?

S4: <LQde> das runde ding. <LQde>

S2: <LQde> planet. <L1de>

T: <L1de> umlaufbahn. <L1de> every planet has an orbit. this is the way it goes in the space {T makes circling movement with hand} and he was sent into an orbit and he went round the earth. okay. and now who was the first man on the moon?

S5: <un> xxx </un>

T: neil armstrong. and there is a very very very famous saying a very famous sentence he said when he put his foot on the moon.

S6: a small step for a man but a big step for the mankind.

T: a giant leap. <L1de> ein grosser sprung. <L1de> a giant leap for mankind. that's right. and he was the first man who set a foot on the moon (.) on the surface of the moon. it was a big sensation. big sensation. people there are pictures that people on the earth who were looking erm were on the streets and there were tvs in the in the in the shops and the people looked at it and didn't believe. <L1de> ja. <L1de> it was a big thing. right. they put up a flag on the moon an american flag and they took some samples erm of the rocks and i was in washington dc in a museum called national air and space museum and there i touched moonrocks. {T imitates touching} i touched the moon rocks. do you understand that? i touched the moon rocks in

washington in the museum. did you understand that? (3) <L1de> **was hab ich gemacht? ich hab?**<L1de>

S2: <LQde> **also sie haben die box** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **die box?** <L1de> @@

S2: <LQde> **die box die auf dem mond war.** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **na nit die box.** <L1de> rocks rocks. what are rocks?

S7: <LQde> **steine.** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **das mondgestein. in washington gibt's ein museum das air und space museum das behandelt luftfahrt und raumfahrt das ist ganz toll gemacht und erm da kann man da sind die ganzen originalanzuege von den astronauten und dann kann man das mondgestein angreifen.** <L1de> to be honest it does not feel different like earth stones. but it's very very

S1: <LQde> **koennen sie ein bisschen lauter reden?** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **lauter?** <L1de> so you can touch moon rocks there real from the moon. it doesn't feel different like any other rock but it's from the moon. or at least they say so. okay. good. now erm let's see what we can do. <L1de> **ja** <L1de> another thing. erm there was a very very dreadful thing about twenty no longer thirty years ago i guess erm there was an accident do you remember that? erm a space shuttle. do you know what a space shuttle is?

S2: <LQde> **raumschiff.** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> a space shuttle means that it can always come back like a plane. it lands like a plane okay? so you can reuse it. and erm in the year i think it says in here yeah thirty years ago in nineteen eighty six the challenger a space shuttle exploded one minute after it's start. i remember that i was at home it was the beginning of my teaching career and i was sitting at home in front of the news <L1de> **zeit im bild** <L1de> and they showed it. it was really terrible. the family and friends were there and wanted to see how they go up into space and suddenly wusch a big explosion and all of them died. really really really hard. all the people were shocked and couldn't believe it. right. and then another one was in two thousand and three that's not so long ago. the columbia another space ship broke up when it reentered the earth atmosphere. that means when the space ship comes back from outer space it goes through the atmosphere and this is a very dangerous moment.

S8: {came late} <LQde> **entschuldigung ich hatte verspaetung.** <LQde>

T: this was a very dangerous moment because the space ship gets so hot that if there is something wrong a <un> **xxx** </un> accident can happen. and this happened it exploded. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> a very tragic event. okay good now let's go to page ninety-nine number four. there are six different words or six different pictures with six different words or phrases and you have to match them. alright?

S6: alright alright alright. (3) <LQde> **S9 spitzer?** <LQde>

S9: <LQde> **hab ich spitzer?** @@ **er faengt ihn nicht** <LQde>

SS: {are whispering among each other}

S1: <LQde> **was ist damage?** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **damage heißt beschädigen.** <L1de> right. now what is injury? what is an injury?

S10: <LQde> **das ist rettung.** <LQde>

S4: picture one.

T: hm?

S4: number one.

T: ah picture number one. no.

S9: picture number four.

T: four <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> injury means <L1de> **verletzung.** <L1de>

S4: <L1de> **achso ja.** <L1de>

T: the poor guy has got a broken leg and a broken arm and whatever. good damage (.) damage.

S11: <LQde> **schaden.** <LQde> picture number three.

SX: <LQde> **das erste.** <LQde>

T: picture number three i would say. <L1de> **also beschaedigung oder schaden.** <L1de> prize, prize?

S9: number six.

T: number six. <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> shhh. what is a prize in german?

SS: <LQde> **preis.** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **und zwar welcher preis? eine? eine auszeichnung ein gewinn. aufpassen. nicht der preis fuer eine ware.** <L1de> the price you say the jeans are fifty pounds <L1de> **oder irgendwas** <L1de> what's that? that's price and that's the difference because there is another spelling. if we say something is fifty euros it's the price but if you get that {T draws a trophy on board} that's a prize. also another pronunciation. that's the price and that's the prize. <L1de> **ja?** <L1de> good. then a child and an adult.

S4: erm picture two.

T: picture two. what is an adult?

S12: <LQde> **aeltere oder sowas.** <LQde>

SX: <LQde> **erwachsene.** <LQde>

T: do you know another for for adult another english word? (2) do you know another english word for adult? (3) grown-up. but if you go to a museum or anywhere you get a ticket it always says adult which means <L1de> **erwachsener.** <L1de> alright. government money.

S4: it's number five.

T: put your hand up.

S4: number five.

T: and what does it mean in german? what is government? (2) the government of austria for example. the government of the united states.

S11: <LQde> **staatsform.** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **regierung heit's eigentlich aber in dem fall heit es staatsgeld.** <L1de>

S1: <LQde> **was ist ein gouverneur?** <LQde>

T: goveror <LQde> **ist das was bei uns sozusagen ein landeshauptmann ist der der politiker der einen bundesstaat in den usa regiert sozusagen oder an der spitze des bundeslandes ist. der governor. es gibt fifty governors fuer jeden bundensstaat einer der wird gewaehlt und der bekannteste war wer von california?** <LQde>

S10: arnold schwarzenegger.

T: arnold schwarzenegger. and (2) other than the president erm the governor must not be born in the united states. schwarzenegger was born in austria but if you want to be president of the united states you must be born in the united states. so schwarzenegger can never be president. okay. good. that's the big difference. and height?

S11: <LQde> **hoehe.** <LQde>

S4: picture one.

T: okay. now the race for space. you read the text number five and match the pictures number 6 okay? underline the words you do not understand. do it now please.

SS: {do the exercise and whisper among each other in german}

T: good. are you done? okay now who wants to read the text? the race for space. what does that mean the race for space?

S10: <LQde> **das rennen ins universum.** <LQde>

T: <L1de> **genau. also der wettkampf in den weltraum.** <LQde> right. who wants to read? come on. you read. {T to S6}

S6: the spaceship must be able to carry three adults. erm fourth picture.

T: <L1de> **ja** <L1de> picture number four. okay. good. <L1de> **aber eigentlich erm** <L1de> there is another text. would you like to win the ansari x prize.

S6: would you like to win the ansari x prize? what is the prize? ten million dollar. who can win the prize? the first people who built a spaceship that can be used more than once.

T: okay what does that mean that can be used more than once?

S6: <LQde> **mehr als einmal zu verwenden.** <LQde>

T: mhm. okay. these are the rules. <L1de> **die regeln. ja? wie gesagt** <L1de> the spaceship must be able to carry three adults. that's picture number?

SS: four.

T: four <L1de> **ja.** <L1de> the picture with the three astronauts. good. next rule. who wants to read it. S13 show me that you deserve your good mark.

S13: <LQde> **erm wo sind wir?** <LQde>

S7: <LQde> **haha er will lesen aber er weiss nicht wo wir sind.** <LQde>

S3: <LQde> **da** the spaceship. <LQde>

S13: the spaceship must be able to carry –

T: we already had that. rule number two. number two.

S13: the spaceship must reach a hight of one hundred kilometers. this hight is where a space orbit begins.

T: the spaceship must reach a hight of one hundred kilometers. this hight is where a space orbit begins. okay which picture is it? number?

S13: number one.

T: number one. okay. number three S9.

S9: the spaceship must not damage must return with no damage damage and no injury to any of the crew.

T: mhm. i think we mixed up one and three. @ because i think picture number four is rule number one where they say hello we are back and picture number three where they enter the spaceship i think that's number three. do you agree? okay number four.

S4: a second flight must be made within two weeks using the same space craft.

T: okay.

S4: erm last picture.

T: yeah it's the last one. it means that two weeks after the first flight you must use the spaceship again reuse it within two weeks okay? and number five? yes S11.

S11: no government money can be used in the project. picture number three.

T: yeah that means where does the money come from? pay from their own money because it's very expensive? nobody has so much money so what do you do?

SX: <LQde> spenden. <LQde>

T: you look for private donators. do you remember felix baumgartner jumping down from the atmosphere? do you remember two years ago?

S1: <LQde> ich hab eine frage. wie geht das wenn da oben keine anziehungskraft ist? <LQde>

S10: <LQde> er war noch in der atmosphaere? <LQde>

T: <L1de> er war das sag ich jetzt auf deutsch er war genau an der an der grenze deswegen hat man gesagt an der grenze des universums genau so weit ist er rauf dass noch die anziehungskraft da war. ja also a bissl weiter hoeher viel hoeher haett er nicht mehr koennen sonst waere keine anziehungskraft mehr da. aber so hat er genau sich es ausgerechnet gehabt dass er so hinauffliegt oder schwebt eigentlich dass er noch herunterkommt <L1de> but if you don't have the money so in the case of felix baumgartner who was the big sponsor? who gave all the money?

S7: red bull.

T: that's right. and erm it's owner mister mateschitz is one of the richest persons in the world not just austria and he is a very smart guy a clever guy mister mateschitz because he put all the money millions of dollars why because even in space everyone sees the red bull logo. <L1de> ja. <L1de> whenever felix baumgartner appears whenever his spaceship his capsule was on the tv screen or on the internet everyone knew oh that's red bull. okay. and this is a very good marketing strategy. a good commercial because everybody thinks not me but many people think that okay if i go and get me a can of red bull and then i'm gonna drink it i'm like felix baumgartner. and there is a slogan or there was a slogan for red bull <L1de> red bull verleiht fluegel. <L1de> and that's the best thing because when felix baumgartner went up into space he had wings more or less. okay? <L1de> also eine super tolle werbestrategie. und dieser herr mateschitz ist ein cleverer bursche oder bursche ist gut ein cleverer herr der hat millionen dollar da hineingesteckt. <L1de>

S1: <LQde> in welchem jahr war das? <LQde>

SX: <LQde> zweitausenddreizehn. <LQde>

T: <L1de> vor zwei jahren war das ja. enorm viel geld. wirklich also allein der anzug vom felix baumgartner den er da anhatte war eine spezialanfertigung und der allein hat glaub ich ein paar millionen gekostet ja und ueberall ueberall war das red bull logo drauf. ueberall. immer wenn der im bild war zack red bull. eine bessere werbung gibt's nicht. die werbung geht sogar bis ins weltall hinauf. okay also das macht er ja nicht weil er so ein großer menschenfreund ist vielleicht auch aber vor allem geht's da ums geld. wenn er die paar millionen die er da für ihn hineinpumpt die kommen xfach zurueck. <L1de> S10!

S10: <LQde> er nervt gerade. <LQde>

S6: <LQde> ich mach nichts alter. <LQde>

T: alright now open your workbooks please on page (6) seventy-seven number four. that's a picture story. it's a picture story and (2) it's a kind of romantic picture story and you try to erm put the sentences below in the correct order.

S4: <LQde> frau [last name] ich hab das schon gemacht. ich weiss aber nicht ob das richtig ist. <LQde>

SS: {are whispering among each other in german and talking about the weekend for example}

T: okay are you done? S4 stop it please. S14. (4) okay now which one is the first sentence?

S15: number seven.

T: can you read it please. please raise your hand before saying something.

S9: one day there was an accident. a woman drove her car into a river.

T: alright. good. next one.

S12: a young woman who had seen the accident jumped into the river and saved the life of a small boy.

T: right. a young woman who had seen the accident jumped into the river and saved the life of a young boy. right. number three S4.

S4: the boys mother was dead.

T: mhm the boys mother was dead. <L1de> ja <L1de> S7.

S7: the boy's father met the woman who had saved they boy's life.

T: <L1de> ja <L1de> the boy's father met the woman who had saved they boy's life. <L1de> ja <L1de> S10.

S10: he gave her a million dollars.

T: he gave her a million dollars <L1de> ja. <L1de> he was very generous. mhm. number six. <L1de> ja. <L1de>

S12: six months later the woman went into a space travel office and booked a flight into space.

T: <L1de> ja. <L1de> six months later the woman went into a space travel office and booked a flight into space. this is going to be the future that you don't go to turkey or to any other country or to america you go to space (.) for your holiday. alright that's the future. some people would like to do it but it's not so cheap.

S6: <LQde> wie viel kostet sowas? <LQde>

T: @@ millions millions of dollars and i don't think that i personally would like that. would you go to space for a holiday?

S6: yes.

T: i am earth-bound so <un> xxx </un> into space. so who else? S16.

S16: they fell in love and when they came back reporters heard about the coincidence.

T: mhm they fell in love and when they came back reporters heard about the coincidence. what is a coincidence in german?

S6: <LQde> zufall. <LQde>

T: very good. alright next one. S14.

S14: the boys mother was dead.

S4: <LQde> was liest du? du musst acht lesen. <LQde>

T: <L1de> ich sehe gerade <L1de> we did a mistake. first when the space shuttle was up in space the woman found out that the boy's father was on the same flight. that's number seven.

SX: <LQde> ja. <LQde>

T: they fell in love that's number eight. we did a mistake. and then they got married soon afterwards. now. what a nice story (.) a romantic story up in space. it could be a film could be a move maybe they make a movie out of it. now who can read the correct order? the numbers of the correct order. who can? who wants to read the correct order? who wants to read the numbers.

S4: <LQde> darf ich? <LQde>

T: alright.

S4: seven four one six two three nine five eight.

T: perfect. seven four one six two three nine five eight. right. take out your school exercise books.

SS: no:::

T: it is the last school exercise for your whole life.

SS: juhu:::

T: {claps her hands} we celebrate that.

S17: <LQde> frau [last name] ist das die letzte stunde? <LQde>

T: no the last school exercise. (3) i promise.

SS: {are talking among each other in german about an excursion for example}

S17: <LQde> **das ist die letzte schuluebung. darauf freu ich mich schon das ganze jahr.**

T: last school exercise in the grundsteingasse. nice. so you have to write extra nice okay? (10) copy the sentences in the correct order.

