



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„‘They should speak German perfectly of course’.
Teachers’ Discourse on Linguistic Diversity
in the EFL Classroom“

Verfasserin

Hajnalka Berényi-Kiss

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag.phil.)

Wien, 2012

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 190 344 382

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Lehramtstudium UF Englisch UF Ungarisch

Betreuerin / Betreuer:

Ao. Univ. Prof. Mag. Dr. Christiane Dalton-Puffer

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
1.1 Why does this matter? Diversity in numbers	3
2 The Multilingual Paradox: Conceptual Issues	5
2.1 Defining multilingualism	5
2.2 Multilingualism or linguistic diversity? The difference that matters	9
2.3 Clarifying the concept of vehicular language	11
3 Policy and Practice: From Europe to Austria	13
3.1 Language education policies in Europe	14
3.2 Language education policies and legal framework in Austria	18
3.3 Having a closer look at Vienna: Policy vs. Practice	24
3.4 How teachers see this: Perception of linguistic diversity in language classrooms	30
4 Research design and methodology	34
4.1 Defining the construct: Discourse explained	36
4.2 Methodological framework	41
4.2.1 Data collection: Teachers in focus	42
4.2.1.1 Formal and technical details	46
4.2.2 Analytical framework	47
4.2.2.1 Validity and reliability of the approach	51
5 The Viennese Case Study	52
5.1 Institutional frameworks	52
5.1.1 Teachers' profiles	54
5.2 Interview Analysis	55
5.2.1 Multilingualism and linguistic diversity	55
5.2.1.1 Individual multilingualism	56
5.2.1.2 Multilingualism in the classroom	63
5.2.2 Confusing concepts of students' mother tongues	68
5.2.3 "They should speak German perfectly of course"	75
5.2.4 English as equal footing	80
5.2.5 Quasi-English-only norm: Language use in the classroom	82
5.2.6 Constructing identities: Non-nativeness as a basis for 'othering'	87
5.2.7 Institutional Frameworks	92
5.3 Language use practices in the classroom	95
5.3.1 "It's part of the teacher business". Teachers' language use practices	96
5.3.2 Students' language use practices	100

6 Discussion	101
Concluding remarks	108
Bibliography	110
Legal and policy documents	110
Literature	111
Appendix.....	119
1. Question sets	119
1.1. <i>Teachers</i>	119
1.2. <i>Principal</i>	120
2. Interview protocol.....	123
3. Lesson observation sheet.....	124
4. Transcription convention.....	125
Zusammenfassung.....	126
Curriculum Vitae.....	129

Introduction¹

“Diversity is as inevitable and as restrictive as gravity. It is not to be deplored, nor to be exalted. It is simply there, to be used as a resource”
(Blommaert & Verschueren 1998: 14)

Multilingualism and linguistic diversity are two interrelated phenomena that have increasingly become the objects of political and public discourse throughout Europe, their effects being pervasive in all areas of life, including the educational sector. Language is clearly inseparable from the teaching context and therefore the linguistic composition of a school’s population inevitably contributes to how teaching is and can be organised in a given institution.

The issues of language diversity on education concern the learners as groups, teachers and the nature of pedagogy itself, the relationship between the school and the community and the relationship between the local level and the national level of policy development and implementation. In fact, language diversity in education is the visible tip of what is, metaphorically speaking, a societal iceberg. (Martin 1997: 101)

Further, as Cenoz and Gorter (2010: 38) rightly argue, because educational institutions are so deeply embedded into their sociolinguistic context and the society they operate in, “school practices can influence the level of multilingualism and the attitudes towards multilingualism and multiculturalism of society as a whole”. Therefore, the issue deserves particular academic attention and the Austrian context seems to offer a rich ground for investigation. Through relatively recent migration, the number of various languages has substantially increased in Viennese schools; nearly half of the school-aged population in the capital has a mother tongue other than German. This simultaneously means that linguistic diversity has substantially grown, and also that the number of bi- and multilingual individuals has increased. Often both the

¹ I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Ao. Univ. Prof. Mag. Dr. Dalton-Puffer for her help and constructive comments. Special thanks to Mag. Martin Ilkow who supported me in conducting the study and to MMag. Dipl.-Ing. Dr. Jeremy Bradley for proofreading the text. Sincere thanks also to Ao. Univ. Prof. Dr. Ute Smit and Univ.-Prof. Dr. Johanna Laakso for their helpful advice.

institutions and the educators themselves find the situation to be challenging on several levels; they report dealing with linguistically mixed student groups as difficult or problematize learners' language competences. The aim of this study is, to investigate how teachers perceive linguistic diversity and individual multilingualism and how they treat the involved languages as a result. The focus of the investigation lies with the EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom, as foreign language teachers inevitably need to deal with the various linguistic repertoires of their students. Employing a discourse analytic approach, the thesis strives to reveal teachers' discursive repertoires on linguistic diversity and multilingualism, and within that the categorisation of related concepts, and what effect teachers' discourse has on teaching practices and language use patterns in the classroom.

The key research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

- How is multilingualism and linguistic diversity constructed in teachers' discourse?
- What value is attached to English (the target language), German (the school vehicular/majority language) and students' heritage languages (languages other than English and German)?
- Which language use practices are considered legitimate in the EFL classroom?
- Does teacher discourse affect language use practices in EFL lessons?
- Do language-related regulations and language policies (international, national, or institutional) inform teacher discourse on multilingualism and linguistic diversity?

In an attempt to provide a thorough overview of the context and simultaneously enable a comprehensive analysis, the relevant social, legal and institutional frameworks will be examined on various levels. Applying a top-down approach, the thesis first discusses pertinent language education policies, moving from the wider and more general European context to the specific Austrian regulations. This is then followed by the description of more recent academic discourse on the topic. The central chapters of this thesis present the case study conducted at

one Viennese secondary school and the methodological considerations behind the project. Given the complexity of the issues addressed, the present thesis clearly cannot be exhaustive, yet it attempts to cover as many of the relevant questions as its limitations allow.

1.1 Why does this matter? Diversity in numbers

Contemporary public and political discourse draws attention to the fact that the linguistic composition of Austria, and especially that of the capital, has gone through extensive changes in the past decades. “Recent immigration accounts for the presence of a large number of ‘new’ languages in Austrian society and [accordingly] the high percentage of pupils for whom German is a second language” (LEPP 2008: 5). In some regions the percentage of migrant pupils amounts to as much as 90% (ibid.: 28). According to the Austrian statistic services, Statistik Austria², in the school year 2010/11 the number of students in all school types, including both private and public institutions, was 1,166,525. Students with a non-German vernacular³ (*mit nicht-deutscher Umgangssprache*) make up 18.4% of the whole school-aged population of Austria. In Vienna, a total of 224,697 students were registered in that period 95,125 of them had a first language other than German. Non-German natives thus make up 43.3% of the whole Viennese student population, which is unquestionably a substantial number. Broken down to school types: with 64.1%, secondary schools with a general orientation (*Hauptschulen*) have the highest number of students with a non-German vernacular, followed by polytechnic schools (*Politechnische Schulen*) with 62.1%. 57.1% of the students in other general schools (*Sonstige allgemeinbildende Schulen*) and 52.5% in special schools (*Sonderschulen*) are also users of a language other than German. Furthermore, 52.9% of the student population in Viennese primary schools (*Volksschule*) are also reported to speak a language other than German.

² http://www.statistik.at/web_en/

³ In some context the German terminology is translated to English as ‘language of habitual use’. Although statistical data does not say anything about student’s mother tongues, the numbers are usually interpreted as those reflecting the number of individuals with a non-German first-language.

Although these figures are relevant, they must be treated with great caution. Because statistical data is merely an approximation of reality and thus never completely accurate, it might be assumed that the number of children with a vehicular other than German is somewhat higher than reported. More importantly, however, statistical information, as all data, is also object to interpretation and it is worth noting that the general attitude towards these figures seems to be rather negative. Both the media and the general public see this as the number of school-aged children who cannot speak German and are, therefore, a burden on the Austrian educational system. It is rarely seen as the number of those pupils that are bi- or multilingual and that can enrich teaching and learning or contribute to education with their skills. Similarly, Weidinger (2001) points out that statistics say nothing about the German competence of these children, and argues that only about 10% of pupils have difficulties following German lessons. Furch (2009: 33), in contrast, doubts that most non-natives can effortlessly follow lessons in German. What it means to “follow a lesson in German”, however, needs to be defined, for it is not clear what level of German competence enables pupils to actively participate in lessons. As has been pointed out (Furch 2009, LEPP 2008), not even the Ministry of Education has given clear guidelines for assessment requirements⁴. The “[a]ssessment of migrants’ proficiency in German is a local responsibility, and there are no national minimum standards or descriptions of the minimum level of proficiency needed at the different levels of the educational system (Bildungsstandards for German are concerned with German as L1)” (LEPP 2008: 29). The pressure put on teachers to bring pupils to a native level often influences the teaching of foreign languages as well, and therefore the issue is highly relevant with regard to the EFL context. The wish to improve learners’ German skills might well have an impact on how English is taught, and accordingly how well students can learn it.

The foreign language classroom proves to be an ideal context for studying the issues of multilingualism and linguistic diversity because they make language use patterns more visible, these being an essential element of the teaching approach

⁴ see BM:BWK (ed.) 1/2002.

itself. Accordingly, it is likely that teachers reflect on these practices and adhere to particular norms based on their beliefs. Before moving into more detail about actual practices and the legal framework these are embedded into, it is essential to elucidate concepts central to the topic of this thesis.