S14: <LQde> **ich kann nicht schoen schreiben.** <LQde>

SS: {are talking among each other in german}

T: hey be quiet.

S2: <LQde> **seien sie mal ehrlich werden sie uns vermissen?** <LQde>

T: <nods>

SS: o:::h.

T: what a question. (3) but i hope we will stay in touch.

S4: {to S14} <LQde> **hast du gw?** <LQde> {S14 nods}

S4: {to S14} <LQde> **hast du zweite fuellfeder? der schreibt ur scheisse.** <LQde>

T: S18 go write down the exercise please (3) on a sheet of paper (3) on a sheet of paper.

S19: {to S18} <LQde> **bitteschoen sir.** <LQde>

T: S7 take a sheet of paper and do your work please.

S7: i don't have paper.

T: then you have to get one.

S18: i give you –

T: no no no.

S9: <LQde> **frau [last name] er hat mein patschen genommen.** <LQde>

S12: <LQde> **hab ich nicht genommen. er hat ihn nach vorne geschossen.** <LQde>

SS: {S are talking among each other in german}

SX: <LQde> **es hat geläutet.** <LQde>

T: okay. bye bye.

4. Teacher interviews

Alice
6 May 2015

- A: okay. welche sprachen sprechen sie?
B: deutsch und englisch.
A: okay. und wie würden sie ihre englischkenntnisse einstufen gemäß den unterschiedlichen sprachniveaus a1 bis c2?
B: erm b (.) 2.
A: erm wie lange unterrichten sie schon?
B: seit 1985 (3) dreißig jahre.
A: erm wie viele schüler haben sie in ihrer klasse?
B: erm zur zeit zwischen (2) unterschiedlich erm die klassen sind unterschiedlich besetzt. zwischen 17 und 22.
A: und in der zweiten klasse?
B: in der zweiten klasse sind es 22.
A: okay. wie viele buben und mädchen?
B: puh.
A: wissen sie das zufällig?
B: erm das wird ungefähr halb halb sein.
A: welche sprachen verwenden sie denn im englischunterricht?
B: englisch und deutsch.
A: und warum englisch und deutsch?
B: ja dafür gibt es mehrere gründe. erstens einmal versuchen wir zwar vorwiegend englisch zu reden aber es gibt situationen da ist deutsch unerlässlich beispielsweise wenn man sieht dass kinder die anordnungen (.) instruktionen nicht befolgen beispielsweise nicht in der lage sind es zu befolgen weil sie es nicht verstanden haben erm wenn ich zwischendurch einmal schnell etwas übersetzt haben möchte und nicht lange herumerklären möchte erm (2) wenn ich grammatik unterrichte ist es wichtig deutsch zu reden damit die kinder verstehen oder auch um bezug zum deutschen herzustellen.
A: erklären sie das dann nur auf deutsch oder zuerst auf englisch und dann auf deutsch?
B: erm das ist dann so eine mixture. meistens erkläre ich es erst einmal auf deutsch und zwischendurch wenn ich weiß die wörter verstehen sie wieder dann erm mache ich zwischendurch wieder etwas auf englisch also das ist erm aber generell beim erklären mache ich es eigentlich nur auf deutsch.
A: mhm.
B: ja.
A: fallen ihnen sonst noch situationen ein wo sie auf das deutsche switchen?
B: wo ich auf das deutsche switche? (2) ja wenn ich erm speziell bei den schwächeren kindern erm etwas erklären muss dann mache ich natürlich deutsch wenn ich (.) vokabeln erkläre versuche ich zwar oft die vokabeln zu umschreiben aber wenn die kinder das vokabular nicht haben mache ich es kurz mit einer deutschen übersetzung und ansonsten (.) hm (2) fällt mir jetzt momentan nichts ein.
A: mhm. wenn sie das prozentuell einschätzen müssten wie viel sprechen sie durchschnittlich englisch im unterricht?
B: ja erm ich bemühe mich natürlich mehr englisch zu reden (.) unterschiedlich so um die siebzig fünfundsiebzig prozent. versuche ich schon.
A: kommt auf die -
B: auf die klasse darauf an und auf die thematik. auf den unterrichtsstoff.
A: okay
okay. wissen sie wie das andere kollegen bei ihnen an der schule handhaben?
B: erm ja ich weiß von einigen kollegen (.) von allen nicht aber einige kollegen sind sehr erm (.) erpicht darauf viel englisch zu reden obwohl ausschließlich englisch geht überhaupt nicht das funktioniert nicht. aber die versuchen doch so fünfundachtzig neunzig prozent englisch zu reden und andere erm (.) habe ich festgestellt teilweise sogar unter fünfzig prozent.
A: mhm.

B: und ja wie gesagt es kommt immer darauf an wie gut sind die kinder (.) verstehen sie es wenn man es auf deutsch erm auf englisch sagt oder muss man eben erm mit deutsch weiterhelfen.

A: mhm. erm weil sie gerade die kinder ansprechen (.) wann glauben sie erm switchen die kinder ins deutsche?

B: ja das ist interessant <lacht> die kinder switchen sehr gerne ins deutsche wenn sie zu faul sind um nachzudenken. wie der satz oder wie sie etwas auf englisch sagen können erm sie switchen aufs ins deutsche wenn sie das vokabular nicht haben erm wenn sie sich unbeobachtet fühlen wenn sie mit dem mit dem nachbar reden (.) oft auch bei so dialogen oder bei gruppenarbeiten wenn der lehrer nicht direkt daneben steht <lacht> erm reden sie deutsch. wann noch? (.) die kinder (.) reden (.) zwischendurch auch deutsch wenn sie nichts verstehen und ja wenn sie anfangen dann fangen sie oft an mit dem nachbarn hin und her zu quatschen weil sie vom nachbarn versuchen die information zu kriegen und das muss man natürlich sofort unterbinden.

A: also wie wie reagieren sie dann in solchen situationen?

B: erm ja erm ich frage ob sie sie das was sie mit dem nachbarn reden auch der ganzen klasse sagen können. wenn sie es nur auf deutsch sagen dass fordere ich sie auf das auf das englische zu übersetzen wenn es nicht geht helfe ich ihnen ein bisschen und erm meistens sind sie dann eh sofort leise weil wenn sie dann englisch reden müssen sind sie eh sofort still.

A: und generell also nicht nur wenn sie mit dem partner schwätzen sondern auch wenn sie mit ihnen auf deutsch sprechen?

B: ja das ist natürlich auch. wenn sie mit mir erm in deutsch kommunizieren wollen und ich weiß dass sie in der lage sind das auf englisch auch auszudrücken dann stelle ich mich taub und beziehungsweise sage erm sage ihnen sorry i don't understand (.) your language. what funny language do you speak? can you try to say this in english? and ansonsten wenn ich weiß dass die kinder nicht in der lage sind das auf englisch zu wiederzugeben dann dürfen sie auf deutsch das sagen (.) und ich helfe ihnen dann helfe ihnen dann zu übersetzen oder wir machen es gemeinsam. oder ich mache sie darauf aufmerksam

A: mhm mhm

B: überleg einmal das wort haben wir schon einmal gehabt das kannst du. ich führe sie ein bisschen hin damit sie die vokabeln vielleicht wieder em (2) ins gedächtnis bekommen.

A: mhm. und können sie sich noch erinnern wie war wie haben sie den erm englischunterricht erlebt während ihrer schulzeit. war da deutsch (.) die verwendung von deutsch ein thema?

B: ja das ist schon relativ lange her dass ich schule gegangen bin <lacht> das sind schon fünfundvierzig jahre. nein nicht ganz vierzig jahre ist es her. gut zu meiner zeit ist englisch so unterrichtet worden dass nur deutsch gesprochen wurde. dass sehr viel deutsch englisch übersetzt worden ist. erm grammatiksätze (.) geschichten die wir gelesen haben die auf deutsch übersetzt wurden und erm es ist eigentlich die englisch kommunikation überhaupt nicht forciert worden. auf das ist eigentlich kein wert gelegt worden. wichtig war das vokabellernen.

A: und während ihrer studienzeit ist da eingetrichtert worden sie sollen englisch only unterrichten oder schon deutsch miteinfließen lassen in den unterricht?

B: also ich kann mich da erinnern an einen professor den wir gehabt haben (.) [name]. professor [name]. erm den wir auch in didaktik gehabt haben der hat alles was er mit uns gemacht hat die ganze stunde spiele erm anweisungen alles mögliche erm er hat alles nur auf enlgisch gemacht. das heißt er hat uns natürlich dazu angehalten auch nur englisch zu reden und erm es ist damals uns ja gesagt worden wir sollen versuchen dass die kinder erm den kindern beizubringen auf englisch zu denken aber das ist natürlich etwas was absolut nicht funktioniert. (2) ich kann von einem kind in dem alter nicht verlangen oder erwarten dass es auf englisch denkt. blödsinn.

A: verfolgen sie eigentlich aktuelle entwicklungen im bereich language teaching und fachdidaktik?

B: ja man geht immer wieder so zu fortbildungen wo man informiert wird man hat auch immer wieder diese schilfs an der schule wo diese themen aufgegriffen werden wo man erm einblick bekommt. wir haben sogar schulinterne erm kollegen die ein bisschen berichten wie wie das forschungsmäßig aussieht. wir haben zum beispiel eine kollegin die erm den lerncoach gemacht hat die zwischendurch ein bisschen erzählt wie man erm englisch unterrichtet. ja man versucht ein bisschen am laufenden zu bleiben.

A: und hat die kollegin von der sie gerade gesprochen haben das thema deutsch im englischunterricht einmal angesprochen oder [war das noch nicht thema?]

- B: [bisher noch nicht nein] das war noch nicht thema und interessanterweise hat genau diese kollegin relativ viel deutsch gesprochen im englischunterricht den ich letztes mal erm beigestanden bin. ja so <lacht>
- A: und wissen sie erm wie die verwendung der muttersprache im lehrplan verankert ist?
- B: erm (2) ja da geht es darum dass man an das anknüpft was die kinder bereits wissen (3) beziehungsweise man soll erm die kinder da abholen (.) wo sie erm wissensmäßig mehr oder weniger stehen und das geht vorwiegend oder das geht oft halt nur mit mit ein bisschen deutsch als hilfe.
- A: also so quasi vorhandene ressourcen nutzen?
- B: super. genau das. vorhandenes wissen vorhandene ressourcen ausschöpfen.
- A: okay. erm glauben sie dass es in klassen mit einer sehr heterogenen schülerschaft wie beispielsweise in wien wo viele erm migrantenkinder im englischunterricht sind glauben sie ist es schwieriger dort zu unterrichten als hier in einer schule wo die schüler sehr homogen sind?
- B: also ich muss ganz ehrlich sagen ich möchte an solchen schulen nicht unterrichten weil ich mir denke dass es sehr schwierig ist zuerst einmal erm ist das große problem dass die kinder nicht die eine gemeinsame sprache sprechen. wie soll ich jetzt etwas vermitteln wo ich nicht weiß wie die kinder das überhaupt verstehen wie das bei ihnen ankommt was ich ihnen vermitteln möchte. ich kann ihnen nicht helfen weil ich kann kein was weiß ich ich kann kein syrisch ich kann kein türkisch ich kann kein serbisch (.) ich finde das schwierig. also für mich hört sich das echt schwierig an.
- A: wie glauben sie dass die lehrerinnen dort damit umgehen?
- B: ja wahrscheinlich werden sie sich wirklich nur eine (.) darauf einigen müssen eine einzige sprachen zu verwenden. die englisch sprache die allen beigebracht werden muss.
- A: glauben sie ist es theoretisch möglich so wie es von vielen vorgeschlagen wird verschiedene muttersprachen integriert?
- B: was unter umständen möglich wäre wenn man die muttersprache einbeziehen sollte müsste dass man das auf ganz ganz kleine sequenzen immer nur erm begrenzt. das man sagt so ein zwei minuten erkläre deinem nachbarn schnell was du jetzt verstanden hast und versuche in erfahrung zu bringen wie er das jetzt verstanden hat. hilft euch gegenseitig. schwierig aber wenn man vor der herausforderung steht muss man sowieso zu einer lösung finden und ich glaube dass erm das eine problem besteht wenn ich da zu viel freiraum lasse dass ich sie in der muttersprache reden lasse dann verliere ich die kontrolle weil ich ja nicht weiß was sie miteinander reden. ich kann ja kein türkisch ich kann kein kroatisch oder was auch immer erm deswegen könnte ich mir vorstellen dass man das nur auf ganz ganz kleine sequenzen in den stunden beschränken müsste.
- A: aber generell finden sie das ist ein guter ansatz dass man diese sprachen -
- B: ist überlegenswert ja. also kann man wahrscheinlich nicht ausschließen.
- A: mhm. wie sehen sie generell die verwendung von der muttersprache im englischunterricht? sehen sie das als vorteil oder als nachteil?
- B: die muttersprache ist immer ein vorteil weil die kinder genau das mitbekommen beziehungsweise genau das erm vermittelt bekommen was ich ihnen sagen will (2) weil wenn ich wenn ich die kinder die in der hauptschule sind beziehungsweise in der nms die haben ja schon zehn elf jahre haben sie die muttersprache gelernt also kann man ganz anders kommunizieren als in einer fremdsprache und deswegen (.) ist es sicher vorteilhaft zwischendurch die muttersprache zu verwenden (2) man muss es halt trotzdem ein bisschen begrenzen und immer wieder schauen dass man die die englisch sprache in den vordergrund stellt.
- A: mhm.
- B: nicht nur sondern auch. also beides soll erlaubt sein aber vorherrschen sollte englisch auf jeden fall.
- A: und glauben sie dass dieses switching eher ein phänomen ist in lower level classes also in der ersten beispielsweise? glauben sie ist das dort mehr ein thema als in einer vierten klasse?
- B: wenn ich nur den vergleich hernehme jetzt mit der (.) mit den leistungsgruppen die wir bis vor kurzem noch gehabt haben da war es so dass eine erste leistungsgruppe beispielsweise von anfang an gewohnt war nur englisch zu reden. da haben wir wirklich von anfang der stunde bis zum ende der stunde nur englisch gesprochen außer es ist grammatik erklärt worden das habe ich auf deutsch gemacht aber ist alles ist wirklich alles auf englisch gesprochen worden. und erm die kinder sind dann aus der schule hinausgegangen und die haben die haben kommunizieren können die haben die haben mit der sprache gespielt und erm da war da ist natürlich der unterschied zu drittgruppisten

relativ groß gewesen. da hat man immer viel deutsch sprechen müssen und das hat seine berechtigung gehabt aber die ersten leistungsgruppen auch in den zweiten leistungsgruppen hat man versucht möglichst viel englisch zu reden aber in den ersten fast ausschließlich. ja und die kinder waren eigentlich erm ja die waren sehr selbständig bis bis in die vierte klasse hinauf haben die wirklich gelernt mit den vokabeln umzugehen mit der sprache ein bisschen zu spielen und sind kreativ geworden und haben auch ganz super tolle aufsätze geschrieben.