2 The Multilingual Paradox: Conceptual Issues

Given the complexity of the phenomena addressed in the present thesis, it is inevitable that they be defined and clarified. This section is dedicated to exploring the concepts of multilingualism, linguistic diversity and vehicular language. Although the research focuses primarily on the former two notions, the latter also plays a significant role in the wider social but also in the educational context of this study.

2.1 Defining multilingualism

Although multilingualism is a seemingly simple concept, it is difficult to understand in its complexity; its definition depends on linguistic, social, cultural and political contexts. In very general terms, one can distinguish between societal and individual multilingualism (e.g. De Cillia 1998, Edwards 2010, Jessner 2006), the former meaning the coexistence of various languages in a given society, whereas the latter refers to the knowledge of multiple languages by one user. Yet, as Wei (2008: 3-4) explains, even if a country is multilingual, its citizens are not necessarily competent in multiple languages. Officially multilingual countries such as, for instance, Belgium or Switzerland in the European context, have monolingual residents; officially monolingual countries, such as France or for that matter Austria, might well have fairly large multilingual populations (ibid.). Nevertheless, whichever definition we look at, it becomes apparent that multilingualism is a social reality. There are no purely monolingual countries and according to Malmkjær's *Linguistic Encyclopedia* (2002: 64) 50-70% of the world's population might be regarded as bi- or multilingual, depending on how we define individual multilingualism. This

practically means that every second person is at least bilingual. Despite this, however, it seems that multilingualism is often not perceived as the normal state of things. It is frequently treated as a recent development, even though it is not a novel phenomenon.

Importantly, the term 'multilingualism' came to mean quite disparate things in different contexts. European language policy promotes and supports multilingualism by advocating a 'mother tongue plus two other languages'⁵ strategy and language education policy, in essence, reflects this principle. Yet, as practice has shown, the recognition of multilingualism as an asset often depends on the prestige of the languages involved. If multilingualism involves the use of major vehicular languages, such as English⁶, for instance, it will be perceived as an advantage. Consequently, such languages are widely taught at schools. In other words,

If a language or several languages have a high status or they have a very important symbolic value in society, it is more likely that they are an important part of the school curriculum and that the aims of education include multilingualism and multiliteracy in several languages. (Cenoz & Gorter 2010: 38)

When, however, multilingualism is equated with the use of less widely spoken, usually minority or migrant languages, it is perceived as a burden and individual multilingualism is perceived as particularly problematic. In this context multilingualism becomes an ethnic marker, rather than an instrument, and therefore the languages involved are either partly or fully neglected in education. Migrant languages, in general, have a low status in the host country (Cenoz & Gorter 2010: 44) and are accordingly rarely integrated into the 'mainstream' language-teaching programmes; even the mother tongue education of autochthonous minorities is usually regulated by special legal norms.

⁵ The 'mother tongue plus two' strategy sometimes referred to as the Barcelona objective. *See* Barcelona European Council, Presidency Conclusions 2002, COM(2005/356), COM(2007/184), 2006/962/EC.

⁶ As Cenoz and Gorter (2010: 43) argue, "English is the most important language of international communication and it is associated with social and economic mobility. English is seen as a resource that opens doors for better opportunities".

These are, however, not the only issues connected to multilingualism. There have been endless attempts to measure the level of an individual speaker's multilingualism. Terminology such as 'balanced bilingualism' or 'double semilingual' have been coined and explored throughout the decades (cf. Malmkjær 2002) and a myriad of concepts have been developed to describe the degree of bi- and multilingual competence or to examine the functions of the languages spoken by the individual. The major problem with such attempts is that multilingual competence has been treated as the result of the isolated acquisition of several languages. The well-established linguistic terms first language (L1) and second language (L2) suggest that there is a chronological order in acquiring or learning several languages. However, in practice this is often not the case. Ortega (2010) identifies the monolingual bias as the root of this belief. She suggests that monolingualism still appears to be the norm and therefore second language acquisition, and for that matter any language learning, is seen as monolingual-like. Monolinguality, she argues, is seen as the implicit norm even in multilingual environments, which often results in a "deficit construction of L2 users" (ibid.). She further highlights the fact that the models of foreign/second language use are always natives who are, in essence, monolinguals with "no detectable traces of other languages". Indeed, language learners' performance is invariably compared to native speakers' language use (Shohamy 2006: 173). As Ortega (ibid.) explains, nativeness is considered a 'birth right' and therefore a privilege that cannot be replaced by experience. This clearly undermines the idea of multilingualism as a competence in its own right because it implies that multilinguals are non-natives and therefore deficient users, except perhaps in one language. The monolingual bias, Ortega (ibid.) suggests, could be overcome by a 'bilingual turn' that would mean focusing on linguistic experience and users' multiple language repertoires while turning away from normative comparisons.

With putting a similarly great emphasis on users' linguistic repertoires, the Council of Europe has introduced the concept of 'plurilingualism' to differentiate between 'multilingualism-as-competence' and 'multilingualism-as-knowledge'. In the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), multilingualism is

defined as “the knowledge of a number of languages, or the co-existence of different languages in a given society”, whereas plurilingualism focuses on the “individual person’s experience of language in its cultural contexts” (CEFR 2001: 4). The plurilingual speaker then “does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact” (ibid.). Successful communication is the focus of the plurilingual approach. According to the CEFR, plurilingual competence means that speakers are able to achieve effective communication by flexibly drawing from different parts of their linguistic repertoire. Yet, as Bono and Stratilaki (2009: 211) put it, even if the plurilingual approach to language use and language learning has evolved in the recent past, there still is a wide gap between scientific and ‘ordinary’ representations of plurilingualism, adding that “the linguistic performance of plurilinguals is still thought to be somewhat inferior to that of their monolingual counterparts” (ibid.). Furthermore, in the context of formal language teaching the plurilingual approach also gives rise to a paradox. While a holistic view on language learning and teaching is fostered by this initiative, the forms of language assessment and even the CEFR with its assessment categories make the practical application of this approach impossible (cf. Vetter 2011).

With regard to language education, the CEFR (2001: 4) states that “[m]ultilingualism may be attained by simply diversifying the languages on offer in a particular school or educational system, or by encouraging pupils to learn more than one foreign language”. When referring to multilingualism in Viennese schools, however, I do not mean the kind of multilingualism defined by the CEFR. In this thesis I am simultaneously dealing with the individual multilingualism of pupils and the pervasive societal multilingualism that has gradually turned into an integral part of education in Viennese schools. Given the great cultural and linguistic diversity of the city, it is more than obvious that schools and their environment are, per se, multilingual.

There are numerous multilingual societies that function relatively well with two or even three national languages in use. It seems thus that issues arise and multilingualism turns into a burden when it results in a vast linguistic diversity that frequently develops as the result of recent migration. This implies that it is not the multilingualism of the individual that is problematic, but rather the potential communicational barrier that might be caused by the growing linguistic diversity. As Van Parijs (2008: 12) very tellingly puts it, “multilingualism is inconceivable without linguistic diversity, and linguistic diversity is pointless in the absence of multilinguals capable of enjoying it”. Although linguistic diversity and multilingualism invariably co-occur, there is salient difference between the two phenomena that should be noted at this point.

2.2 Multilingualism or linguistic diversity? The difference that matters

In the formulation of the European Commission (2007: 6),

Multilingualism is understood as the *ability* of societies, institutions, groups and individuals to engage, on a regular basis, with more than one language in their day-to-day lives. [...] In addition, the term multilingualism is used for referring to the co-existence of different language communities in one geographical or geo-political area or political entity. [emphasis mine]

Taking the above definition as the point of departure, it becomes evident that the definition of linguistic diversity overlaps with that of societal multilingualism (i.e. it refers to the presence of multiple languages in a community). However, while linguistic diversity in essence means the range of various languages present in a given society (i.e. it indicates the presence of several languages in a geographical or political area, but it does not show whether these are shared by all speakers), multilingualism primarily refers to an ability to make use of several languages.

Drawing from the theory of biodiversity⁷, Van Parijs (2008) argues that linguistic diversity can be measured by three dimensions: richness, evenness and distance. As he explains, while richness indicates the “number of types”, evenness refers to “how equally the population is spread between those types, or of how little the members of the population are concentrated in one or few types” (ibid. 18), adding that the two dimensions are inseparable. The third notion, distance, serves to capture how similar or dissimilar the given types are, i.e. how easily could speakers of different types understand each other. As Van Parijs (ibid. 20) puts it, because the theory is based on the concept of biodiversity, it presupposes that every individual can be assigned to one type, i.e. one language, only. Yet, the fact is that most of us are multilingual to some extent.

As soon as some degree of multilingualism is present [...] it is natural to define linguistic distance as the lack of overlap between linguistic repertoires, and linguistic diversity as average linguistic distance. The more languages two people have in common, and the better they know these languages, the smaller the linguistic distance between them. And the smaller this distance, on average, between members of a population taken two by two, the less diverse the population (ibid.).

Van Parijs’ conceptual discussion makes it clear that individual multilingualism, while potentially increasing linguistic richness within a society, reduces linguistic distance. As regards Viennese educational institutions, this means that although linguistic diversity is great in terms of richness, linguistic distance is lessened by the multilingual competence of students and the extensive use of German. When referring to linguistic diversity in the present thesis, however, I refer to linguistic richness only, without considering evenness or distance, as this complexity would go far beyond the limits of this study.