A: aber haben die in der ersten glauben sie noch mehr geswitcht? generell also jetzt unabhängig davon von der neuen mittelschule und den leistungsgruppen?

B: natürlich. natürlich muss man das aufbauen das ist ganz klar. man kann nicht einfach hineingehen in eine klasse so und jetzt rede ich nur mehr englisch weil sehr viel an erklärungsbedarf herrscht. weil von der volksschule in die hauptschule ist zuerst einmal eine große umstellung und da brauchen die kinder noch die sicherheit dass sie wirklich das auf deutsch bekommen und genau wissen was sie tun müssen weil sie eh sehr unsicher sind weil so viele neuigkeiten auf sie einstürzen stürmen wie auch immer.

A: okay dann bin ich eigentlich schon am ende meines interviews. gibt es von ihrer seite noch irgendwelche fragen?

B: von meiner seiten fragen (2) erm eigentlich hätten wir das thema erschöpfend behandelt. <lacht>

A: okay dann bedanke ich mich recht herzlich für das interview.

B: gerne geschehen. dann wünsche ich ihnen alles gute weiterhin erm bezüglich ihrer arbeit und später auch im berufsleben viel erfolg.

A: dankeschön.

- A: wie viele sprachen sprechen sie denn?
- B: eigentlich sprech ich nur zwei. also ich habe zwar einmal ein bisschen italienisch für den fremdenverkehr gelernt aber das geht über essen und schlafen geht das nicht hinaus. und sonst spreche ich eben englisch und deutsch.
- A: okay. wie würden sie ihre englisch kenntnisse einstufen.
- B: erm im großen und ganzen eigentlich relativ gut weil ich eben schon sehr früh angefangen habe. ich habe als fünfzehnjähriger in der schischule immer wieder schigruppen aus england und schottland erm gehabt in den ferien. ich hab dann verwandtschaft in den usa wo ich auch häufig auf besuch war und dann eben das jahr in in amerika in new york wo eben die unterrichtssprache ist nur englisch und von dem her glaube ich dass meine englisch kenntnisse relativ gut sind. also denk ich mal. sage ich jetzt einfach einmal so. <lacht>
- A: <lacht> ja das glaube ich auch. und sie sprechen deutsch und englisch im unterricht. wüssten sie (.) oder warum machen sie das so?
- B: naja. es ist so dass ich erm es ist jetzt (.) die sprache oft so also so weit herunterzubrechen gelingt mir nicht immer ganz es ist dann wenn ich so gewisse kinder kennen zwar viele meiner arbeitsanweisungen und sie wissen auch was zu tun ist. ich glaube das sieht man auch ganz gut auf dem, auf dem videobildern dass sie arbeitsanweisungen verstehen aber manchmal braucht es ein bisschen mehr und dann spreche ich eben in englisch und dann sehe ich eh wenn meistens dann so in die augen schaue erm der kinder. okay da ist irgendwie so weiß ich nicht so eine gewisse lehre <A und B lachen> wo ich dann merke okay sie wissen jetzt nicht so wirklich was ich von ihnen will und dann übersetze ich es noch einmal auf deutsch.
- A: mhm
- B: aber erm ich will es trotzdem in englisch sagen so gut es geht erm weil ich mir denke sie können aus den anweisungen vielleicht das eine oder andere herauspicken dass sie sich für das nächste mal merken. also dass ich es nur rein in deutsch sage ist sehr selten. meistens ist es also dann zweigeteilt wobei ich schon kolleginnen gesehen habe, die allerdings aus england kommen, die haben solche (.) da gibt es so eine englischwoche wo also die engländerin kommt und mit den kindern arbeitet und die arbeitet also wirklich ausschließlich auf englisch und bricht das anscheinend noch mehr herunter aber das ist (.) es ist einfach dann auch der aufwand dermaßen groß dass ich sage okay dann mache ich es lieber manchmal zweisprachig. also nur deutsch will ich eigentlich nicht weil ich einfach finde die kinder können viel (.) können viel herausnehmen und sich herauspflücken erm wenn sie (.) wenn sie es wenigstens in englisch dann einmal gehört haben und wenn sie es dann nicht verstanden haben dann erm dann sage ich es halt dann in deutsch noch einmal. aber das beobachte ich eh und das sehe ich und merke ich an den rückmeldungen. okay das haben sie jetzt nicht verstanden was ich von ihnen will.
- A: sie haben jetzt gesagt arbeitsanweisungen. gibt es da sonst noch erm situationen wo sie das speziell (.) bewusst machen?
- B: ja also es sind gewissen anweisungen die ich ihnen gebe oder ob das (.) das sind auch manchmal grammatikkapiteln. da ist es oft einmal notwendig dass man auch die (.) zum deutschen auch manchmal etwas herstellt. obwohl man natürlich im englischen heute ja nichts mehr in dem sinn von deutsch auf englisch übersetzt einfach um das natürliche sprachgefühl in den kindern zu erwecken. allerdings manche sachen (.) wie gesagt die kann ich nicht so weit unterbrechen dass sie das mitbekommen oder dass sie eine regel dazu aufstellen und gerade in der ersten klasse fehlt ihnen auch sprachlich relativ viel wo sie das einfach noch nicht zuordnen können oder dann, das hat man heute eh gesehen bei der geschichte sind es oft nur wörter die sie dann bringen können, oder manche bemühen sich dann schon einen satz zu machen aber der ist dann oft ein bisschen durcheinander gewürfelt. also sie versuchen schon das zu sagen aber es kommt eben nicht wirklich jetzt richtig heraus. also von dem her.
- A: und wie schaut das mit vokabeln aus? wenn sie neue vokabeln unterrichten? ist das dort auch ein thema?
- B: ja. was ich natürlich noch immer (.) was ich noch nicht habe (.) und ich war jetzt gerade erst über lerndesignausbildung habe ich eine kollegin kennengelernt aus oberösterreich die schon von diesem

(.) vom vom vokabellernen als solches weg ist sondern die macht das über diese mindmaps teilweise erm wo mir die idee ganz gut gefällt aber wir haben jetzt erst mit der neuen mittelschule angefangen. und ich bin jetzt eben dabei dass wir da ein bisschen umwurschteln und es ist auch mit mit der kollegin so wir sind im prinzip beide aus dem aus dem alten system und im alten system ist es halt so gewesen dass man sehr viel wert auf vokabel lernen gelegt hat und natürlich über erm viel sprechen und so weiter kommt das vokabular dann schon mit der zeit von selber aber es ist halt auch hier wieder wenn ich sage (.) wenn ich drei vier stunden englisch die woche habe erm ich brauche einfach einen gewissen, einen gewissen wortschatz und den lasse ich sie einfach dann auch wieder lernen. <B schweift zu sehr vom thema ab deshalb werden die nächsten drei minuten nicht transkribiert>

A: also das heißt noch ist diese übersetzten schon noch ein thema?

B: übersetzen in dem sinn also ich lasse keine keine deutschen sätze ins englische übersetzen.

A: nein, nein, nein. das meine ich nicht. aber mit vokabeln meine ich. wenn sie merken okay die schüler verstehen das jetzt nicht probieren sie das zu zeigen oder zu imitieren oder –

B: richtig so wie die kinder das heute gemacht haben wo sie selber nachahmen. als bei gewissen wörtern bietet es sich ja an dass man das macht und bei anderen ist es halt einfach so dass man (.) ja alles zeigen lässt sich nicht.

A: das stimmt.

B: und von dem her ja es wird (.) ein bisschen deutsch wird immer drin sein. glaub ich. vor allem in der sekundarstufe eins wird sich das nicht ganz vermeiden lassen. oder doch? ich weiß es nicht.

A: ich meine die literatur geht ja immer mehr in die richtung dass man sagt man soll die muttersprache nicht verbieten weil das ja ein system ist an das die schüler anknüpfen. also es ist ja gar nicht förderlich das man das komplett erm außer acht lässt.

B: ja. es gibt ja auf der anderen seite die theorien wo man sagt wenn man nur englisch spricht man kann es (.) man bringt es auch herüber. und wie gesagt das machen diese engländer in diesen wochenkursen erm wie heißt denn das? ich weiß es jetzt nicht mehr wie das heißt. die machen das da schon nur ist halt da glaub ich der aufwand für den output am schluss ist dann einfach enorm und erm ich glaube wir schaffen dann einfach zu wenig.

A: es ist zeitaufwändig. auf alle fälle.

B: <B schweift zu sehr vom thema ab deshalb werden die nächsten eineinhalb minuten nicht transkribiert> wenn wir 4 stunden haben das ist zu wenig. ich meine ich habe überlegt man könnte so gewisse teile einfach auch im naturwissenschaftlichen unterricht einmal einfließen lassen wobei ich dann bei vielen kindern wieder das nasenrumpfen sehe.

A: also englisch als arbeitssprache meinen sie?

B: ja. ja. interessieren täte es mich schon aber es ist halt (.) ja dann müsste man es einfach noch häufiger irgendwo dazwischen drin haben.

A: ja.

B: und dann ist es eigentlich mit physik, chemie nicht getan. erm ja wie auch immer. es würde helfen wahrscheinlich auch. aber dann kann man auch nicht alles machen sondern auch nur wo du sagst okay gewisse dinge macht man einmal in englisch. permanent ist wahrscheinlich zu kompliziert. da bleibt dann was ich stofflich für die weiterführenden schulen wieder brauche bleibt dann wieder hängen weil sie dann auf englisch können (.) vielleicht auf englisch können aber nicht auf deutsch.

A: schwieriges thema. <lacht>

B: <lacht> ja es ist nicht so einfach.

A: und müssten sie das jetzt prozentuell einschätzen. wie viel glauben sie sprechen sie englisch im unterricht?

B: puh. das ist schwer zu sagen. ich kann es gar nicht sagen weil ich passe da gar nicht so genau auf weil ich (.) weil ich so im fluss irgendwo drinnen bin aber ich denke schon dass es (.) dass es mehr als die hälfte ist was ich (.) was ich in englisch spreche. also wo ich rein englisch spreche.

A: also was ich jetzt mitbekommen habe auf alle fälle.

B: ja ich denke schon dass es mehr als die hälfte ist. also ja erm ich passe da jetzt nicht wirklich auf. die (.) die frage hat mich jetzt etwas überrascht weil ich noch nie darüber nachgedacht habe.

A: das ist bei den meisten so. ja. <lacht>

B: ja. es ist einfach so eine sache die passiert.

A: [das macht man unterbewusst.]

- B: [ja. ja. und es] bring auch irgendwo die dienst Erfahrung (.) die bringt es dann mit dass man da gar nicht so aufpasst. man passt auf andere sachen mehr auf und erm ich meine wenn ich das vergleiche erm mit meinen ersten jahren wo man extrem am stoff hängt. erm du siehst nicht was in der klasse vor sich geht und wer was macht und erm jetzt ist inzwischen natürlich in der klasse bei den schülern da entgeht mir wenig. aber was ich selber jetzt wirklich tue ist mir selbst nicht immer bewusst. <B schweift sehr ab. die nächsten zweieinhalb minuten werden daher nicht transkribiert>
- A: wann gauben sie switchen die schüler oder switchen die schüler aufs deutsche (3) im unterricht?
- B: das ist immer dann eigentlich glaube ich wenn sie (.) wenn sie (.) erstens wenn sie jetzt nicht direkt einen arbeitsauftrag haben also das in der fremdsprache zu machen dann machen sie es schon in, in, in deutsch. also wenn sie untereinander (.) auch wenn sie, wenn sie so arbeitsaufträge erfüllen und irgendetwas dazwischen ist was dem einen jetzt nicht passt oder dem anderen nicht passt das wird dann in der muttersprache geredet. also erledigen tun sie im prinzip nur die arbeitsaufträge wobei ich schon versuche sie jetzt schon dahin zu bringen wenn sie so ganz einfache fragen haben wie was ist hausübung dass sie die versuchen in englisch zu stellen. also das schon.
- A: also sie machen sie dann darauf aufmerksam?
- B: ja. ja also bei dingen wo ich weiß sie können das in englisch sagen frage ich sie auch ob sie das in englisch sagen können und dann machen sie das auch. wo sie halt sehen eigentlich könnten wir es eh.
- A: also wenn man ihnen sagt sie sollen englisch sprechen und den auftrag in englisch ausführen [dann machen sie das sehrwohl?]
- B: [dann machen sie das auch.] aber sobald es im prinzip ein bisschen vom auftrag abgeleitet sind sie natürlich in der muttersprache drin weil es einfach einfacher ist.
- A: und grammatikmäßig oder vokabeln (3) unbekannte neue dinge?
- B: ja. die fragen sie dann auch wobei sie auch fragen können what's that and that in englisch. also das dürfen sie schon. aber sie machen es nicht immer. sie machen es sicher nicht immer. wobei diese klasse ist ist sehr brav und sehr bemüht und das war jetzt nicht nur heute also das sind sie (.) sind sie immer. <B holt zu sehr aus. die nächsten achtzig sekunden werden daher nicht transkribiert>
- A: können sie sich vielleicht noch erinnern wie war das als sie in der schule waren? wie war da der englisch unterricht? ist da viel übersetzt worden oder nur englisch geredet worden?
- B: es ist sehr viel übersetzt worden. als wir haben viele deutsche sätze ins englische übersetzt wir haben viele englische lesestücke ins deutsche übersetzt oder sätze heraus übersetzt. erm also wir haben schon viel übersetzt und es ist halt dann im prinzip auch im unterricht so gut wie (.) englisch is so gut wie nichts gesprochen worden und es ist halt im prinzip vokabeln und grammatik geprügelt worden. das (.) das wars mehr oder weniger. also da war der englisch unterricht ist schon völlig anders als er früher war.
- A: das stimmt. und ihre ausbildung damals? war das ein thema? ist ihnen eingepügelt worden english only oder?
- B: nein da hat man schon sehr darauf (.) auf english only (.) da ist man damals schon sehr darauf gestanden. <fünfundzwanzig sekunden werden nicht transkribiert> im unterricht ist schon sehr viel erm englisch verlangt worden wobei schon auch das eine oder andere deutsche wort natürlich gefallen ist. also in irgendeiner weise muss es natürlich auch dann sein. das ist (.) ergibt sich eh aus der situation.
- A: wie ist das im lehrplan eigentlich verankert? wissen sie das wie es da aussieht mit erm deutsch im englischunterricht?
- B: müsste ich nachschauen. das kann ich jetzt gar nicht sagen. so sattelfest bin ich beim lehrplan nicht. <lacht>
- A: <lacht> kein problem.
- B: aber das ich weiß gar nicht ob das angeführt ist drinnen. ich habe wirklich keine ahnung.
- A: okay.
- B: ich kann mich nicht erinnern. ich habe zwar schon einiges darin gelesen aber mehr so dinge die ich dann gebraucht habe und darauf bin ich jetzt nicht wirklich gestoßen.
- A: kein problem. kein problem.
- B: es ist immer schwierig lehrer nach dem lehrplan zu fragen. <lacht>
- A: <lacht> da werde ich auch noch drauf kommen. guter tipp schon mal. und verfolgen sie aktuelle entwicklungen im bereich language teaching? wahrscheinlich schon oder wenn sie [sagen]

B: [erm ja.] wobei ich im englischbereich jetzt das nicht so stark verfolge wie ich es im naturwissenschaftlichen bereich mache weil der naturwissenschaftliche bereich für mich in den letzten jahren wirklich zum steckenpferd geworden und ich habe da wahnsinnig viel gemacht und ich habe halt immer wieder wo wenn ich etwas erwische so wie jetzt bei der lerndesignerausbildung im bereich englisch erm da bin ich dann schon sehr dankbar und die kollegin die das macht also die ist sehr weit vorne in der entwicklung. sie ist auch selber daran beteiligt die macht also glaub ich auch an der ph oberösterreich diverse sachen erm und ist eben in diesem bereich sehr sehr aktiv und was natürlich dann zur folge hat dass ich natürlich da dann auch wieder etwas neugieriger geworden bin und (.) also diese ganzen ausbildungen im bereich unterrichtsentwicklung und schulentwicklung erm haben mich in den letzten jahren wirklich sehr interessiert weil ich mich damit sehr auseinandergesetzt habe. sei es jetzt durch die bfl ausbildung vorher und dann jetzt die lerndesignerausbildung und dann noch das masterstudium dass ich im sommer anfrage also es sind (.) es ist schon sehr interessant was, was es da an möglichkeiten gibt. erm und dass man auch vom alten schlag sein kann und trotzdem etwas dazu lernen kann. also es gibt wirklich sehr viele dinge die sehr interessant sind und wir würden uns ja alle zum beispiel im kollegium auch wünschen dass wir endlich junge leute bekommen wo man einfach was dazu lernt als alter weil wir sind ein kollegium die sind wirklich alle mit einander alt geworden und da sind halt über die jahre die ganz alten weggebrochen und wir anderen sind übriggeblieben und junge kollegen haben wir jetzt (.) weiß ich nicht eine ganz junge kollegin haben wir letztes jahr bekommen und von dem her wo wir uns einfach auch von jungen kolleginnen und kollegen einiges erwarten aber wir bekommen sie irgendwie nicht. wir müssen wahrscheinlich alle erst wegsterben bis da die jungen nachkommen. <lacht> <B holt zu sehr aus. die nächsten fünf minuten werden daher nicht transkribiert>

A: ich habe ihnen ja erzählt dass ich mir das auch in wiener schulen anschau wo sehr viele kinder mit migrationshintergrund sind. glauben sie dass da der englisch unterricht sehr anders abläuft was jetzt english only oder verwendung der muttersprache betrifft.

B: naja ich denke mir dass das für den lehrer sicherlich schwieriger ist weil (.) so wie ich es auch aus etlichen (.) aus, aus den seminaren kenne wo ich in wien war ist teilweise schon eine sehr bunte Mischung drin also aus aller herren länder und erm ich denke mir einmal wenn ma da den also erm den gemeinsamen nenner dann finden kann erm englisch dann wird es noch gehen aber ich glaube dass es für den lehrer relativ beschwerlich ist weil der ja im endeffekt ja das gleiche problem hat wie ich. ich habe allerdings nur eine fachfremde sprache nämlich dann das deutsch drin und der hat von mir aus albanisch, indisch, chinesisches, was weiß ich was alles, swaheli und erm die kinder schauen ja wahrscheinlich wenn er dann nur englisch spricht ähnlich wie meine wenn sie gewisse sachen nicht verstehen erm und dann glaube ich wird es schon sehr mühsam das so stark herunterzubrechen dass man (.) dass einem dann das letzte kind auch noch versteht was man eigentlich will. also ich denke schon dass das relativ schwierig ist. also ich denke einmal dass ich mir da relativ leicht tue weil meine kinder reden alle deutsch und dann haben wir halt englisch als unterrichtssprache (2) mehr oder weniger. also ich denke dass, dass es für die kollegen aus wien erm wesentlich schwieriger ist erm da etwas weiterzubringen. glaube ich.

A: ja. es ist sicher nicht einfach. überhaupt weil in der literatur, ich habe mich jetzt viel eingelesen die tendenz dahin geht dass man sagt soll im endeffekt im unterricht integriert werden. dass man zum beispiel sagt man gibt ihnen language time outs wo zum beispiel die zwei türkischen kinder miteinander kurz erm türkisch reden dürfen oder man macht eine language of the week wo jede sprachgruppe einmal ein paar vokabeln vorstellen darf und mit englisch kombinieren. glauben sie dass das umsetzbar ist wenn man selber nur deutsch spricht?

B: also ich denke einmal dass die anforderung da an den kollegen oder an die kollegin schon ganz enorm ist weil erm erstens gewisse dinge sind klar zu machen also wie gesagt ich behelfe mir dann halt mit der muttersprache der kinder erm mit deutsch erm und dann geht das relativ flott. und ich denke dass da halt der aufwand enorm ist und unterm strich wahrscheinlich (.) ich weiß es nicht ich nehme es jetzt einmal nur an aber ich sage dass die sicherlich mit dem fortkommen in der, in der, in der fremdsprache also in englisch da bei weitem benachteiligt sind also dass das bei weitem nicht so schnell geht vor allem wenn ich jetzt in kleineren gruppen irgendwo unterrichte die würden teilweise sicher in ihre muttersprache zurückfallen. wobei man auf der anderen seite wieder die chance hat und sagt okay ich mische von mir aus das swaheli kind mit einem türken und mit einem griechen und dann müssen sie miteinander schauen dass sie miteinander zurecht

kommen. erm also es gibt sicherlich gewisse chancen die man da nutzen kann, wo man sich etwas überlegen kann aber ich denke dass das für die kolleginnen und kollegen schon ein gewaltiger aufwand ist und vor allen dingen wenn du nur englisch und deutsch sprichst. vielleicht kann jemand noch türkisch dazu dann tut er sich mit den paar türkischen kindern leichter die noch drin sind aber, aber alle anderen (.) also ich finde das schon einen extremen aufwand und sehr sehr schwierig. also ich finde das (.) wobei ich sagen muss im endeffekt ich würde mir halt wünschen dass die kinder generell so wie man es in amerika und in kanada verlangt dass die zumindest einmal die grundlagen in, in deutsch und in der sprache des gastlandes dann auch beherrschen und dass man halt dafür Sorge tragen muss dass die das irgendwie mitbekommen und dass man auch die familien da mit einbindet.

A: ja das ist sehr schwierig was ich da so mitbekommen habe.

B: ich glaube schon. es ist ein ganz ganz schwieriges pflaster weil es auch die kulturellen unterschiede sind. man sollte zumindest wirklich eine gemeinsame sprache haben die alle können aber (2) das wäre halt die sprache des gastlandes wahrscheinlich einmal primär und dann würde man sich auch im englisch unterricht wahrscheinlich leichter tun. aber da gibt es wahrscheinlich so viele blickrichtungen und blickwinkel wie man da darauf schauen kann. das kann auf der einen seite sicher eine chance sein erm aber ob sie jetzt das (2) ob die kinder jetzt in der leistung mit unseren im dem sinn direkt vergleichbar sind oder nicht am schluss? wobei man auch da sagen muss was müssen sie können nicht? also da ist mit den standards ist es glaub ich schon ganz gut dass es also dass man sagt man setzt so gewisse mindeststandards eben und wobei sich vielleicht unsere da ein bisschen leichter tun als die kinder. die haben da sicherlich die größeren probleme. und da kann sich der kollege oder die kollegin auch auf den kopf stellen. also das wird sehr mühsam sein.

A: ja. es ist schwierig. also sie versuchen halt was ich bis jetzt mitbekommen haben den großteil auf englisch zu machen weil es halt nicht anders geht, weil sie oft weder deutsch noch ihre muttersprache entsprechend beherrschen. und eben in der literatur ist leicht gesagt alle sprachen integrieren aber praktisch ist es eben eine andere frage und ich kann das sowieso nicht beurteilen weil ich noch nicht einmal im berufsleben stehe.

B: nein und du hast im prinzip ja nur vier stunden jetzt da in der woche oder drei. wobei sie wahrscheinlich wenn sie zwölf dreizehn sind im klassenverband so viel deutsch gelernt haben dass man da schon dann wieder zurückgreifen kann. also ich habe nie an so einer schule unterrichtet und bei uns sind die paar kinder, die ausländerkinder die wir haben, die siehst du gar nicht. die fallen überhaupt nicht auf.

A: und die sind gut integriert wahrscheinlich und können gut deutsch.

B: die sind alle integriert. ja, ja. also die fallen auch nicht auf. von dem her. ich habe selber kosovo albaner drin gehabt in meiner klasse aber die fallen überhaupt nicht auf. also das sind kinder die sind ganz genau wie unsere auch. problematisch wird es halt dann glaube ich wenn der druck so groß ist und du hast so viele verschiedene. also das glaube ich ist schwierig. aber ein ausländerproblem haben wir überhaupt nicht.

A: so jetzt habe ich noch eine letzte frage und zwar sehen sie generell die verwendung der muttersprache im englisch unterricht als vor- oder nachteil was jetzt die entwicklung der englischen sprache betrifft?

B: ich würde es im prinzip schon als vorteil sehen weil ich sage okay ich habe immer noch eine ausweichmöglichkeit erm wenn anweisungen oder, oder (.) weiß nicht dinge nicht verstanden werden dann habe ich eine ausweiche wo ich sagen kann okay dann kann ich dem (.) muss ich das kind jetzt nicht mit einem fragezeichen über dem kopf stehen lassen sondern kann über den umweg der muttersprache dinge erklären die es nicht versteht. erm und ich denke dass die, die auswirkungen da nicht so groß sind wenn ich etwas muttersprache miteinfließen lasse einfach deshalb weil ich auch sage in der dritten und vierten klasse haben wir drei stunden englisch und in der ersten, zweiten haben wir vier stunden englisch also im prinzip ist es ja wenig (2) also wenn ich heute erm kinder wirklich viel zum sprechen bringen will ist im prinzip sind ja drei stunden englisch in der woche das ist einfach unterm strich zu wenig. und da muss ich glaub ich manchmal dann auch der kürze halber auf gewisse sachen zurück greifen die vom alten schema her erm rühren und wo ich einfach sage okay gewisse wörter muss man einfach lernen. punkt. erm und weil ohne worte habe ich auch keine sprache. und bei der grammatik ist es das gleiche. es sind viele dinge nett wo man sagt okay man kann das über viele verschiedene wege eintrainieren aber man muss (.)

mit drei vier stunden tue ich mir da halt oft hart. zumindest halt ist das noch in meinem denken verankert so erm dass man eben in gewisser weise mit unter zeitdruck steht.

A: mhm. und glauben sie dass das weniger wird, dieses switchen, in der vierten klasse zum beispiel als in der ersten oder ist das dort genauso ein thema?

B: erm. es gibt also so wie ich es jetzt bei mir habe in der vierten klasse da muss ich relativ viel hin und her switchen weil da habe ich eine zweite und dritte leistungsgruppe beieinander und dann habe ich noch ein integrationskind drin also da ist relativ viel. in der vierten klasse erste leistungsgruppe habe ich relativ wenig gebrauch gemacht aber gewisse sachen sind auch.

- A: gut. okay. erm wie viele sprachen sprichst du?
B: zwei. deutsch und englisch.
A: deutsch und englisch. okay. und wie stufst du deine englisch kenntnisse ein.
B: mit den a niveaus?
A: genau.
B: erm. puh. erm b2.
A: okay.
B: b2 ist matura niveau? ich weiß es jetzt gerade nicht.
A: b2, b2. b2 ist matura niveau.
B: und dann kommt c1?
A: dann kommt c1.
B: also ich würde dann schon sagen zwischen B2 und C1.
A: okay. und wie lange arbeitest du schon als lehrerin? wie lange unterrichtest du schon?
B: ich bin jetzt (.) im februar waren es zehn jahre.
A: zehn jahre. okay. wie viele mädchen und wie viele burschen sind denn in deiner klasse?
B: dreizehn mädchen und zwölf buben.
A: dreizehn und zwölf. und weißt du wie viele verschiedene sprachen die sprechen?
B: hm. sagen wir mal ich hab kein einziges österreichisches kind in meiner klasse.
A: [kein einziges österreichisches]
B: [also wir haben keine muttersprache deutsch.] und ich glaub es sind so um die –
A: ungefähr, circa.
B: acht bis zehn müssen es sein. wenn nicht sogar mehr.
A: acht bis zehn.
B: verschiedene ja.
A: und hast du eine ahnung wie die deutschkenntnisse der schüler sind? hat das irgendeinen einfluss auf deine –
B: sehr schwach. ja erm die kinder können weder ihre eigene muttersprache noch eben deutsch so gut dass sie teilweise dem unterricht nicht folgen können.
A: wie wirkt sich das auf deinen englisch unterricht aus? spielt –
B: na englisch ist einfach weil ich versuche kaum ein deutsches wort zu verwenden also es gibt bei mir keine deutschen wörter. auch an der tafel nur ganz ganz selten. wir machen alles mit bild und wort weil die kinder es eben (.) dann müssen sie das deutsche und das englische lernen.
A: ja. das ist mir aufgefallen. also du verwendest großteils englisch. wenn du einen prozentsatz angeben müsstest wie viel wäre das ungefähr? [deutsch und englisch. das verhältnis.]
B: [also ich glaub schon das wir] (.) dass ich achtzig prozent ist auf jeden fall also jetzt in den ersten und zweiten klassen ist es fast mehr. in dritte und vierte wird's manchmal dann wenn's komplizierter wird quasi dass man dann ins deutsche switcht.
A: okay. wann glaubst du switcht du ins deutsche?
B: eigentlich wenn ich merke dass die kinder keine ahnung haben wovon ich rede. zuerst versuch ich immer alles mit bildern und englischen erklärungen, und händen und füßen zu erklären und wenn das nicht hilft dann switze ich. genau.
A: okay. wo (.) wann kommt das hauptsächlich vor?
B: erm puh wenn's um vokabeln geht oder auch in der grammatik zum beispiel. wenn sie strukturen nicht verstehen weil sie es einfach auch aus dem deutschen nicht kennen. also die kinder tun sich total schwer.
A: okay. erm weißt du wie das andere kollegen von dir so handhaben?
B: in englisch [mit der deutschen sprache?]
A: [genau in englisch mit der deutschen sprache.]
B: puh. schwierig. weil wir zur zeit sehr viele ungeprüfte auch haben die gar keine lehrer sind. mhm. also wir sind zur zeit zwei geprüfte lehrer an der schule. also in englisch. und die andere englisch lehrerin die erzählt oft geschichten und switcht dann sehr schnell auch ins deutsche. aber prinzipiell

erm sollte man versuchen so viel englisch wie möglich zu sprechen. also eigentlich nur englisch soweit es möglich ist.