The Council of Europe has attempted to establish linguistic diversity as an asset. This is, without doubt, a central issue in European language policies as currently Europe has 23 official languages and a great number of recognized minority languages, each of which ought to receive similar promotion. In their recommendation R No. (82) 18 the Council of Europe states that

⁷ For a comprehensive overview and discussion on the concept of biodiversity in linguistics, see Muehlmann 2007.

[T]he rich heritage of diverse languages and cultures in Europe is a valuable common resource to be protected and developed, and that a major educational effort is needed to convert that *diversity* from a barrier to communication into a source of mutual enrichment and understanding.
[my emphasis]

Clearly, here the competence in several languages is recognized as a tool for communication. However, while linguistic diversity is defined as a resource in this context, the wording of the Recommendation implies that diversity represents a challenge – it is typically perceived as a communicational obstacle and thus also as a potential source of conflict. To avoid hostility rooted in linguistic diversity, the Committee of Ministers (R No. (82) 18) assert that “it is only through a better knowledge of European modern languages that it will be possible to facilitate communication and interaction among Europeans of different mother tongues in order to promote European mobility, mutual understanding and co-operation, and overcome prejudice and discrimination”. However, in areas with great linguistic diversity, especially where mostly mutually unintelligible languages are spoken, there is a strong need for a common means, or rather a common vehicle for communication (Adler 1977: 16). This is equally true for countries as it is for micro-communities, such as linguistically heterogeneous classrooms. Consequently, the concept of vehicular languages is relevant both in the educational but also in a national context.

2.3 Clarifying the concept of vehicular language

The terms vehicular language, lingua franca and vernacular are frequently used interchangeably, their meaning often being rather vague. It seems thus that there are no universally accepted definitions for these concepts. However, for the purposes of the present thesis, I would like to make a clear distinction.

Of all three concepts, lingua franca is the most widely used one, and accordingly, the most ambiguous. Its name originates from the first pidgins; for its speakers it is always at least a second language, never a mother tongue (Adler 1977:16). Further, it is still associated with grammatically reduced, deficient varieties. The

Oxford English Dictionary, for instance, gives this usage only.⁸ In contrast, mainly in the field of linguistics, lingua franca has come to refer to any language that serves as a medium of communication for individuals or groups that share no common language. With the expansion of English as a global language the term is increasingly associated with English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) only. Clearly, these distinct uses make the concept rather vague and at times even misleading.

In a similarly equivocal manner, the term vernacular also has two rather disparate meanings. Like lingua franca, vernacular can also refer to a national language. The Oxford English Dictionary gives the following definition: “The native speech or language of a particular country or district [...] also, the informal, colloquial, or distinctive speech of a people or a group”. Thus, in one sense, it denotes a national language, while in the other it connotes non-standard varieties or even minority or migrant languages used predominantly in the private domains. In this latter sense, vernaculars are also associated with heritage languages as opposed to the official state language(s). Having had a brief look at the above notions, it becomes clear that they come to mean very distinct things in different contexts.

The term vehicular or vehicular language (*Verkehrssprache*) is, therefore, often used to avoid the rather vague concept of lingua franca. Nonetheless, the term is not easy to define either for any language can function as a ‘vehicle of communication’ (Adler 1977: 8, Cherubim 2006: 16). Cherubim (2006: 20-21), nevertheless, offers a plausible definition. To him, a vehicular language is a variety that is used by certain speakers in certain well-established situations for particular functions (*“Handel und Wandel”*) and social practices. A vehicular, as he goes on explaining, is a language that has gained status as a social symbol for specific social practices. For instance, a particular language may be used in the communication with local authorities, for religious practices, business purposes

⁸ The Oxford English Dictionary defines lingua franca as follows: “[Italian, = ‘Frankish tongue’] a mixed language or jargon used in the Levant, consisting largely of Italian words deprived of their inflections; also *transf.* any mixed jargon formed as a medium of intercourse between people speaking different languages”.

or, for that matter, in education. This then implies that vehiculars are varieties⁹ associated rather with public than with private domains. Accordingly, a vehicular language can be understood as the opposite of vernaculars; however, the same language may fulfil both functions in a society.

Clearly, in the Viennese context German is the language of the public domain and accordingly, it is the inter-ethnic or inter-group vehicular for the majority of those who do not share mutually intelligible languages. With regard to the educational context I use the term vehicular to refer to the school vehicular, which is predominantly or rather almost exclusively German, with the few exceptions of bilingual or international schools. Accordingly, in this study's terminology, vehicular refers to the primary official school language in Austria, namely German.

3 Policy and Practice: From Europe to Austria

As Extra and Yağmur (2004: 26) assert, owing to socio-economic and political processes in the past few decades the number of immigrant minorities have increasingly grown in most industrialised Western European countries. These immigrant groups, as they explain, significantly differ from the “mainstream indigenous population” (ibid.). As a result of these population changes, patterns of language variation, but also of language use, have altered considerably. Migration, both planned and unplanned, has led to great diversity and multilingualism in several industrialised European countries (ibid. 74), including Austria. This increase of cultural and linguistic diversity is a central theme in public and political discourse today and has undoubtedly generated some double standards. Immigrants' languages and cultures are usually perceived as “sources of problems and deficits and as obstacles to integration”, whereas the official national languages and cultures of the EU are considered to be “sources of

⁹ The term *variety* can refer to an officially acknowledged language, but also to a dialect.

enrichment and as prerequisites for integration” (Extra & Yağmur 2004: 22)¹⁰. This tension is manifest on multiple levels and consequently, also in educational institutions throughout Europe. Thus, in order to map these inconsistencies and point out potential problem areas, the following sections will explore both European and Austrian language policies, laying emphasis of the existing legal frameworks for education, and contrast them with actual teaching practices in more detail.

As Romaine (2002) argues, it is difficult to assess to what extent language policies influence actual language patterns of language use, for there is no straightforward causal relationship between the two and naturally language practices depend on many other factors. From a legal perspective, it is also essential to differentiate between policies and actual legislation. While legislation is a tool for the implementation of a policy, policy in itself is a much broader term formulating objectives and aiming to define the long-term strategies for the achievement of those objectives. Policy, however, does not necessarily cover immediate action. Nevertheless, policies, and within them legislative tools, might inform discourses on the various levels (i.e. meso or micro levels). Therefore, one of the aims of the present study is to assess the efficacy of language policies or the existing legislative framework by investigating whether these influence the discourse about multilingualism and linguistic diversity and accordingly shape actual teaching practices in the foreign language classroom.

3.1 Language education policies in Europe

Without doubt, issues of language use, and therefore of language education, have always been highly political (Brizič 2008, Casanova 1991, Cenoz 2009, Edwards 2010, Shohamy 2006, Skutnabb-Kangas 1998). Vetter (2011) has also noted that the issue of language is increasingly part of economic discourse but also the

¹⁰ Note, however, that in some context this is not the case. For instance, Romanian – an official language of the EU – is a migrant language in several member states and is often considered as problematic, rather than enriching.

discourse concerned with social cohesion. Thus, as Edwards (2010: 273) rightly observes, multilingualism in education is not primarily a linguistic matter; yet, frameworks provided by law may have profound effect on actual pedagogic practices.

The Barcelona objective of 2002 constituted one of the first milestones of more multilingualism-centred European language policy. As briefly noted above, the European Commission developed the 'mother tongue plus two' strategy, which in essence supports European citizens in learning at least two foreign languages. As formulated in the communication of the Commission of the European Communities on the European Indicator of Language Competence (COM 2005/355: 3)

The Commission's objective is a truly multilingual European society: a society in which the rate of individual multilingualism steadily increases until every citizen has practical skills in at least two languages in addition to his or her mother tongue. Heads of State and Government in Barcelona in March 2002, having set the objective of making European Union education and training systems a world quality reference by 2010, called "for further action ... to improve the mastery of basic skills, in particular by teaching at least two foreign languages from a very early age..." At the same time, they called for the "establishment of a linguistic competence indicator in 2003.

Since the formulation of the 2002 Barcelona objective

the Commission has worked [...] towards the Barcelona objective of enabling citizens to communicate in two languages in addition to their mother tongue, in particular, by developing an indicator of language competence, by setting out strategic action and recommendations, and by including skills in foreign languages among the key competences for lifelong learning. (COM 2008/566: 4)

In this sense, European language education policies clearly strive to support individual multilingualism. Yet, as argued above, both within society and educational institutions, there is a manifest contradiction between the different perceptions of multilingualism and linguistic diversity. The kind of multilingualism that is acknowledged by society and fostered within the education system is an additive 'elite multilingualism' that usually covers the learning of widely used vehicular or national languages. Among all the major vehiculars, English seems to be the most wide-spread, not only in Europe but

also on an global level. Due to its current position as the global lingua franca, it seems to be a requisite in most higher educational and employment contexts (cf. Cenoz & Gorter 2010) and as a result has become the most widely taught foreign language in Europe. Accordingly, this makes the importance of EFL indisputable.