A: also hat es auf alle fälle etwas mit der proficiency [sag ich jetzt einmal der lehrer zu tun.]

B: [ja, ja, ja, ja, ja, ja.]

A: und wie schaut das von seiten der schüler aus? tolerierst du es wenn sie englisch erm deutsch sprechen?

B: ja. natürlich. wir versuchen es dann halt immer naja und was heißt das jetzt auf englisch. what does it mean in englisch. einfach so dann zu überspielen quasi.

A: okay und wie wäre es wenn sie in ihrer eigenen muttersprache sprechen. kommt das auch vor bei dir? dass die kinder untereinander in türkisch oder in –

B: also prinzipiell haben wir hier in der schule die regel dass wir deutsch miteinander sprechen. also das gilt auch in der pause. alles was mit schule zu tun hat sprechen die kinder deutsch miteinander und werden auch von uns darauf hingewiesen quasi nicht in ihrer muttersprache zu sprechen.

A: dass ist mir nämlich heute auch aufgefallen dass sehr wenige andere sprachen von den kindern selbst gesprochen werden.

B: ja weil wir einfach so viele verschiedenen muttersprachen haben dass es kaum möglich ist.

A: was glaubst du dass es für kinder für funktionen hat eben ins deutsche zu wechseln?

B: weil es für sie wahrscheinlich einfacher ist, weil's einfach die sprache ist die sie tagtäglich auch benutzen oder die wir auch in den meisten anderen fächern auch benutzen aber ich mache immer wieder die erfahrungen gerade in englisch wenn wir in der ersten klassen beginnen und nur auf englisch sprechen und ich dann am ende sag bye, bye see your tomorrow dann antworten sie auch auf englisch. also wenn man das spielerisch in den tagesablauf auch miteinplant also in meiner klasse begrüße ich egal ob es jetzt englisch ist oder irgendeine andere stunde immer auf englisch. also die sind das gewohnt. und ich sag dann am ende auch immer bye, bye. see your tomorrow or see you later. also ich versuche die englische sprache schon einzubauen und spielerisch und das taugt den kindern. und was halt auch für die leistungen sich positiv auswirkt ist dass wir alle auf dem selben level beginnen. ich fang von vorne an. ich setze nichts voraus. wir fangen bei null an und das heißt alle kinder kommen auf alle fälle mit.

A: okay und das hat nichts zu tun mit ihrer ersprache. du versuchst das so gut wie möglich –

B: genau. alle auf englisch. alle schauen das bild an und das englische wort. egal ob deutsch türkisch (.) die wörter sind mir dann egal.

A: und kannst du vergleiche ziehen zum beispiel zwischen kindern (.) jetzt nicht in der klasse aber in anderen vielleicht wo kinder deutsch als muttersprache sprechen und welche die andere muttersprachen haben. sind die leistungsmäßig unterschiedlich?

B: wir haben hier kaum kinder die deutsch als muttersprache haben. achtundneunzig prozent kinder mit nicht deutscher muttersprache [an der schule.]

A: [okay.]

B: wirklich ganz vereinzelt nur und die sind halt dann meistens auch aus einer unteren schicht die wenig förderung (.) wenig unterstützung von zu hause auch bekommen.

A: okay das heißt das ist bei euch kein thema.

B: ganz genau.

A: okay. wie war das bei dir wo du selber in der schule warst? kannst du dich erinnern ist da viel deutsch gesprochen worden?

B: in der englisch stunde?

A: in der englisch stunde. ja.

B: ja. sehr viel.

A: sehr viel?

B: mhm. also ich hab eine ganz normale ahs gemacht und das war alles frontal. also da gab es so spiele wie wir heute gemacht haben gar nicht. nein. nein. ganz klassisch sie saß vorne.

A: übersetzt wahrscheinlich?

B: genau ich musst auch dann auf englisch also so vokabel tests machen mit englisch deutsch. das gibt's bei mir auch nicht. nein. das gibt's bei uns nicht. oder auch so vokabellisten schreiben. links steht das englische rechts das deutsche. das gibt's bei mir auch nicht.

A: wie handhabst du das?

B: wir machen das mit picture dictionaries. also wir haben sie kriegen zu jedem thema quasi erm bilder von den gegenständen und schreiben das englische wort darunter.

- A: aha. okay.
- B: und auch eigentlich bis hinauf in die vierte machen wir das. sicher wenn wir dann mal in der vierten eine artikel oder so lesen und sie sollen mit den wörterbuch arbeiten und sich wörter die sie nicht kennen raussuchen die dürfen sie dann schon englisch deutsch hinschreiben. aber das ist eher selten. also wir machen alles eher bild und wort.
- A: und da gibt's keine verständnisprobleme bei schularbeiten zum beispiel oder bei den angaben beispielsweise?
- B: nein. das wird vorher so trainiert dass das bei der schularbeit kein problem sein sollte. und wenn es darum geht quasi verständnis abzufragen weil wir fragen auch keine vokabeln ab ich darf auch keine picture dictionaries zur schularbeit geben da geht es dann eher um die anwendung quasi die wir vorher üben wo sie wörter einsetzen müssen oder so. ja.
- A: bist du während deiner ausbildung (.) während deiner lehrausbildung darauf vorbereitet worden dass du klassen unterrichten wirst wo fast niemand deutsch spricht als muttersprache also sehr multilinguale klassen? ist das irgendwann einmal ein thema gewesen?
- B: nein. eigentlich gar nicht. nein. es war schon immer die tendenz da dass sie gesagt haben ja es wird nicht so einfach sein. es wird schwierig. aber dass ich so viele kinder hab die nicht deutsch als muttersprache haben liegt halt auch am bezirk. man wusste ja vorher nicht wo man hinkommt quasi.
- A: glaubst du dass man das erm–
- B: vorher weiß?
- A: ja überhaupt dass man lernt damit umzugehen. [dass man vorbereitet wird sowohl theoretisch als auch praktisch.]
- B: [unbedingt. ja.] also ich find überhaupt gehört viel mehr in die ausbildung hinein was dann später realität wird. <inhalt schweift vom thema ab und wird daher nicht transkribiert.>
- A: erm weißt du zum beispiel wie multilingulismus und die verwendung der muttersprache im lehrplan [festgelegt ist?]
- B: [verankert ist?]hm. erm. es ist schon ein kriterium glaub ich. also ein teil des lehrplans es mit in den unterricht einfließen zu lassen. erm also wir machen das eher in so sachen zum beispiel wir lesen märchen in verschiedenen sprachen. also das hab ich selber mal gemacht mit den kindern.
- A: im englisch unterricht jetzt oder?
- B: nein. also ich hab eine lesestunde und da haben wir jetzt märchen auf verschiedenen sprachen gelesen zum beispiel. also eher im anderen unterricht. in englisch hab ich eigentlich kaum andere sprachen außer englisch.
- A: okay. erm wie funktioniert das dann wenn du sagst ihr lest sie auf verschiedenen sprachen? tust du dir da schwer weil du verstehst ja die sprachen nicht.
- B: nein. wir haben das so gemacht dass immer ein teil (.) also ich hab ein buch wo die sprachen schon drin stehen. und da liest ein kind das deutsche, eines das englische, eines das serbische, und eines das türkische.
- A: aha okay.
- B: also das ist immer ein part wird auf quasi vier sprachen gelesen.
- A: okay das klingt aber interessant.
- B: ja. sehr gut. nur viele kinder können ihre eigene muttersprache gar nicht so gut lesen. und im lesen hapert es überhaupt bei unseren kindern.
- A: generell, siehst du die verwendung der muttersprache im englisch unterricht eher als vorteil oder nachteil.
- B: also ich bin eher eine die sagt wir sprechen wenn wir englisch haben nur englisch. also keine andere sprache. weder deutsch noch eine andere muttersprache. aber das liegt glaub ich einfach daran dass wir hier einfach die regel haben dass wir deutsch oder englisch sprechen und damit ist für mich auch klar dass ich im englisch unterricht englisch spreche. und eigentlich auch für die kinder weil es wird dann zu kompliziert wann sollen sie jetzt welche sprache anwenden und ich verstehe sie nicht also ja. ich glaub eher in deutsch als zweitsprache zum beispiel. da wird eher darauf geachtet dass sie das wort in ihrer muttersprache benennen können, auf deutsch benennen können. da fließt das mehr ein. aber das haben halt nur wenig kinder bei uns das deutsch als zweitsprache. das sind nur kinder die quasi direkt aus einem anderen land herkommen und gar kein wort deutsch sprechen.

- A: glaubts du wäre das einfacher umzusetzen in klassen wo der großteil deutsch als muttersprache hat. glaubst du ist da das unterrichten einfacher oder –
- B: also für englisch glaub ich ist es egal ob sie deutsch oder eine andere sprache als muttersprache haben weil eben alle bei null anfangen. aber ich glaube wenn es ums deutsche geht wäre es schon sehr sinnvoll dass quasi mehr deutschsprachige kinder in der klasse sind damit die kinder auch die vorbilder haben. weil bei uns können sie gar nicht deutsch lernen weil sie haben nur uns lehrer als vorbilder. als sprachvorbilder. weil alle anderen kinder sprechen auch ihr eigenes deutsch würd ich sagen. das ist das problem. und da wir eben nur klassen haben wo kein einziges kind richtig deutsch sprechen kann haben die keine vorbilder. auch am nachmittag nicht. die sind immer unter ihresgleichen. ja also sehr schwierig.
- A: in der literatur habe ich gelesen geht ja die tendenz da hin dass man alle muttersprachen auch im sprachenunterricht zum beispiel integriert indem man beispielsweise eine language of the week einführt, wo man bestimmte wörter in einer anderen sprache lernt oder ihnen so language time outs nennt man das gibt wo man sagt okay die die türkisch sprechen dürfen kurz auf türkisch sprechen um ungereimtheiten zu klären oder wie auch immer oder man darf verschiedene bilinguale dictionaries verwenden. könntest du dir soetwas vorstellen?
- B: bilinguale dictionaries bekommen die kinder einmal in den vier jahren.
- A: nur auf englisch deutsch?
- B: nein. deutsch und ihre muttersprache. diese wörterbuecher bekommen sie einmal im jahr.
- A: aber in englisch gibt es soetwas -
- B: nein. nein. haben wir gar nicht.
- A: ich habe zum beispiel überhaupt keine erfahrung. ich kann diese theoretischen sachen schwer einschätzen wenn man zum beispiel sagt man macht jetzt so time outs wo sie einfach untereinander ihre sprache reden dürfen. glaubst du lässt sich das irgendwie umsetzen?
- B: also ich glaub schon es ist schon auch wichtig und das machen wir schon auch dass wir die kulturen quasi in der klasse in den unterricht miteinfließen lassen. ja. erm und dass ich ihnen so gruppenarbeiten geb und sag okay ihr präsentiert zum beispiel euer land und dürft da auf türkisch auch untereinander sprechen. ja. es ist schwierig weil wir einfach darauf pochen dass sie einfach deutsch sprechen lernen.
- A: okay. das ist quasi die schulphilosophie die das sehr beeinflusst.
- B: ja. wobei wir natürlich schon die kulturen (.) also wir haben zum beispiel gemacht eine nacht der kulturen wo wir die kinder im traditionellen gewand zum beispiel gebeten haben zu kommen, ihr traditionelles essen. also wir berücksichtigen das schon. wir lassen sie auch viel erzählen über ihr land oder wo sie herkommen. oder auch die kinder die flüchten können ihre geschichte erzählen aber dass ich in englisch sag (3) also da hab ich auch eigentlich wenig erfahrung mit der muttersprache.
- A: okay.
- B: also dass sie ihr land zum beispiel darstellen ja und dass sie zum beispiel auch bei den kel-gesprächen also bei den kinder eltern lehrer gesprächen dass sie zum beispiel sachen die ihnen wichtig sind auf ihrer sprache erm sagen dürfen oder auch zählen also die zahlen von eins bis zehn oder so das machen wir schon. aber im englischunterricht geht es mir prinzipiell ums englische.
- A: ums englische. okay. das steht bei dir im vordergrund. erm dann noch eine letzte frage dann bin ich eh schon fertig. dieses switchen glaubst du ist das eher ein phänomen das in den lower levels auftritt also wenn die kinder noch nicht sehr gut englisch sprechen können oder ist das später auch noch ein thema?
- B: also ich glaub gerade bei den kleinen geht es eher darum dass sie zeigen können was (.) dass sie auch englisch sprechen können. dass sie da irgendwie stolz darauf sind am anfang. erm später glaub ich ist es weil es einfach zu mühsam ist (.) mir fällt das wort jetzt gerade nicht ein. ich switche jetzt und sag es einfach auf deutsch. aber ich glaub schon dass es auch darauf ankommt wie der lehrer das quasi handhabt. weil wenn ich immer auf englisch quasi antworte wenn das kind sagt weiß ich nicht kann ich aufs klo gehen dann sag ich i can't understand you oder so. quasi dass sie daran schon merken okay du musst auf englisch fragen sonst stoßt du bei mir auf taube ohren.
- A: also diese vorbildfunktion [ist deiner meinung nach sehr wichtig.]
- B: [ja, ja, ja.] also ich glaub eher dass es diese faulheit geschichte ist. dass ich jetzt nicht weiss was es heißt und es leichter ist auf deutsch weiß ich es und sag es einfach. (3) glaub ich. <lacht.>

A: nein. das ist auf alle fälle ein punkt. und hast du sonst noch irgendwelche anmerkungen zu dem thema oder hast du an mich irgendwelche fragen?
B: erm so schnell nein. fällt mir eigentlich nichts ein. nein.
A: okay. dann bedanke ich mich für's interview.
B: bitte gerne.
A: eine frage hätte ich doch noch. die ist irgendwie untergegangen.
B: <lacht> kein problem.
A: und zwar verfolgst du aktuelle entwicklungen im bereich language teaching bzw. fachdidaktik?
B: ja natürlich. ich besuche viele seminare. außerdem schau ich mir viele you tube videos an um eben ideen für den unterricht zu bekommen.
A: okay. das war's. danke.
B: bitte.

- A: also ich schaue mir im rahmen meiner diplomarbeit ja an welche sprachen im englischunterricht verwendet werden. zuerst vielleicht kurz wie viele sprachen sprechen sie denn?
- B: ich spreche deutsch englisch französisch persisch und ein bisschen italienisch und persisch deshalb weil ich selbst halbperserin bin und mein mann perser ist also ich hab selber so einen multikulti background sozusagen.
- A: interessant. und ihre englischkenntnisse wie würden sie die einschätzen?
- B: die sind jetzt leider gottes ein bisschen schlechter geworden hab ich bemerkt. nein ich muss ganz ehrlich sagen ich muss unterscheiden zwischen dem englisch was ich in der schule spreche und dem englisch was ich privat spreche. ich habe sehr viele englischsprachige freunde also hauptsächlich aus amerika da rede ich mit denen rede ich anders ja. schneller und auch anderes vokabular. sie haben es vielleicht eh gemerkt ich muss dauernd runterschrauben das ist so furchtbar das ist wirklich schwierig ja. auch in einem gymnasium redet man anders englisch aber ich muss echt für die kinder runterschrauben das fällt mir teilweise sehr schwer. vielleicht haben sie es bemerkt manchmal habe ich mich ein bisschen eingekriegt kurz überlegt erm so kann ich das jetzt nicht sagen.
- A: nein ich glaube dass ist nur ihnen -
- B: und das ist das ist das ist echt schwierig das ist wirklich schwierig erm aber ansonsten glaub ich kann ich englisch recht gut. es interessiert mich sehr ich bin sehr an englisch sprachigen ländern war auch in australien amerika kanada weiß gott wo überall erm hab auch wie gesagt sehr viel kontakt mit native speakers schaue falls es also ich lese bücher von englischen autoren nur in der originalsprache also immer schon und egal ob das jetzt irgendwelche herz schmerz romane sind oder wurscht ja und versuche auch soweit möglich also früher war es leichter da habe ich mehr zeit gehabt aber dass ich mir viel mehr im original anschau.
- A: also b oder c nach den sprachniveaus?
- B: eher c hätt ich gesagt. also ohne mich überschätzen zu wollen.
- A: okay.
- B: ich glaub man kann c sagen. also ich verstehe es mühelos das ist überhaupt kein problem und sprechen kann ich auch. wie gesagt nur da muss ich mich immer ein bissl runterschrauben. <lacht>
- A: ist verständlich.
- B: und deutsch im übrigen auch. also das ist nicht nur in englisch das ist in deutsch auch so.
- A: und wie viele jahre unterrichten sie schon?
- B: dreißig jahre.
- A: dreißig jahre.
- B: also ich bin jetzt im dreißigsten dienstjahr wobei achtundzwanzig jahre an dieser schule. <B schweift vom thema ab sechzig sekunden werden daher nicht transkribiert.>
- A: wissen sie wie viele verschiedene sprachen von ihrer schülern gesprochen werden?
- B: also in der klasse das ist ja nicht meine klasse gewesen aber türkisch, serbisch, bosnisch, albanisch erm farsi also persisch, zwei sind afghanen erm in meiner klasse kommt dann noch urdu dazu erm also wir haben eigentlich ganz ganz ganz viele also jetzt glaub ich haben wir in der ganzen schule fünf oder sechs muttersprachler deutsch. ja also wir haben wirklich aus aller herren länder haben wir die sprachen aber hauptsächlich ist es türkisch serbisch bosnisch kroatisch also bks und eben dann noch albanisch sehr viel und ja polnisch auch ein paar ja und dann noch tschetschenisch weil sehr viele tschetschenische schüler gekommen sind und in letzter zeit natürlich auch arabisch weil sehr viele syrische flüchtlinge zu uns kommen.
- A: und wie schaut es zum beispiel in der klasse jetzt aus wo ich war?
- B: in der wo sie jetzt waren?
- A: genau. ungefähr.
- B: also wartens einmal da sind die vier türken (6) ich glaub sechs türken (3) also ungefähr drei vier albaner also kinder die albanisch sprechen zwei die farsi also persisch sprechen erm serbisch auch ein paar das werden zehn sein schätz ich mal ja.
- A: also sind es vier fünf verschiedene?
- B: ja vier fünf verschiedene sprachen.

- A: und wie schaut es mit den deutschkenntnissen dieser kinder aus?
- B: also es sind zwei (.) bulgarisch ist auch noch dabei übrigens erm zwei nein wie viel sind es drei die sind erst gekommen außerordentlich die das ist ein aphgane und eine bulgarische türkin und zwei sind es genau die gehen allerdings in den hiesigen deutschkurs wir haben einen deutschkurs den macht die kollegin. deutsch für also daz deutsch als zweitsprache die sich da auch sehr engagiert und sehr reinhaut und die lernen das eigentlich in kürzester zeit und erm es ist so dass wir sie ja benoten können in den fächern wo es geht also wenn ich sehe was weiß ich ich hab einen in meiner klasse der ist jetzt aus serbien gekommen der kann perfekt englisch der redet und schreibt super englisch ja den kann ich natürlich eine note geben das ist klar aber natürlich schwierig wird's dann in so fächern wie weiß ich nicht deutsch klarerweise oder geschichte oder geographie und so bevor wir ihm eine schlechte note geben geben wir nicht beurteilt weil er eh noch außer ordentlich ist also ich muss ihn ja nicht benoten aber es ist natürlich nett weil um die kinder auch ein bissl zu motivieren und in englisch kann ich den einen schüler bei mir absolut positiv benoten der bekommt einen einser weil er wirklich gut ist.
- A: also hängt das zusammen oder ist das wichtig im englischunterricht dass die schüler deutsch können?
- B: nein das nicht also in englisch hab ich da einen sonderstatus gott sei dank. es ist natürlich ein bisschen schwierig ich mein der hat offenbar in serbien ganz toll englisch gelernt ja. für die anderen ist es natürlich ein bisschen schwierig weil die müssen jetzt einmal deutsch lernen erm so und dann englisch auch noch und viele die kommen hatten keinen ausreichenden englischunterricht also wenn überhaupt und das ist dann schwierig weil und dann sag ich dann immer so passts auf lass ma das englisch mal ein bisschen beiseite schauts mal dass ihr dem unterricht folgen könnt und das deutsch mal so halbwegs auf die reihe kriegts und dann schauen wir dann tun wir das englisch ein bissl aufbauen. also da versuche ich sie nicht zu überfordern. ja also wenn ich merke der is vollig (.) kennt sich gar nicht mehr aus dann lasse ich das ein bissl und sag du schau du kannst ruhig im englisch unterricht deine deutsch sachen machen da habe ich persönlich nichts dagegen und erm dass er das einmal dass er da einmal mitkommt und dann langsam langsam führ ich ihn dann an das englische heran.
- A: also sie sprechen sowohl englisch als auch deutsch im englischunterricht?
- B: ja ja ja schon. manchmal mehr manchmal weniger. zum beispiel wenn ich eine grammatik erkläre ist es geht's nicht auf englisch aber das habe ich früher probiert das ist völlig über die kinder hinweg das verstehen sie auf deutsch nicht was ich von ihnen will. <lacht> und wenn ich dann womöglich anfang das ist nichts. aber zum beispiel irgendwelche so wie heute so themen allgemeine themen oder landeskunde sowieso das ist ja eh klar dass ich das nur auf englisch mach das natürlich das ist klar oder auch so classroom phrases also open the books und was weiß ich take out your school exercise books oder was weiß ich put it in the correct order das natürlich schon das sind so classroom phrases oder stand up sit down open the window switch on the light oder was das ist eh klar aber wenn es eine sehr komplexe sache ist dann mache ich es auf deutsch weil das hat überhaupt keinen sinn bei meinen schülern da mit englisch zu kommen und wenn es wie gesagt landeskunde also usa oder london oder was weiß ich oder christmas oder so irgendwas das mach ich natürlich auf englisch. wir haben jetzt auch erm vor einem monat oder was haben wir romeo and juliet gemacht also shakespeare ein bissl einen block und dann ja das ist außertourlich das ist im buch nicht drinnen das hat ihnen sehr gefallen und wir haben uns dann sogar diese verfilmung mitn leonardo di caprio haben wir uns dann sogar auf englisch allerdings mit deutschen untertiteln angeschaut also ehrlich gestanden wir haben die schlüsselszenen so gemacht das andere haben wir auf deutsch das war schon schwierig genug wenn die da in der originalsprache reden dann haben sie gefragt reden die den ganzen film so <lacht> und die und die balkonszene und diese sachen das haben wir dann schon auf englisch weil ich mir denk das müssen sie einmal gehört haben was das für eine schöne sprache ist. hat ihnen irrsinnig gefallen wenn das dann in so einem modernen setting ist und die alte sprache und das passt irgendwie und die ganze gschicht irgendwie und das hat sie sehr berührt.
- A: das kann ich mir vorstellen.
- B: und da wenn ich mir denk dass sie in ihrem leiben nie mehr irgendwas davon hören haben wir gesagt dass sie es einmal wenigstens gehört haben und dass und vom shakespeare auch ein bissl die zeit mit dem globe theater das hat ihnen das hab ich ihnen geschildert wie die schauspieler halt waren dass das nur männer waren und so das hat ihnen sehr gut gefallen also das hat sie sehr vor

allem weil die kollegin der klassenvorstand von der klasse wo wir heute waren die hat die theatergruppe bei uns also einige kinder spielen auch theater und das war für sie auch interessant zu sehen dass das gar nicht so weit weg ist die shakespeare bühne von dem was sie machen also das war irgendwie eine nette sache ja. das hat uns auch spaß gemacht.

A: das denke ich mir ein bisschen eine abwechslungs.

B: genau mal was anderes.

A: erm fallen ihnen sonst noch außer grammatik irgendwelche (2) [situationen ein wo sie auf deutsch sprechen?]

B: [wo ich auf deutsch spreche] also ich muss ihnen ehrlich sagen wenn ich merke dass sie sehr müde sind oder ausgelaugt oder es war irgendwie eine schularbeit an dem tag oder so irgendwie oder es sind irgendwelche anderen umstände oder irgendwie ist die stimmung in der klasse schlecht sage ich ihnen ganz ehrlich in meinem eigenen interesse da mach ich es dann auf deutsch oder hauptsächlich auf deutsch. weil dann überanstrengung ich sie so und dann flippen sie aus und das muss man natürlich auch bedenken dass sie nur zu einem gewissen maß belastbar sind auch die großen bei den kleinen ist es ja noch viel mehr ja und da und wenn ich da jetzt noch kommen würde und sie und sie also wie gesagt so phrases das ist eh immer auf englisch aber wenn ich sie da jetzt noch bombardieren tät mit irgendwelchen sachen dann driften sie mir völlig ab und machen nichts mehr ja und ich hab früher noch vor vielen jahren hab ich den hab ich mir gedacht nein das mach ich jetzt nur auf englisch da war dieser grundsatz so viel englisch wie möglich so viel deutsch wie nötig den kennen sie vielleicht aber ich bin für mich persönlich davon abgerückt weil es immer schwieriger wird weil auch wie soll ich sagen das klientel von uns die sind schon so damit überfordert dass sie deutsch als zweite manchmal sogar als dritte sprache haben und dann noch das sehr ähnliche englisch dazu da würde ich sie manchmal echt überfordern. ich mach das auch als selbstschutz ich gebs zu weil sonst bring ich die stunde nicht rüber und kann mich erschießen ja. und erm und des lieben friedens willen <lacht> und bequemlichkeit ich gebs zu erm mach ich es dann auf deutsch aber wenn wenn es eine erste stunde ist wenn sie alle gut drauf sind das ist klar mach ich das ist ja auch klar das merken die kinder ja auch dass ich dann auch selber anders werd oder auch wenn's für mich ist ich bin müde es ist eine fünfte stunde und die hängen nur dann denk ich mir ja das leist ich mir das ich sage heut lass ma das einmal weil das würde in jeder hinsicht völlig vorbei schießen.

A: okay und wenn sie das prozentuell einschätzen müssten also so im durchschnitt englisch deutsch dieses verhältnis?

B: also allgemein gesehen?

A: genau genau jetzt allgemein gesehen.

B: ich würd sagen sechzig fünfzig englisch.

A: sechzig vierzig.

B: ah sechzig vierzig tschuldigung ich bin keine mathematikerin <lacht> sechzig vierzig ja genau so würde ich würde ich ehrlicherweise sagen.

A: und ihre kollegen wissen sie wie die das so handhaben?

B: naja da wir ja team teaching haben erm eigentlich genau so.

A: genauso okay.

B: eigentlich genauso ja. also ich hab da eine kollegin die den daz kurs macht die sowieso sehr sprachaffin ist wir sind da beide so auf der selben wellenlänge gott sei dank also das ist das kann ich auch sagen dass es genauso ist.

A: und bei den schülern wann glauben sie wechseln die aufs deutsche?

B: eben wie gesagt wenn sie müde sind wenn sie irgendwie ausgelaugt sind wenn sie nicht wollen ja wenn ihnen das thema irgendwie überhaupt keinen spaß macht was ich natürlich auch verstehe ich muss das ehrlich sagen ich kann's nachvollziehen. es gibt ja auch ich hab jetzt zwei lehrgänge gemacht und da versteh ich sie und da quäle ich sie auch nicht. aber die kinder sie haben es vielleicht gemerkt ein paar die die in der ersten leistungsgruppe sind die zwei burschen hinten und die eine die haben es eh und die können auch von sich aus sehr gut englisch.

A: ja da ist mir aufgefallen.