Although the European Commission acknowledges the significance of English, having set the maintenance and development of linguistic diversity as its explicit objective, it simultaneously promotes the learning of less widely spoken languages. As formulated in the Commission's 2004-2006 Action Plan for Linguistic Diversity

Promoting linguistic diversity means actively encouraging the teaching and learning of the widest possible range of languages in our schools, universities, adult education centres and enterprises. Taken as a whole, the range on offer should include the smaller European languages as well as all the larger ones, regional, minority and migrant languages as well as those with 'national' status, and the languages of our major trading partners throughout the world. (COM 2003/499: 9)

This passage reflects the basic principle of European language policy that defines linguistic and cultural diversity as valuable common resource. One of the core principles of European language education policies, as formulated in the preamble of Recommendation (98)6 (qtd. CEFR: 3), is "[t]o maintain and further develop the richness and diversity of European cultural life through greater mutual knowledge of national and regional languages, including those less widely taught". This being one of the Council's main objectives with regard to modern languages, EU member states must adapt their own language education policies in accordance with it. Nevertheless, as Vetter (2011: 233) asserts, European language policies are notoriously difficult to implement, especially those advocating a plurilingual approach. Although the plurilingual approach is becoming an increasingly accepted strategic concept, attempts for its implementation in school settings are not wide-spread, or at least are not widely known (ibid.).

It is important to note that European language policies are built on so-called soft laws, which in practice means that they are not legally binding for any of the

member states. The documents discussed in this section are predominantly recommendations¹¹ as to how the objectives of European language education policy could or should be achieved. As a result, glaring disparities occur between different European states as regards the status of various (immigrant) languages at school “depending on particular nation-states, or even particular federal states within nation-states (as in Germany), and depending on particular [immigrant] languages, being national languages in other EU countries or not” (Yağmur & Extra 2011: 1189). Vetter (2011: 234) further stresses the contradictory nature of European language education policies. As she explains, while a plurilingual approach is strongly supported, the ‘mother tongue plus two’ strategy and the descriptors for assessing foreign language competence as formulated in the CEFR stress exactly the opposite, namely an additive concept of multilingualism that results in treating languages as “isolated entities”. Yağmur and Extra (2011: 1193) point to another weakness of the ‘mother tongue plus two’ policy. They argue that

the concept of ‘mother tongue’ referred to the national languages of European nation-states and ignored the fact that mother tongue and national language do not coincide for many inhabitants of Europe.

It seems, however, that more recent communications of the EU have attempted to readdress this issue. As the European Commission formulated in their 2008 communication on multilingualism as an asset for Europe,

In the current context of increased mobility and migration, mastering the national language(s) is fundamental to integrating successfully and playing an active role in society. Non-native speakers should therefore include the host-country language in their ‘one-plus-two’ combination. There are also untapped linguistic resources in our society: different mother tongues and other languages spoken at home and in local and neighbouring environments should be valued more highly. For instance, children with different mother tongues — whether from the EU or a third country — present schools with the challenge of teaching the language of instruction as a second language, but they can also motivate their classmates to learn different languages and open up to other cultures. (COM 2008/566: 4)

Hence, it is undisputable that European language policies strive for a more positive approach towards multilingualism and language diversity. Policies also

¹¹ As opposed to actual legal implementations.

emphasize that “language teaching and learning in a country needs to be understood holistically, to include teaching of the national language(s)/ language(s) of education, of regional and minority languages, of the languages of recent immigrant groups, of second and foreign languages” (LEPP 2008: 3). In how far these policies are implemented and embedded into the Austrian education system is examined in following section.

3.2 Language education policies and legal framework in Austria¹²

As formulated in the Language Education Policy Profile of Austria (LEPP 2008: 7-8), the existence of several institutions and organisations supporting language teaching and learning, among them the *Österreichisches Sprachenzentrum* (ÖSZ) or the *Österreichisches Sprachengremium* (ÖSKO), corroborates the state’s commitment to language education. The ÖSKO is a national committee responsible for questions of language teaching, while the ÖSZ attempts to foster innovations in language education, assigning special attention to issues of international language policy, including those of the EU and the Council of Europe (ibid.). Another crucial point regarding language policies and language teaching is, as Zwitter (2012: 3) maintains, that in Austria “language is seen as an area to be regulated by law”. This means that there is a relatively extensive legal framework¹³ for issues concerning language use and accordingly this influences language practices on several levels, including that of educational institutions. Importantly, Zwitter further stresses the fact that “[l]anguage diversity is mentioned as a goal of the Austrian *legal system* [sic.]” (ibid.: 6) which also influences regulations concerning language teaching. It must be noted, however, that this objective has disparate implications depending on the languages involved. For instance, while autochthonous national minorities are granted special linguistic rights in the areas traditionally inhabited by them, the Austrian

¹² For an overview of the Austrian legal system see Funk 2000.

¹³ For instance, the status of particular languages (the national language or territorially restricted official languages of the autochthonous ethnic groups) and the use of these languages in the public sphere (e.g. language use with public authorities, regulations on the bilingual place name signs, regulations concerning issues of language in education) are both regulated by law.

legal system largely disregards the linguistic needs of the ever-growing migrant groups.

The Act on School Education (*Schulunterrichtsgesetz*) is central to discourse on language use in schools. § 16(1) of the Act provides that the language of instruction must always be German. This also applies to foreign language lessons, unless the teacher uses the target language. Exceptions to this regulation can be made in schools for minority language students. Furthermore, as formulated in § 16(3) of the same Act, a modern foreign language can be used as the language of instruction in situations where this is justified by the high number of non-German native individuals (those speaking a foreign language as their mother tongue) living in Austria or for the sake of more successful training in the foreign language. In both cases using the foreign language as the language of instruction must not affect the general accessibility of education in of any of the school types. The foreign language can be applied either in single groups or for single subjects.¹⁴ In order to cater for such linguistic needs, schools must officially request the use of a foreign language at the responsible authorities. This regulation is thus highly relevant as, in theory, it allows the use of languages other than German as the language of instruction.

In addition to the respective paragraph of the Act on School Education, the Ordinances on Curricula (hereafter Curricula), both those for primary and secondary schools, deserve particular attention as these are also legal norms¹⁵

¹⁴ The original German text of § 16 reads as follows:

(1) Unterrichtssprache ist die deutsche Sprache, soweit nicht für Schulen, die im besonderen für sprachliche Minderheiten bestimmt sind, durch Gesetz oder durch zwischenstaatliche Vereinbarungen anderes vorgesehen ist.

(2) Soweit gemäß § 4 Abs. 3 des Schulorganisationsgesetzes an Privatschulen die Auswahl der Schülernach der Sprache zulässig ist, kann die betreffende Sprache auch als Unterrichtssprache in solchen Privatschulen verwendet werden.

(3) Darüber hinaus kann die Schulbehörde erster Instanz auf Antrag des Schulleiters, bei Privatschulen auf Antrag des Schulerhalters, die Verwendung einer lebenden Fremdsprache als Unterrichtssprache (Arbeitssprache) anordnen, wenn dies wegen der Zahl von fremdsprachigen Personen, die sich in Österreich aufhalten, oder zur besseren Ausbildung in Fremdsprachen zweckmäßig erscheint und dadurch die allgemeine Zugänglichkeit der einzelnen Formen und Fachrichtungen der Schularten nicht beeinträchtigt wird. Diese Anordnung kann sich auch auf einzelne Klassen oder einzelne Unterrichtsgegenstände beziehen. Zwischenstaatliche Vereinbarungen bleiben davon unberührt.

¹⁵ Importantly, the Ordinances are legally binding.

that directly influence language education. Furthermore, the Curricula explicitly deal with multilingualism and linguistic diversity, which are the central themes of the present thesis. It is crucial that the Curricula for Secondary Schools¹⁶ explicitly advocate individual multilingualism and diversified language use in the classroom in that it states that “an existing bi- or multilingualism shall have a positive connotation and pupils shall be given incentives to make use of their mother tongue during the lessons” (transl. Zwitter 2012: 6). As regards foreign language teaching, the section on modern foreign languages (*Lebende Fremdsprache*) addresses issues of multilingualism and language diversity by offering a variety of languages as first or second modern foreign language, which clearly complies with the European language education policies outlined above. Nevertheless, Zwitter (ibid. 6-8) calls attention to the fact that even though the Curriculum includes all minority languages with the exception of Romani, in foreign language education there is an apparent focus on the teaching of major vehicular languages such as, for instance, English or French (cf. elite multilingualism, section 3.1 above). According to the ÖSZ’s report on foreign language teaching in Austria, the most widely taught foreign languages in the school year 2004/05, beside English (which is by far the most popular), were French, Italian and Spanish in this order (Haller 2007). Nevertheless, “[a]lthough not mandatory, English is the dominant language taught from pre-school to upper secondary education, so that almost all Austrian pupils will learn English, which is therefore THE first foreign language in the country [sic.]” (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 183). Even though a number of minority languages, including Croatian, Slovakian, Slovenian, Czech and Hungarian, are also foreseen as obligatory modern foreign languages (Zwitter 2012: 7) in the

¹⁶ *Verordnung des Bundesministers für Unterricht und Kunst vom 14. November 1984 über die Lehrpläne der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen* [Ordinance of the Federal Minister for Education and Art of 14 November 1984 on the Curricula of Secondary Schools]. The Ordinance in itself is a brief document, while the text generally known as the Curriculum (*Lehrplan*) is in the Annex. Due to the specific structure of the Austrian educational system, the difference between the curricula for secondary modern schools (*Hauptschule*) and lower grades of grammar schools (*Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule Unterstufe*) must be noted. With regard to language teaching, secondary modern schools have a different goal for achievement for German and modern foreign languages; however, the general parts of the Curriculum, such as the educational goals and didactic principles, are identical for both school types.

Curricula for Primary Schools and Special Education Schools¹⁷ and the most widely spoken migrant languages, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS; these languages are mutually intelligible) and Turkish, are offered as optional foreign languages, as Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer and Vetter (ibid.) assert, “[m]inority and immigrant languages [...] are rarely learned within the formal education system in Austria.”

Importantly, the section on modern foreign languages of the Curriculum for Secondary Schools explicitly addresses issues connected to the learners’ native languages. Because communicative competence is, in general, seen as the overarching goal of language education, the Curriculum provides that one of the aims of foreign language teaching is to contribute to the development of socially appropriate communication skills both in the students’ mother tongue and in the foreign language.¹⁸ Further, it is suggested that the foreign language should be used as much as possible in foreign language lesson and that reflective language comparison is fostered. Here the original formulation of the Curriculum seems to be somewhat vague: it mentions the language of instruction as well as learners’ mother tongues and states that comparative and contrastive methods are to be used when this helps raising language awareness and results in higher learning success.¹⁹ However, it is not clear if students’ mother tongues are equated with the language of instruction. Most importantly, however, the Curriculum provides that a positive attitude towards individual multilingualism and linguistic

¹⁷ *Verordnung des Bundesministers für Unterricht und kulturelle Angelegenheiten, mit welcher die Lehrpläne der Volksschule und der Sonderschulen erlassen werden; Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht an diesen Schulen* [Ordinance of the Federal Minister for Education and Cultural Affairs by which the Curricula for Primary Schools and Special Education Schools are Enacted; Notification on the Curricula for Religious Education at these Schools], hereafter Ordinance on the Curricula for Primary Schools.

¹⁸ *Curriculum of Secondary Schools*. The original German text reads as follows: “Der Fremdsprachenunterricht hat einen Beitrag zur Entwicklung sozial angemessenen Kommunikationsverhaltens der Schülerinnen und Schüler – sei es in der Muttersprache oder in einer Fremdsprache – zu leisten”.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* The original German text reads as follows: “Ein bewusster und reflektierter Umgang mit Sprache (auch im Vergleich mit der Unterrichts- bzw. Muttersprache) ist zu fördern. Komparative und kontrastive Methoden sind vor allem dort angebracht, wo sie zu einem verbesserten sprachlichen Bewusstsein der Fremdsprache gegenüber führen und den Lernerfolg wesentlich verstärken”.

diversity should be fostered by diverse means.²⁰ In the case of culturally and linguistically diverse groups, special attention should be given to the various cultures that learners encounter in their everyday lives²¹ and the individualization based on learners' varied linguistic backgrounds should also be provided. Furthermore, as formulated in the Curriculum, existing bi- or multilingualism should be treated positively and learners are to be encouraged to meaningfully use the knowledge of their mother tongues in the lessons²².

In accordance with European language teaching policies, language education in Austria includes not only the teaching of foreign languages, but also that of the majority as well as the heritage languages. Accordingly, the Curricula address issues of mother tongue and the teaching of German alike. As regards mother tongue education of non-German native students, the Curriculum for Primary Schools provides that the aim of the subject is to reach functional bilingualism. It further requires teachers to provide opportunities for their learners to experience "the theoretical equality" of their heritage languages and German as only encounters of this type can make the bilingualism of learners evident.²³ However, the wording of the provision makes it evident that students' heritage languages are, in practice, subordinate to the majority language in the sense that they are used to a lesser degree.²⁴ Furthermore, in order to ensure that linguistic minority students gain competence in the majority language, German for non-natives (*Lehrplan-Zusatz Deutsch*) has been introduced as a subject. The first

²⁰ *Ibid.* The original German text reads as follows: "Die Förderung einer positiven Einstellung zu individueller Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachenvielfalt ist auf mannigfache Weise anzustreben".

²¹ *Ibid.* The original German text reads as follows: "Wenn Schülerinnen und Schüler mit unterschiedlichen kulturellen Hintergründen – zB unterschiedlichen Muttersprachen – gemeinsam unterrichtet werden, ist neben der sicheren Verwendung der Unterrichtssprache der Begegnung der Kulturen im Alltagsleben besonderes Augenmerk zu widmen".

²² *Ibid.* The original German text reads as follows: "Unterschiedliche Ausgangsbedingungen sind zu berücksichtigen. Eine allenfalls vorhandene Zwei- oder Mehrsprachigkeit soll positiv besetzt und die Schülerinnen und Schüler sollen ermuntert werden, Kenntnisse in der Muttersprache im Unterricht sinnvoll einzubringen".

²³ *Ordinance on the Curricula for Primary Schools and Special Education Schools.* The original German text reads as follows: "Die prinzipielle Gleichwertigkeit von Muttersprache und Deutsch muss im Unterricht für die Schüler erlebbar sein, dann kann die Bedeutung der Zweisprachigkeit und der Bikulturalität den Schülern einsichtig gemacht werden. Die Erreichung der Zweisprachigkeit ist Ziel des Muttersprachlichen Unterrichtes, die Gleichwertigkeit von Muttersprache und Deutsch ist anzustreben.

²⁴ This is clearly because there are scarce opportunities to use these languages outside of private domains.

such courses were originally designed for and introduced in primary schools in the school year 2006/07 (BM:UKK 2011: 19). Supportive courses for the secondary levels were only made available quite recently, starting in the school year 2011/12. These courses target students that have been accepted as extraordinary students due to their lack of German competence (i.e. the language of instruction) and thus need to develop the necessary language skills that would enable them to follow the lessons of the respective grade²⁵ (ibid. 10-11). As regards this subject, the Curriculum notably supports an integrative approach and requires that language acquisition (*Spracherwerb*) draws on the existing knowledge of the mother tongue and on potential skills in the second language²⁶, which is clearly an indicator of a more multilingualism-centred approach.

Thus, on the whole, Zwitter (2012: 8-9) rightly observes that multilingualism and linguistic diversity “are mentioned as explicit goals of the *educational system* [sic.]”. She further notes that these legal norms propagate a positive attitude towards multilingualism and linguistic diversity (ibid.). However, it must be noted that although the mentioned regulations are declarative in character and strive to be precise in their descriptions, they are nevertheless object to interpretation that might result in a diversified understanding of the actual provisions. An especially noteworthy point here is that the notion of mother tongue, a concept of paramount importance in language education, is rather vaguely defined, which might give rise to a variety of interpretations and accordingly to a variety of teaching practices.

It is, therefore, crucial to examine how language education policies and legal norms are interpreted and how far they influence actual teaching practices. As Spolksy (2008: 27) maintains,

it is still relevant to identify the actual practices. For example, teachers in Arabic-speaking countries say they want their pupils to learn Classical or Modern Standard Arabic, but most commonly they conduct their classes in

²⁵ The courses may last no longer than two years.

²⁶ *Ibid.* The original German text reads as follows: “Der Spracherwerb erfolgt möglichst unter Rückgriff auf bereits verfügbare Kenntnisse der Muttersprache und auf eventuell vorhandene Kenntnisse der Zweitsprache”.

the local vernacular (Amara and Mari, 2002); and certainly many teachers claiming to teach in English are actually speaking the local language while using English textbooks.

Thus, while language education policies may have a far-reaching effect on the way language teaching is organised, when the issue at question is teachers' language use within the foreign language classroom, it has to be argued that the way diversity and multilingualism are treated on this micro level largely depends on the individual teachers' attitudes, i.e. the way they understand, think about and act upon these issues. The following section will, therefore, provide an overview of the academic discussion about actual classroom practices in Austria, focusing mainly issues of language use.

3.3 Having a closer look at Vienna: Policy vs. Practice

Considering education policies, language teaching seems to be given great attention in Austria. The Language Education Policy Profile (2008), compiled and published by the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture and the Ministry of Science and Research, is yet another piece of evidence of the policy makers' efforts to improve the quality of language teaching in Austria. However, as stressed in this document, newer approaches promoted by EU policies are difficult to implement due to several factors. As stated in the LEPP

while the development of plurilingualism is a generally accepted aim of language education, its implementation is only just beginning in most educational contexts. Measures may be more or less demanding, e.g. ministerial regulations concerning curriculum, or new forms of organization, which may require special financial arrangements, or political decisions, implying extensive discussion at all levels. (LEPP 2008: 4)

Disregarding this, language education in Austria seems to be optimal in theory, as has been argued above, individual multilingualism and linguistic diversity are equally supported, and although language teaching seems to place great importance on German, students' heritage languages are also taken into consideration. Yet, as the academic discussion reveals, the reality seems to be somewhat less inspiring. As Lutsch (2010: 88) observed, one of the problems in

Austria is that multilingualism is not widely supported outside the educational context; other sectors barely contribute to the development or the maintenance of multilingualism. Developing and sustaining multilingualism is seen as a task that is solely to be carried out by schools (ibid.), yet it seems that in practice institutions often cannot cope with this responsibility. Although the legal framework is there, it has been argued that in practice regulations promoting multilingualism are rarely, if ever, implemented in the classrooms.