B: die probieren. also die die tun das eh von selber ja und die anderen ein paar hab ich müssen echt aus der reserve locken und sie haben auch gesehen die aussprache also ich müsst ja dauernd an der aussprache herumäkeln erm das tu ich auch nur insofern wenns ganz arg ist. sie haben vielleicht gemerkt dass ich die sätze immer richtig wiederhole. das ist mir sehr wichtig ich korrigiere sie

nicht im lesefluss weil dann vergeht ihnen der spaß wenn man da dauernd sondern ich lass sie erm dann lese ich ihnen den satz noch einmal richtig vor in der hoffnung dass sie sich das merken manchmal mach ich es auch so wenns irgendwie witzig ist und das wort zum beispiel eine ganz andere bedeutung hätte oder der satz dann sag ich ihnen das w eißt du was du jetzt gerade gelesen hast weiß ich nicht keine ahnung ich bin ein trottel oder sie irgendwas <lacht> dann sag ich naja wenn du das so liest heißt das dann das dann mach ich das so auf die lustige tour. aber normalerweise ist es für mich ein grundsatz ich unterbreche sie einmal prinzipiell nicht ja einfach darum weil ich froh bin dass sie irgendwas sich trauen englisch sagen das ist ja auch eine überwindung für die kinder dass sie einen unbekannten text vor allen lesen und in dem alter macht man sich eh oft lächerlich deshalb mach ich das nicht das tu ich überhaupt nicht sondern ich sag auch nicht das hast du jetzt falsch oder das sagt man anders ich wiederhole ganz ruhig ich wiederhole den satz noch einmal und noch einmal und noch einmal weil ich mir denke vielleicht geht's dann ja doch irgendwann einmal ins ohr hinein. ja also das ist ein ganz wichtiger punkt. {B schweift zu sehr vom thema ab deshalb werden die nächsten neunzig sekunden nicht transkribiert.}

A: ist das bei ihnen in der klasse auch ein thema das die schülerinnen ihre muttersprache sprachen.

B: ja. auf jeden fall.

A: in englisch auch?

B: teilweise also wenn ich zum beispiel wenn das eine außerordentliche ein außerordentlicher schüler schülerin ist und ich merke die kommt überhaupt nicht mit dann sage ich sagst ihm das auf serbisch oder auch türkisch je nach dem.

A: also sie erlauben das sehrwohl?

B: selbstverständlich. also das ist für mich ein ganz also es gibt kollegen bei uns die das nicht so sehen die sagen nein die müssen das auf deutsch können weil (.) ich sehe das nicht so weil ich mir denke erm ich kann etwas nur in meiner muttersprache verstehen. ich geh immer von mir selber aus wenn ich in der mongolei sitze und da habe ich einen zweiten österreichischer oder deutschen sitzen und ich kenne mich überhaupt nicht aus was der da von mir auf mongolisch will und der erklärt mir das auf deutsch bin ich ja heilfroh wenn ich das in meiner muttersprache und genauso projiziere ich das auf die kinder und die sind heilfroh wenn das einer der das halbwegs durchschaut ihm das in türkisch bulgarisch oder sonst was erklärt. also ich bin das sehr ich bin da sehr erm froh wenn sie das machen wie gesagt es gibt kollegen die wir haben ab nächsten jahr übrigens ein projekt und die daz kollegin macht das die englisch kollegin box me ich weiß nicht ob sie das kennen.

A: nein das kenne ich nicht.

B: das ist so ein mehrsprachigkeitsprogramm dass man die muttersprachen fördert und auch im unterricht gezielt einsetzt sei es durch eben so oder durch social media oder was auch immer ja und da werden wir jetzt mit den nächsten ersten klassen das ganz verstärkt machen also wirklich verstärkt dass sie einfach auch erm merken man schätzt das man schätzt ihre muttersprache. leider gottes muss ich jetzt ehrlich sagen bei uns an der schule von manchen kolleginnen und kollegen wird das als makel angesehen. ich sehe das aus eigener persönlicher erfahrung nicht als makel. es ist nur ein gewinn wenn man mehrere sprachen kann und erm auch meine eigenen kinder können die zwei sprachen und erm das ist einfach man kriegt auch eine andere sehensweise oder sichtweise auf dinge. und ich verstehe leute nicht die sagen nein nur auf deutsch. das sind dann für mich persönlich ist das immer so ein dings.

A: es geht ja in der literatur immer mehr dahin das man sagt [sprachen auch im englischunterricht im sprachenunterricht integrieren.]

B: [auf jeden fall auf jeden fall.]

A: und ich habe jetzt schon einige interviews geführt und war schon in ein paar schulen und es ist wirklich noch nirgends hat sich da jemand darüber getraut.

B: aha. <lacht>

A: und erm das finde ich toll dass sie das machen.

B: na wir machen also auf jeden fall und wie gesagt dieses box me projekt das läuft jetzt also wir sind jetzt in der vorbereitungszeit und das haben wir vor mit den ersten und das haben wir auch den eltern gesagt da haben wir applaus bekommen und das war echt ganz toll von den nächsten ersten klassen weil das wirklich gerade in der heutigen zeit in der heutigen situation muss das sein weil wie gesagt weil's auch die sicht auf dinge ändert und auf sachverhalte und die kinder müssen merken dass sie gewertschätzt wie sagt man da wertgeschätzt werden jetzt nicht nur als person sondern ihre kultur wo sie herkommen ihre sprache die ganz lebensart das muss man wertschätzen

weil wenn man das nicht hat (2) das geht nicht ja schließlich haben wir ja fast nur kinder aus anderen erm also mit migrationshintergrund und mit anderem background da muss ich dem stellen da kann ich nicht sagen nein du musst nur deutsch reden das geht nicht.

A: gibt es da noch andere beispiele wie sie das integrieren? [sie sagen okay ich lasse schüler in ihrer muttersprache reden.]

B: [ja das erm (2)] so zum beispiel noch so schnell fällt mir jetzt gar nichts ein. ach ja zum beispiel eine kollegin also meine co die macht das wir haben immer das ist an und für sich zwar für die volksschule aber das ist im grunde egal da gibt's so hefte das nennt sich trio das sind so kleine hefterln da sind immer so verschiedene themen und die oder texte die sind dann immer in drei sprachen also bisnisch serbisch kroatisch und türkisch auf jeden fall und deutsch auch meistens ist dann noch eine gastsprache dabei also das ist dann rumänisch oder was weiß ich urdu oder persisch oder indisch oder hindi oder sonst irgendwas ja und das ist sehr nett und ab und zu bauen wir das in den unterricht ein. leider geht's nicht immer weil wir natürlich auch unseren stoff haben aber in welchen situationen noch zum beispiel erm

A: speziell jetzt im englischunterricht

B: ja ich überleg jetzt gerade erm ja also zum beispiel wobei das mach ich jetzt nicht (3) also eventuell aber das ist eher selten vielleicht wie (6) nein also es fällt mir jetzt so schnell gar nichts ein. also das ist jetzt das was das hauptsächliche ist ansonsten nein fällt mir jetzt eigentlich nichts ein ich bin jetzt irgendwie vernagelt. <lacht> es ist immer so wenn man das so abrufen muss.

A: aber es ist sehr interessant dass sie das tolerieren und [dass sie sagen das ist wichtig.]

B: [na absolut na sicher absolut.]

A: weil viele wie sie sagen sind NOCH nicht der meinung. vielleicht kommt da ja.

B: ich hoffe. ich glaub es wird auch ziemlich schwierig weil die dame wo wir da waren wo wir das besprochen haben der hat gesagt also es müssten alle lehrer eigentlich hinter dem projekt stehen und das wird ein bissl schwierig dann alle ins boot zu holen aber wir ziehen es trotzdem durch wir haben gesagt das ist so wichtig und spannend ja.

A: auf alle fälle. erm wie war das bei ihnen wo sie in der schule waren und englischunterricht gehabt haben war da englisch deutsch ein thema oder war da english only?

B: nein nur englisch. english only. wir haben eine englisch lehrerin gehabt die die liebe zum englisch die hat den grundstein gelegt erm english only und ja also ich kann mich nicht erinnern dass die irgendwas einmal auf deutsch gesagt hätte. es war nämlich meine deutsch professorin auch ja aber nein in englisch nur englisch und gut so muss ich sagen.

A: und während ihrer ausbildung?

B: naja also ich muss dazu sagen ich hab eigentlich ursprünglich die volksschullehrerausbildung gemacht und hab dann später also wie ich dann schon gearbeitet hab das hat sich harmonisiert genannt englisch und geographie nachgeholt sozusagen das lehramt. und da war das problem mit englisch dass das das ausgelaufen ist und wir waren vier leute und haben's dann mehr oder weniger im selbststudium gemacht und die professorin ist nach passau gegangen die war so alle paar monate in wien dann und da haben wir uns mit ihr getroffen und haben die prüfungen abgelegt aber phonetik das haben wir alles selber gelernt.

A: also sie haben so didaktikkurse und so gar nicht gehabt?

B: na da ich ja die ausbildung hatte zur volksschullehrerin war das ja jetzt nicht so ein thema es war eher phonetik und diese sachen pronunciation da bin ich gesessen und hab mir die ganzen phonetics da aus dem kropf geholt ha <lacht> also das hab ich alles im selbststudium gemacht. da war niemand da der mir gesagt hat mach das so und so. die hat nur gesagt das und das ist für die prüfung zu können und dann habe ich das gemacht. die gettysburg address vom lincoln hab ich damals transkribieren müssen das vergess ich nie. das weiß heutzutage keiner mehr was das ist aber ja also das war noch ziemlich heavy. aber gut wars weil mir ich hab das so gern gemacht weil ich das machen wollte.

A: also war das natürlich auch nie thema das sie einmal so multilinguale klassen unterrichten werden? ist man da gar nicht irgendwie vorbereitet worden?

B: gar nicht nein. also ich bin da so reingewachsen in das ganze. wobei ich sagen muss hier bei uns im sechzehnten war eigentlich immer schon wir haben sehr viele migrationskinder nur dass es klassen gibt wie meine klasse wo null muttersprachler deutsch drin sind das ist das kommt jetzt erst aber in meiner eigenen klasse habe ich keinen einzigen österreichischer drin ja. und der eine kärntner wie ich ihnen gesagt habe der war nur heute nicht da der [name] das ist der einzige österreichischer also

einzig mit muttersprache und den haben die kinder integriert sozusagen in die andere richtung ja also die haben den gleich adoptiert mit seinem süßen zungenschlag ist auch ein hübscher bursche ja also schwarm aller mädchen die haben ihn gleich in beschlag in beschlag genommen und das war auch nie ein problem und er fühlt sich auch wohl also das ist nicht so dass er als fremdkörper überhaupt nicht. das hat uns eh sehr gewundert. aber gut das ist ein gutes zeichen.

A: ja auf alle fälle. glauben sie dass da in der ausbildung mehr gemacht werden muss und dass man studenten jetzt auch erm ihnen die augen öffnet [was so multilinguale klassen betrifft und einbeziehung der verschiedenen muttersprachen?]

B: [ja auf jeden fall (.) auf jeden fall ja. auf jeden fall] also ich war ja versuchsschullehrerin lange zeit und ich hab das wobei ich sagen muss das bei meinen studenten auch selber sehr viele einen migrationsbackground hatten da muss man auch dazu sagen also wenn für die war das auch nicht so ein wirkliches thema oder so ja das war auch so selbstverständlich ja aber ja auf jeden fall muss das sein vor allem auch in den ahs weil ich sehe es bei meiner tochter die geht jetzt ins zweite gymnasium im neunzehnten bezirk die hat auch in der klasse also in der schule sind auch sehr viele kinder mit migrationshintergrund und erm da habe ich manchmal das gefühl also jetzt nicht von englisch aber in deutsch habe ich manchmal das gefühl dass da überhaupt keiner das wird einfach verlangt wurscht ob der jetzt deutsch als muttersprache hat oder nicht. ich mein die kinder reden alle perfekt deutsch ja nur ist es natürlich schon dass die eltern nicht helfen können und so das merk ich schon und ich denk mir immer ich helf ihr weil ich kann das ja alles und ich denk mir da gibt es kinder wo zu hause keiner helfen kann. und da wird auch also ich hab das gefühl nicht so bei weitem nicht so rücksicht genommen wird wie bei uns. und es gibt zwar deutsch also auch den daz kurs und so und förderkurse und so aber so wie bei uns die einstellung haben die lehrer die meisten lehrer nicht. was ich so mitkriege also jetzt nicht nicht nicht ungut dass sie ungut sind aber einfach die die denken gar nicht nach die verlangen das einfach punkt aus und das ist so und das lernst jetzt ja das mach ich nicht weil ich mir denk -

A: und glauben sie ist das die schwierigkeit bei den lehrern? dass sie vielleicht angst haben dass sie die sprache nicht verstehen wenn sie ihre muttersprache sprechen.

B: bei den ahs lehrern?

A: genau aber auch da. wenn man mehrere sprachen integriert.

B: also ich hab ja in diesen beiden lehrgängen die ich da gemacht hab waren auch ahs lehrer sehr nette kolleginnen und kollegen aber okay ich glaub einfach dass die ahs lehrer erm wie soll ich sagen die haben ja die möglichkeit zu sagen wenn du das nicht schaffst oder wenn du das nicht kapiert gehst einfach in die kms. die möglichkeit haben wir nicht. also unter uns gibt es nichts mehr. und da denk ich mir da sagen halt viele lehrer okay gut ich mach mein ding kapiert das nicht geh halt. und das das ist glaub ich der punkt dass die einfach erm die sind sehr engagiert und machen ihre sachen aber ich glaub das ist bei denen kein punkt irgendwie oder über das müssen's gar nicht so nachdenken weil sie sich denken ja dann halt nicht ja. die möglichkeit haben wir nicht wir müssen schauen dass die möglichst durchkommen und das ist glaub ich der unterschied und deshalb finde ich es in der ahs ausbildung auch sehr ich hoff dass das jetzt in der neuen lehrerbildung eben auch ein großes thema ist dass man das auch dass man auf das auch einen fokus legt. weil das ist die realität. das ist so vor allem in den städten und da kann ich nicht umhin. und wenn ich eine gemeinsame lehrerbildung habe und davon ausgehe dass einer der den bachelor hat auch in der unterstufe beziehungsweise bei uns unterrichtet dann muss der das auch machen. also auf der ph jetzt ist es ja eh thema ja oder ein bisschen zumindest aber ich glaube auf der uni nicht so wirklich. das denk ich mir.

A: nein noch nicht so wirklich.

B: erm jetzt sind wir dann gleich fertig ein paar fragen hab ich noch und zwar wie multilingualismus und die verwendung der muttersprache im lehrplan verankert ist?