Gogolin (1994) identified a central problem within the German educational system that directly applies to the Austrian system as well. She maintains that German schools are predominantly monolingual institutions and speaks of a 'monolingual habitus' that manifests itself in the practice that German is used as the school vehicular, without considering the presence of other languages. This, she explains, is the result of the misconception that the school environment, including the learners and the teachers alike, is monolingual per se. As a consequence, the languages of minority or migrant children are not only ignored, but also perceived as a burden (Abendroth-Timmer & Breidbach 2010: 11). These monolingual institutions, Gogolin (1994) asserts, have proven to be dysfunctional for they cannot cope with the growing linguistic diversity mainly triggered by migration. She points out that outside a classroom context, linguistic diversity is tolerated; however, as soon as formal teaching is involved, German will be the dominant language (ibid. 256). To change these practices, she suggests that schools treat multilingualism as a general education requirement and introduce it as an educational goal (ibid. 23). With regard to the Austrian educational system, these legal pillars have long been established; as argued in section 3.2 above, the Austrian Curricula have a clear focus on multilingualism and linguistic and cultural diversity. Yet, actual teaching practices seem to be lagging behind.

Both De Cillia (1998) and Furch (2009) argue that even those schools that provide extracurricular mother tongue education for students with migrant backgrounds are not striving to maintain bilingualism but are rather trying to develop a 'quasi-native competence' in German with the help of the learners'

native language(s). This implies that the aims of Austrian language education overlap with that of submersion or 'sink-or-swim' programmes that, according to existing research (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1998), have a low degree of success in maintaining bi- or multilingualism. As has been argued (Skutnabb-Kangas 1998, Butzkamm & Caldwell 2009), the reason why most 'sink-or-swim' programmes fail is that linguistic minority students are expected to follow instructions in the majority language while their native languages are often fully neglected, which typically results in a minimal level of fluency in the majority language (Edwards 2010). In the Austrian and especially in the Viennese context, the German competence of students with migrant background has been a central issue in recent public and political debates. The commonly accepted discourse is that German proficiency is the key to integration²⁷ and the struggle to bring children to a native-like level in German seems to have a considerable impact on the EFL classroom as it, among other things, influences the way the target language is taught and often also the amount of English learners are exposed to.

A further salient point is that, as has been so often argued, the aim of education is to prepare students for the 'real world' (cf. Gogolin 1994, Jørgensen 2005, Shohamy 2006) and accordingly, ignoring the existing linguistic and cultural diversity within the EFL classroom – in an environment where these could clearly get room – contradicts the essence of educational aims. As Shohamy rightly puts it (2006: 172), "languages and their varieties need to be acquired, used, and developed harmoniously, for nothing else but to reflect the '*real world*'" [emphasis mine]. Along similar lines, Jørgensen (2005) stresses that education ought to reflect the multilingualism of the environment by making use of all the linguistic means available. This points to the importance of treating languages as part of the social reality and accordingly raising learners' awareness of their linguistic environment. Hence, if German is the sole basis of comparison in the EFL classroom, it does not reflect the social reality as German is evidently not the only language used either in the wider environment or in the schools themselves. Fully neglecting the learners' heritage languages implies that

²⁷ This is a common phenomenon in other European contexts as well (cf. Muller & Beardsmore 2004: 24).

these are not valued and are treated as inferior to the school vehicular and to English. It has been pointed out that in linguistically variable settings, a non-normative learner-centred approach which acknowledges the various linguistic repertoires of the learners should be adapted (Busch 2007 qtd. Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 190). Furthermore, “multi-variety materials should help to valorise all languages in the classroom in order to make the ‘multivoicedness’ of society visible” (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer & Vetter 2011: 190). Adapting these and similar approaches is also relevant because restricting multilingual individuals in using their full linguistic repertoire forces them into a ‘language conflict’ (Oomen-Welke & Krumm 2004: 11). Speakers of minority languages feel to be accepted only in a community, where they are free to use their languages and thus the only fully appropriate learning environment for multilingual children would be one where their mother tongues are not treated as inferior to the school vehicular.

As research has shown, however, such innovative methods are hard to find in Viennese schools. Furch (2009), in her study, investigates issues of teacher training with regard to multilingualism in the Austrian context. Although, her research was limited to primary school teachers, it still provides valuable insight into Viennese classroom reality. Furch’s findings reveal that 79% of teachers have no experience with multilingual materials. 64% of her informants further stated that the languages of migrant children are not present in the classroom. This supports Furch’s argument according to which teachers in Austria are not prepared to deal with linguistically heterogeneous groups. Brizič (2008) is similarly critical of the situation. She claims that teachers are not only poorly trained, but also poorly informed about the multilingualism of their students, and therefore are not aware of the linguistic diversity in their own classes.

These facts clearly imply that, although the legal support for linguistic diversity and multilingualism is given, these have no direct influence on the actual classroom practices. Taking all the ordinances, measures and research data mentioned above into account, it seems that the (partial) neglect of minority and migrant languages in classrooms is not a legal, but a primarily a pedagogic issue.

In line with European language policies, Austria provides legal support both for individual and societal multilingualism. The Curricula clearly foster multilingualism and linguistic diversity, giving explicit measures on mother tongue and second language instruction in order to support functional bilingualism. Yet, as so often, the regulations do not seem to function in reality, there is an identifiable gap between policy and practice.

A crucial point James Tollefson and Amy Tsui (2004, as qtd. in García et al. 2006: 25) make with regard to the shortfalls of the practical implementation of language education policies is “the gap between (pluralist) discourse and (monolingual) practice”. And indeed, institutionalised language teaching in Austria has not yet moved away from the monolingual perspective and thus treats multilingualism as an additive competence where one language is acquired or learned after the other. Accordingly, languages are taught, assessed and kept separate as if interference would have a detrimental impact on reaching proficiency. Yet, exactly the opposite has been demonstrated in a number of relevant studies (e.g. Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner 2001a, 2001b; Cenoz & Genesee 2001, Herdina & Jessner 2002, Jessner 2006). Moving away from the traditional approach that treats different languages in strict isolation from one another presupposes that language education is understood “as a broad, all-embracing notion rooted in the concept of plurilingualism” (LEPP 2008: 28). It seems however that traditional conceptions of additive multilingualism and the monolingual norm are still embraced and, accordingly, language teaching and assessment are still deeply rooted in them. Wright (2008: 248-249) also points to this deficiency. As he argues,

At the school level, the desired outcomes for language policy development tend to remain somewhat idealistic. [...] Escamilla (1994) cited some of the difficulties with school language policies having the desired effect. Her study investigated the relationship between policy and practice in a Californian elementary school that promoted bilingualism. She found that the perception and reality were somewhat different. English was, in practice, the privileged language, even though the school’s policy espoused an equal footing with Spanish. [...] Perhaps these cautions illustrate the distance between the desire and detail; that schools seem unable to “walk the talk” for a range of reasons, not the least of which include some constraints imposed by external policy makers, coupled with the complex nature of teachers’ work.

Similarly, although the Austrian Curricula and more recent policy documents, such as the LEPP, foster the equal treatment of German and heritage languages (cf. section 3.2), German is the 'privileged' language in practice. In principle, however, all languages should be treated as potential assets. The Austrian LEPP (2008: 29) maintains that even if the teaching of German is "a key prerequisite for success in education and employment", supporting students with migrant backgrounds in developing and maintaining competence in their heritage languages is essential. The approach promoted by this document "sees the intrinsic value of immigrants' L1 skills as a national resource" and asserts that the various heritage languages of immigrants could be exploited to their full potential (ibid.). In the context of EFL this might support the utilization of learners' linguistic repertoires in order to achieve more successful learning on the one hand, and to shift heritage languages from their position as a burden to a setting where they are seen as a resource on the other. As Beacco (2007: 30) asserts

it is not enough to diversify the languages offered in schools; the education system must also be enabled to offer education for plurilingual awareness, that is, to organise educational activities as part of language teaching and beyond which lead to equal dignity being accorded to all the linguistic varieties in individual and group repertoires, whatever their status in the community. Teaching English should be conceived so as to stimulate speakers' plurilingualism and not block its later development in the name of a monolingual ideology.

The need to use German as the language of instruction in non-language related subjects in schools with a vast linguistic diversity is clearly undisputable.²⁸ Yet, taking Beacco's argument into consideration, it seems questionable whether the exclusive use of the school vehicular as the language of instruction is justifiable in EFL lessons for linguistically heterogeneous classrooms. Relying on German as the language of instruction while not paying attention to minority students' linguistic backgrounds obviously results in inequalities between native and non-native speakers of German, and between non-natives with various levels of German competence. As students master the school vehicular to different

²⁸ As noted above in section 3.2, it is legally possible in special cases to use another modern foreign language as the language of instruction.

degrees, it is questionable whether its use is beneficial or rather unfavourable for non-native students. Under these conditions, non-German natives often have to work both on their English and German competences in order to succeed in the target language. As García and Sylvan (2011: 398) rightly observe

In the 21st century, as classrooms become more and more linguistically diverse, the greatest challenge will be how to educate all students equitably and meaningfully. Imposing one school standardized language without any flexibility of norms and practices will always mean that those students whose home language practices show the greatest distance from the school norm will always be disadvantaged. Clearly, monolingual education is no longer relevant in our globalized world.

Furthermore, disregarding the existing linguistic diversity in the EFL classroom also deprives students of potential possibilities to gain awareness of their own multilingualism and plurilingual skills. Despite the multilingual approaches fostered in language education policies, in practice it is the teacher who determines how (heritage) languages are treated in the classroom. Teachers' practices, on the other hand, depend primarily on their ideas about how languages are learned, what is beneficial for the process and what constitutes an obstacle. Accordingly, in order to gain insight how educators work with the multilingualism and linguistic diversity present in their classes, it is important to investigate the discourses they produce about these phenomena.

3.4 How teachers see this: Perception of linguistic diversity in language classrooms

It is a fact that the majority of the schools both in Vienna and other urban areas in the world are culturally and linguistically diverse (cf. section 1.1); however, teachers frequently perceive immigration as a recent occurrence and believe that homogeneous classrooms are still the norm (Dooly 2005: 143). As Dooly (2007: 98) rightly asserts, "the completely homogeneous classroom is a myth". Learners come into the classroom with their own personality, background, beliefs, attitudes, learning styles, and personal stories; their linguistic repertoire is only one of the many issues that a teacher needs to pay attention to.

As pointed out above in section 3.1, the European Commission acknowledges the significance of multilingualism and has set the maintenance and development of linguistic diversity as its explicit objective. Accordingly, it encourages the teaching and learning all European languages, including widely and less widely spoken national languages but also regional, minority and migrant languages, for they are recognised as equally valuable (COM 2003: 9). European language policy thus defines linguistic and cultural diversity as a 'valuable common resource'. Having this in mind, the question is: if linguistic diversity is recognized as a potential asset on the legal level, why is it conceptualized as hurdle in the classroom?

In Dooly's (2007: 99) interpretation, "linguistic diversity should be seen as an [...] asset for the learning processes in the language classroom". In a study on teachers' perception about linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom Dooly (2005, 2007, 2009) demonstrated that linguistic diversity is primarily associated with categories such as "difficult", "hard" or "problematic". All teachers involved in the study attached attributes such as "conflict" and possible "teaching problems" to both linguistic and cultural diversity (Dooly 2005: 160). Dooly's (ibid.) findings thus also illustrate that there is a wide gap between teachers' perception and actual educational policies.

The core of the problem seems to lie with implicit ideologies about language and teaching. In the above-mentioned study by Dooly (2005, 2007, 2009) categorisations such as “difficult” and “problematic” might be traced back to the ideology of the monolingual classroom. “Even though linguistic diversity was assembled by some [informants] as possible teaching resources for languages and multicultural education, without exception, the foundation of the successful classroom seemed constructed upon the idea of ‘one language’ as preferable for class management and for instruction” (Dooly 2007: 160). One of Dooly’s examples nicely illustrates this negative perception of diversity.

- 12 ELIS: but as your group is a multilingual group and I think they
they don't have the same language
13 SAN: eh | then for me all are disadvantages then\|

14 ELIS: although you want them to explain to the rest of the class |
 15 SAN: then it's the problem\|
 16 ELIS: I think it's very difficult because if they don't |
 17 SAN: \| I agree
 18 ELIS: \| the same language\|
 19 SAN: I agree with you\|

(Dooly 2005: 149)

For in-service teachers, linguistically heterogeneous classrooms primarily meant “extra work” and “difficult”. They perceived diversity as a possible advantage for the students, but not for the teachers (Dooly 2005: 148). As one informant put this “as a teacher you have a lot of problems when you have students from different countries with different languages” (ibid.).

Yet another excerpt explicitly addresses the question of mother tongue in the EFL classroom, implying that the students’ mother tongue should be the school vehicular. This also demonstrates that the concept of mother tongue is somewhat problematic.

272 KIM: (. . .) mm but I think with a multilingual class it's not exactly
 suitable because eh the levels are so different and when you
 have a lot of when your class is multilingual and you have a lot
 of pupils that came from other countries and they don't know
 the the mother lang the language of \|
 273 MAR: of the school\|
 274 SHA: a lot of time you have to explain something in your own language to
 the rest of the students and if they haven't a common language \|

(Dooly 2005: 151)

Furthermore, for the teachers participating in the study, students who had no knowledge of the school vehicular “are constructed as having no real need to study foreign languages because they cannot ‘communicate’” (Dooly 2005: 154). Dooly (ibid.) further asserts that “the ability to ‘communicate’ is only accepted as long as it is in one of the official languages of the school”. The following exchange is a straightforward illustration of this.

209 SAM: eh yes more than in English because at this moment they don't
 need real English [. . .]
 211 SAM: no yes yes when you as a teacher a new student just arrived
 from Morocco and he only speaks Arabian why do you have to
 teach him some English structure if they can't communicate with
 you in any language? it's very difficult\|

(Dooly ibid.)

Notably, this excerpt also illustrates the derogatory perception of students' heritage languages. The issue of mother tongue became apparent in all groups studied by Dooly. The definition of mother tongue was, however, contradictory. On the one hand it was categorized as the majority or the school language, while in some instances, "mother tongue" was defined as the opposite of the school language (Dooly 2005: 156). If "mother tongue" referred to the language of migrant students, it was constructed as a potential source of conflict or miscommunication (Dooly 2007: 105). Dooly (2007: 103) further notes that "fear of racial or cultural conflict" was frequently mentioned in the data. Similarly, Pinterits (2001) and Furch (2008a) also argue that multilingual students are usually perceived as initiators of problems; they are regarded as deficient users of the majority language, and as such are seen as "a disruption in the well functioning national educational system" (Pinterits 2001: 27). Consequently, as Pinterits (ibid.) explains, German proficiency is given central importance, as it is considered to be the sole solution to solving the problem of integration. In other words, gaining a high level of competence in the majority language is the sole criterion for the integration of these children. Consequently, schools, but also teachers, struggle to give these learners native-like competence, often disregarding their distinct linguistic background.

As Dooly (ibid.) explains, teachers construct the "normal" classroom "as one in which one language prevails". The study further showed that the monolingual and the multilingual classroom are always constructed as opposites and linguistically heterogeneous contexts are "never constructed as a possible 'normal' situation" (2005: 159). Dooly (2005, 2007) further observed that pre-service teachers frequently attached positive attributes to multilingual speakers as language learners, and constructed diversity as a potential resource. For these teachers, the problems arising in multilingual contexts were not different from those arising in other settings (Dooly 2005: 158). Viewing these arguments in contrast with those of in-service teachers, the tension between diversity-as-an-asset and diversity-as-a-hurdle becomes even more articulated. An important point that Dooly (2007: 152) brings to attention is that

the pre-service teachers' assembly work included linguistic diversity in the foreign language classroom as a reason for using English as the vehicular language in an EFL classroom and perhaps most importantly, their construction of English as the lingua franca included the feature of "English" as a means of "equality" for all the students in the classroom.

A pre-service teacher argued as follows: "I think that maybe that the foreign language class is the only place where they have something in common and all of them are learning the same new language [...] if the class is run in English for instance as here" (ibid.). Similarly, another informant suggested: "well just speak English with them they are in the same position as the other pupils in the class so anybody knows English and everybody should learn a new language from the very beginning" (Dooly 2007: 104). Thus, even if language learning is stereotyped as a problem, in the EFL classroom "it is the same problem for everyone" (Dooly 2005: 153). Accordingly, in English lesson all learners of a linguistically diverse group are placed on equal footing (ibid.). However, relying on the majority language as the tool of instruction overturns this balance and puts non-native speakers in a disadvantaged situation due to their varying level of competence in the school vehicular. Furthermore, in contexts where the relationship between minority languages and the majority language is seen as conflicting or opposing (as it is in the domain of education), English can act as a quasi-neutral language. Hence, in the EFL classroom it functions a neutral tool of communication and teaching. It is thus reasonable to argue that in linguistically mixed classrooms the extensive or even the exclusive use of English during EFL lessons is the most beneficial.

4 Research design and methodology

The central question that this study seeks to address is how multilingualism and linguistic diversity is perceived and treated in linguistically diverse Viennese EFL classes in secondary school settings. A further crucial issue that the thesis wishes to examine is the standing of non-German native students' heritage languages as opposed to that of German and how they are treated in the EFL classroom as a result. More precisely, the study investigates which languages are legitimate in

the EFL classroom and the implications this has for the learners. Accordingly, the role of German in the EFL classroom will be examined as well. These issues are especially relevant as the Curricula maintain that learners should be encouraged in foreign language lessons to draw from their mother tongues and that a conscious approach to both the school vehicular and students' mother tongues should be fostered (cf. Chapter 3, sections 3.1 and 3.2). This study can clearly not assess whether this goal is reached, but it can explore whether attempts are being made towards it.

What this thesis has not set out to do is to look at the general approach to language teaching or why multilingual pedagogy has not been applied within linguistically variable settings in non-language lessons, as such issues clearly lie outside the scope of this project. Most importantly, however, this is not a study of the promotion multilingualism (*Mehrsprachigkeitsförderung*), but of why existing multilingualism is oftentimes treated as a burden in practice when its advantages are advocated in theory.

The basic assumption this study is based on is that actual teaching practices are greatly influenced by pedagogic discourse within a given institution and on the beliefs and attitudes of individual teachers that are, in turn, expressed through discourse. Belief is here understood as the associations that individuals establish between the object of thought and particular attributes belonging to that object (cf. Eagly & Chaiken 1993: 11). The term attitude here denotes a "settled behaviour or manner of acting, as representative of feeling or opinion", as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, and not the traditionally more complex concept used in social psychology. As Smit (1996: 24) asserts, "attitude has been defined in various ways depending on the scholar's theoretical approach and practical aims". At the most general level, however, attitude can be defined as "a disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects" (Edwards 1994: 97). The term *disposition* here does not refer to the personality, but to the tendency to react in certain ways (cf. Eagly & Chaiken 1993). Most importantly, attitude "is expressed by evaluating a particular entity" (Eagly & Chaiken 1993: 1) in a positive or negative manner. Further, attitudes are commonly described

in terms of three major components, namely the cognitive (thoughts/beliefs), the affective (emotions/feelings) and the conative (behaviour/behavioural intention) (Eagly & Chaiken 1993, Gallois, Watson & Brabant 2007, Garret 2010, Smit 1996). Attitude, as it is used in this study, designates a less abstract and much more general notion.