A: also so weit ich weiß gar nicht. ich weiß nur eben dass es das unterrichtsprinzip interkulturelles lernen gibt das schon das ist natürlich sehr dehnbar. also unterrichtsprinzip heißt dass es möglichst in allen fächern behandelt werden sollte. jetzt nicht unbedingt als eigenes thema kann man natürlich machen es sollte halt so wie friedenserziehung und so halt immer dabei sein. jetzt kann man das ja sehr auslegen und das hab ich in meiner arbeit ja sehr gut gesehen zum beispiel war ich im gymnasium das ist jetzt auch schon wieder fünfzehn jahre her aber egal aber die haben zum beispiel austauschüler gehabt im gymnasium [name] und ich weiß nicht dieses und dieses und jenes und eine fahrt nach weiß ich wo hin und die hauptschule damals die hatten ja ihre

muttersprachlichen lehrer die gibt's ja leider nimma mehr und erm deutschunterricht und dieses und jenes also das ist wirklich gottseidank also ein sehr dehnbare sache und jede schule kann sich das auf ihr auf ihr bedürfnis oder ihre erm äußeren umstände zurecht biegen was ja okay ist aber eigentlich sollte es genauso wie sexualerziehung wie friedenserziehung wie gesundheitserziehung in jedem fach eigentlich erm rüberkommen sozusagen. und bei mir ist es ganz sicher so weil ich wie gesagt aus persönlichem background für mich ist das ein ganz wichtiger punkt.

A: wie sehen sie die muttersprache generell was jetzt die entwicklung von von der englischen sprache betrifft? als vorteil oder als nachteil?

B: auf jeden fall also ich hab so eine theorie aufgestellt. ich merk dass wenn kinder mit zehn jahren kommen aus ihrem heimatland und dort englisch hatten erm tschuldigung ihre muttersprache hatten und gut gelernt haben also ich sag immer grammatikalisiert sind ja dann tun sich die wirklich leicht weil dann wissen die in ihrer sprache was ein präsens is was eine past tense is oder sonst irgendwas okay wenn das aber einer ist der hier geboren ist aufgewachsen ist zu hause meistens redens ja eh nicht die reine sprache sondern so ein mischmasch ja dann noch womöglich irgend eine dialekt dann wird's schon schwierig weil dann kann der seine sprache eigentlich nur mündlich hat keine struktur drin also oder versteht die struktur nicht ja dann wird's schwierig. da tut man sich wirklich leicht erm schwer dem eine sprache zu vermitteln. wenn der aber seine muttersprache gelernt hat so wie in der volksschule wo der weiß das ist ein hauptwort und ba ba ba ba dann ist es wesentlich leichter und die lernen das viel schneller. und das hat jetzt auch gar nichts mit intelligenz und so zu tun dass hat einfach zu tun dass er die struktur durchschaut und wenn er das einmal durchschaut hat das ist ja im grunde in jeder sprache ähnlich oder gleich dann ist es wirklich leichter und das merke ich sehr oft also auch der in meiner klasse wo ich gesagt habe dass der so gut englisch kann das ist so ja. der hat in kürzester zeit der kann wirklich gut deutsch. also der ist im oktober oder im september gekommen mit null und ist so lieb gesessen und hat gelächelt und jetzt kann ich mich mit ihm unterhalten er versteht alles das ist ganz toll.

A: also sind so ressourcen definitiv etwas an das man anknüpfen kann im sprachenunterricht?

B: natürlich auf jeden fall auf jeden fall eine basis auf JEDEN fall.

A: mhm erm wenn sie jetzt so schulen hernehmen wie beispielsweise in kärnten wo jetzt hundert prozent kinder mit deutsch als muttersprache drin sind im englischunterricht glauben sie dass es dort einfach ist zu unterrichten als hier?

B: ich würd nicht sagen einfacher anders. <lacht>

A: anders?

B: anders. einfacher würd ich nicht sagen erm aber anders weil wie soll ich sagen erm ich kann viele dinge nicht voraussetzen ja also ich kann viele dinge mich beutelt's manchmal wenn sie mir sagen dass sie nicht wissen was ein verb ist oder irgendwas ja erm oder halt ein zeitwort. das kann ich bei deutschsprachigen kindern eigentlich schon voraussetzen dass sie das wissen ja. aber da haben sie auch irgendwie keinen bezug dazu. erm ich glaub das hat auch damit zu tun dass es jetzt bildungsferne und bildungsnahe schichten sind aber wurscht aber ich glaube dass es nicht einfacher ist aber anders. ein anderes unterrichten. ich merk das beim [name] bei dem kärntner erm dem sag ich was und der versteht's auch auf englisch und die anderen denen müsst ich das eigentlich zwanzig mal erklären. das ist mir schon aufgefallen dass es ein anderes unterrichten ist.

A: gibt's da auch glauben sie einen unterschied was die leistung betrifft zwischen schülern die deutsch als muttersprache haben im englischunterricht und die die nicht deutsch als muttersprache haben?

B: also ich kann jetzt nur den [name] hernehmen der hat ja erm das war so in englisch hab ich ihn weil er war in der nms in kärnten und das haben wir in der vierten hier ja noch nicht gehabt jetzt hab ich ihn müssen einstufen in die dritte leistungsgruppe und das war gut so weil er ist ich glaub das war auch der wechsel und so da ist er sehr geschwommen ja bis er sich ein bissl eingefunden hat und so jetzt der wollte unbedingt oder will unbedingt auf die kindergartenschule und da braucht er halt zweite gruppe und da hat er sich derartig angestrengt dass er jetzt auf die schularbeit einen einser geschrieben hat und dann hab ich ihn aufgestuft also das geht schon. das war er ist ja relativ kurzfristig gekommen also der ist glaub ich im märz oder im februar also relativ kurz also das dauert ja und auch die lebensumstände und so also das hab ich alles berücksichtigt und wie man sieht hat's was gebracht.

A: aber kann man dass wahrscheinlich nicht so sagen wenn sie sagen sie haben nur einen schüler. dann ist das schwierig eine aussage zu treffen.

B: genau.

- A: so dann komme ich eigentlich schon zu meiner letzten frage. glauben sie ist dieses switching eher ein phänomen ist das in den niedrigeren klassen auftritt also in einer ersten oder ist das in einer vierten genauso thema?
- B: genauso. ist genauso wobei ich sagen muss in der ersten ist es insofern noch ein bisschen weniger das switching weil ich da wirklich versuch ihnen so die basic vocabulary also school things zum beispiel ja nur auf englisch damit sie das einmal reinkriegen und in den höheren klassen wird's dann ein bisschen komplexer natürlich da muss ich dann schon mehr deutsch machen das ist klar aber gerade in der ersten ganz am anfang ist es also fast english only das kann ich unterschreiben. das macht ihnen auch spaß also das ist so ein bissl babyenglish ja aber natürlich wenn's dann komplexer wird dann und auch die grammatik dann reinkommt wird's ein bissl versärkt ja. muss es sein.
- A: nein wie gesagt in der literatur geht ja immer mehr die tendenz dahin dass man sagt es soll nicht nur english only sein weil man eben an dieses vorhandene wissen anknüpfen soll das den schülern ja hilft.
- B: ja ja ja eben genau genau.
- A: eine frage habe ich noch die habe ich jetzt vergessen. erm machen sie fortbildungen im bereich didaktik und language teaching?
- B: also ehrlich gesagt im moment nicht weil mein schwerpunkt gerade im bereich berufsorientierung ist aber ab und zu schon ja.
- A: gut gibt es von ihrer seite noch irgendeine frage?
- B: nein ich kann nur sagen viel spaß beim auswerten <lacht>
- A: <lacht> danke vielmals dass sie sich zeit genommen haben.
- B: bittesehr. ich hoffe ich hab ihnen geholfen.

5. Abstracts in English and German

This thesis deals with the use of the first language in the foreign language classroom, which has always been contentious. The negative view dates back to the nineteenth century where the students' first language was banned from the classroom because it was regarded as something negative. In recent years, however, a major change of attitude occurred, placing special emphasis on and encouraging the use of the L1. The students' first language is regarded as an important resource to which teachers and students can resort in the foreign language classroom (Cook 2001: 401-404). The integration of students' L1 is easy to implement in those settings where students and teachers share an L1 and come from the same linguistic background. In settings where the participants have different cultural and linguistic backgrounds the situation is much more complex (Poudel 2010: 123-124). Therefore, the two different settings, monolingual and multilingual EFL classes, are investigated and compared in terms of L1 use or code-switching incidences. Code-switching, which has been devoted much attention already, is referred to as "the alternation between two (or more) languages" (Eldridge 1996: 303). The data for this research were collected in four new secondary schools in Carinthia and Vienna in the form of classroom observations and teacher interviews. The aim was to highlight similarities and differences between the two settings and to find out about teachers' beliefs and practices. Moreover, the research should motivate teachers to reflect upon their idea of language teaching and learning.

Die folgende Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit dem umstrittenen Thema der Verwendung der Muttersprache im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Die negative Einstellung gegenüber der Muttersprache geht zurück auf das neunzehnte Jahrhundert, als diese aus dem Fremdsprachenunterricht verbannt wurde. Mittlerweile hat diesbezüglich ein Wandel stattgefunden, was bedeutet, dass die Verwendung der Muttersprache immer mehr in den Vordergrund rückt und gefördert wird. Sie wird als wichtige Ressource angesehen, auf die sowohl die LehrerInnen als auch die SchülerInnen im Fremdsprachenunterricht zurückgreifen können (Cook 2001: 401-404). Dies ist in einem Umfeld, in dem LehrerInnen und SchülerInnen eine gemeinsame Muttersprache sprechen, leicht umzusetzen. In einem Umfeld, in dem jedoch viele verschiedene Muttersprachen gesprochen werden und in dem die SchülerInnen verschiedenste kulturelle Hintergründe aufweisen, stellt sich die Eingliederung der Muttersprache(n) als schwierig heraus (Poudel 2010: 123-124). Im Rahmen dieser Arbeit sollen deshalb monolinguale und multilinguale Umfelder untersucht und in weiterer Folge miteinander verglichen werden. Der Fokus liegt hierbei auf der Häufigkeit von Code-Switching-Vorkommnissen. Darunter versteht man den wechselnden Gebrauch von zwei oder mehr Sprachen (Eldridge 1996: 303). Im Rahmen dieser Arbeit wurde eine empirische Studie an vier Neuen Mittelschulen in Kärnten und Wien durchgeführt. Diese Studie umfasste die Aufzeichnung von vier Unterrichtseinheiten mit anschließender Befragung der betroffenen LehrerInnen. Ziel war es, Gemeinsamkeiten und Unterschiede zwischen diesen beiden Umfeldern aufzuzeigen und die Einstellungen der LehrerInnen zum Thema herauszuarbeiten. Des Weiteren sollten die LehrerInnen dazu veranlasst werden, über ihre Vorstellungen des Sprachenlehrens und -lernens zu reflektieren und bestenfalls ihr eigenes Handeln im Unterricht zu optimieren.

6. Zusammenfassung

Das Thema der Verwendung der Muttersprache im Fremdsprachenunterricht ist seit jeher umstritten und hat vor allem in den letzten Jahren viel Aufmerksamkeit in der Forschung erfahren. Während die Befürworter von deren Verwendung überzeugt sind und die Muttersprache als wichtige Ressource beim Erlernen der Fremdsprache ansehen, warnen die Gegner vor dem negativen Einfluss auf die Entwicklung der Fremdsprache. Heutzutage scheint die Einstellung zu diesem Thema jedoch hauptsächlich positiv zu sein, was auch die Unterrichtsbeobachtungen und Interviews, die im Rahmen dieser Arbeit durchgeführt wurden, bestätigen.

Ziel dieser Arbeit war es, Unterschiede zwischen monolingualen und multilingualen Klassen herauszuarbeiten. Monolinguale Klassen sind gekennzeichnet durch eine homogene Schülerschaft, die eine gemeinsame Muttersprache – Deutsch – spricht. Multilinguale Klassen hingegen sind sehr heterogen und umfassen SchülerInnen unterschiedlichster Kulturen und Erstsprachen.

Was die Funktionen von Code-Switching, oder Sprachenwechsel, für LehrerInnen und SchülerInnen betrifft, so lässt sich festhalten, dass monolinguale und multilinguale Klassen ähnliche Ergebnisse aufweisen und sich nicht deutlich voneinander unterscheiden. In beiden Umgebungen erfüllt das Wechseln von Englisch auf Deutsch größtenteils dieselben Funktionen. Unterschiede sind allerdings hinsichtlich der Häufigkeit des Auftretens unterschiedlicher Funktionen zu erkennen. Insgesamt haben LehrerInnen in monolingualen Klassen häufiger auf Deutsch gewechselt als LehrerInnen in multilingualen Klassen, was wahrscheinlich auf die gemeinsame Muttersprache von LehrerInnen und SchülerInnen zurückzuführen ist. Bei den SchülerInnen hingegen, ist die Anzahl der aufgetretenen Wechsel fast identisch.

Der Großteil der TeilnehmerInnen verwendet sowohl Englisch als auch Deutsch im Englischunterricht und sieht der Verwendung der Muttersprache positiv entgegen. Die diesbezüglich negative Einstellung, die jahrelang vorherrschend war, scheint also der Vergangenheit anzugehören. Wenn es um die Verwendung anderer Erstsprachen als Deutsch geht, sind einige noch skeptisch, vor allem deshalb weil sie keine Erfahrung mit multilingualen Ansätzen im Fremdsprachenunterricht haben. Es ist deshalb die Aufgabe der Universitäten, Pädagogischen Hochschulen und des Ministeriums auf diese aufmerksam zu machen und (angehende) LehrerInnen über aktuelle Entwicklungen im Bereich der Sprachwissenschaft zu informieren. Außerdem muss das Bewusstsein geschaffen werden, dass Mehrsprachigkeit ein enormer Vorteil ist, und dass auch andere Muttersprachen im Fremdsprachenunterricht ihre Berechtigung haben.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen, dass die Muttersprache eine wichtige Ressource darstellt, auf die sich die SchülerInnen beim Erlernen einer Fremdsprache stützen können und sollen. Der Großteil der TeilnehmerInnen dieser Studie identifiziert sich mit dieser Aussage und versucht aktiv die Muttersprache in den Unterricht zu integrieren. Was die Umsetzung eines multilingualen Ansatzes betrifft, besteht jedoch noch Aufklärungsbedarf.

7. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL DATA

Name:	Sabrina Koch
Date of birth:	29.03.1990
Place of birth:	Spittal/Drau
Citizenship:	Austria
Languages:	German, English, Italian

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

since 2010	University of Vienna Teacher Training – English and Geography
2004 to 2009	Commercial Academy Spittal/Drau
2000 to 2004	Secondary Modern School Gmünd
1996 to 2000	Primary School Eisentratten

VISITS ABROAD

Winter term 2013	Semester abroad in Manchester
Summer 2012	Language course in Cambridge