The manner in which language education policies are implemented in practice largely depend on what the individual teachers believe and how they act as a result of these beliefs. Their beliefs regarding issues of language are especially relevant as they significantly affect the teaching and learning process. It has also been argued that teachers' negative attitudes towards students' mother tongues can create potential obstacles for teaching (Dooly 2007). Research has further demonstrated that "students' perception of teachers' attitudes towards them, and subsequently the students' reaction in accordance to this" may influence their general performance in the lesson (Dooly 2007: 98). In a wider context Dooly (2007: 99) asserts that the way teachers perceive "multicultural and multilinguistic components within a classroom can have far-reaching impact on educational opportunities and, consequentially, influence employment and life opportunities for many students in the diverse classroom".

Although this study does not look at actual classroom practices extensively due to its limitations, it seeks to give some insight into how language use practices are shaped by the teacher's construction of multilingualism, linguistic diversity and notions closely related to these. The present chapter outlines the research design providing a working definition of discourse employed in the study and describes the methodological framework of data gathering. Finally, the analytical framework is presented.

4.1 Defining the construct: Discourse explained

As briefly mentioned above, the way teachers approach the teaching process is shaped by pedagogic discourse within their institution, but also by their own

beliefs about how languages are taught and learned best. These beliefs then may be communicated through discourse, yet discourse in turn forms beliefs, meaning that the relationship between the two concepts is not a linear but a circular one. As Talja (1999: 474) maintains, the primary feature of discourses is “that they organize social reality at a large scale”. However, discourse as a notion is perhaps difficult to grasp in its complexity.

Due to its multiple uses and great range of distinct meanings, the term *discourse* is one that often gives rise to confusion in social sciences (cf. Potter & Wetherell 1987, Wodak 2008). As Wodak (2008: 1) aptly puts it, “*discourse* means anything from a historical monument, a lieu de mémoire, a policy, a political strategy, narratives in a restricted or broad sense of the term, text, talk, a speech, topic-related conversations, to language per se [sic.]”, adding that its meaning has been stretched “from a genre to a register or stile, from a building to a political programme”. The main problem with this diversity of definitions is that they are seldom systematic and their operationalizations are perhaps even less so (ibid.).

From the perspective of social sciences, discourse is often seen as a form of social practice. Consequently, as has been argued, “the discourse event is shaped by situations, institutions and social structures, but it also shapes them” (Fairclough, Mulderrig & Wodak 2011: 357).

To put it in a different way, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially shaped: it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially influential, it gives rise to important issues of power. [...] Thus discursive practices may have major ideological effects: that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic groups, through the ways in which they represent things and position people. (ibid. 358)

As Jäger (2001: 36) puts this, “in discourses reality is not simply reflected [...] they impact and shape and enable social reality.” In other words, the production of reality is performed by discourse (ibid.). In this sense, “discourses are to be

treated as practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault 1998: 74, qtd. Jäger 2001: 43).

From a linguistic perspective, discourse is often defined as a text, i.e. as the largest communicative unit that can be either written or spoken. In Wodak’s (2008: 6) definition, however, “*Discourse* implies patterns and commonalities of knowledge and structures whereas a text is a specific and unique realization of a discourse [sic.]”, the latter comprising all forms of communicative utterances (Wodak 2008: 7). Adhering to this view, the type of discourse that this study is built upon can be defined as “knowledge formation” (cf. Talja 1999: 474) that is both socially constitutive and socially shaped (Fairclough, Mulderrig & Wodak 2011: 358). Discursive practices therefore produce and transport the knowledge on which collective and individual consciousness is built on (Jäger 2001: 38). In this, sense the analysis of discourse essentially means “the analysis of knowledge formations, which organize institutional practices and societal reality on a large scale” (Talja 1999: 460). As a result it may reveal “how people do things beyond language, and the ideas and beliefs that they communicate as they use language” (Paltridge 2006: 9) as well as the effect these discursive practices have on certain situations, on social identities and on the relationship between certain individuals and groups.

Discourse, as a linguistic social practice (Wodak 2001), has an underlying structure, as all constructs do. As a whole, it comprises multiple themes. The “thematically uniform discourse processes” are what Jäger (2001: 47) refers to as discourse strands. The discourse about multilingualism would be one such strand. In Jäger’s model, each such strand is made up of several texts to which he refers to as discourse fragments. A discourse fragment is “a text or part of a text which deals with a certain theme” (Jäger 2001: 47). A text thus has the potential to “address several themes and thus contain several discourse fragments” (ibid.). Importantly, discourse strands have a synchronic and diachronic dimension. It is the analysis of the latter that can give an insight into what is and what could be ‘said’ in a particular point in time (ibid.). The present study is concerned with

this dimension only and thus attempts to identify what is 'said' about multilingualism and linguistic diversity in the present (cf. Jäger 2001).

"The uses and effects of discourses [, however,] are context dependent" (Talja 1999: 477) and accordingly contextual factors must be taken into consideration. Beside these intra- and intertextual relationships, discourse analysis must take into account several other variables as well. Wodak (2008: 12-13) suggests a method that "is based on a concept of context which takes into account [the following] four levels":

1. the immediate, language or text internal co-text;
2. the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses,
3. the extralinguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific context of situation (middle-range theories);
4. the broader socio-political and historical context, to which the discursive practices are embedded in and related (macro theories).

(Wodak 2008: 13)

The analysis of co-text "involves relating each utterance to what comes before and after it, and to other utterances in the interview transcript", while intertextual and interdiscursive relationships "include links between the talk in an interview and other talk, as in the use of keywords and topoi" (Abell & Myers 2008: 150). Accordingly, the "co-text refers to the immediate textual collocations of an expression, it may also cover the [Conversation Analysis] approach that looks at the preceding and following turns" (ibid.: 152). These analytical modes are, however, not mutually exclusive and in both cases, as Wodak (2008: 14) explains, "verbal expressions have to be analysed with regard to *linguistic pragmatic*/grammatical [sic.] approaches (presuppositions; insinuations; implicatures; [and other relevant characteristics of the given discourse])". Importantly, "[e]very expression can [also] be examined from the point of view not only of its meaning but also of its effects" (Alasuutari 1995: 86). The extralinguistic layers on the other hand denote the social/sociological variables and institutional and wider socio-political frames that enable and, to a varying degree, shape discourses. These contextual elements may give rise to

certain discourses and determine which discourses are possible as well as in what form are they possible.

As the present thesis investigates a particular and sharply delimited discourse that focuses on in-service EFL teachers, the concept of discourse community is relevant. Among other things, discourse communities are defined “through a broadly agreed set of common public goals, through mechanisms of intercommunication among its member; through their own genres; through their own lexis; and through a suitable degree of relevant content and discursive expertise” (Wodak 2008: 15). Hence, discourse communities have common goals and hold common values and beliefs (Paltridge 2006: 24-25, Wodak 2008: 15, Borg 2003: 398) that may surface in actual discursive repertoires. In this sense, in-service EFL teachers share the common goal of bringing students to a particular level of proficiency in the target language, while their common values and beliefs may surface in their discursive practices. The importance of these discursive practices lies with the fact that they are shaped by the institutional and wider social frames teachers operate in as well as by actual teaching practices, but are also the shapers of teaching practices as well as the wider social reality. Hence, the views teachers form and hold about certain situations and contexts – in the frame of this study about multilingualism and linguistic diversity within the classroom – influence the way they act in these contexts and vice versa. Discourse and the texts that represent it are, therefore, the objects of this study rather than the descriptions of the object (cf. Potter & Wetherell 1987: 49, Talja 1999: 472).

The analysis of [discursive] repertoires is like putting together a jigsaw puzzle. Interviews are not interpreted as stories having a clear and distinguishable message and meaning; instead, all the accounts produced by the participants are taken into consideration and analyzed to identify significant patterns of consistency and variation in them. [...] The endpoint of analysis is the systematic linking of descriptions, accounts, and arguments to the viewpoint from which they were produced and the naming of the different [discursive] repertoires—usually by concepts that repeatedly occur in participants’ talk and that tend to be used when the topic is approached from a particular angle. [...] The search for the pattern of repertoires includes three phases. The first phase consists of the analysis of inconsistencies and internal contradictions in the answers of one participant. The second phase consists of the identification of *regular*

patterns in the variability of accounts [sic.]: repeatedly occurring descriptions, explanations, and arguments, in different participants' talk (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The third phase consists of identifying the basic assumptions and starting points (in Foucauldian language, "statements"), that underlie a particular way of talking about a phenomenon. (Talja 1999: 466)

The purpose of DA, however, is not solely to identify these repertoires "but to point out the power and influence of particular narratives and to analyze their potential societal and institutional functions and effects" (Talja 1999: 474). DA "make[s] it possible for the readers to weigh the practical consequences of different discourses and to show the problems and possibilities created by their existence" (ibid.).

4.2 Methodological framework

Having defined the object of the study, the following sections will outline the forms and techniques of data gathering as well as the approaches to analysing the data. The general approach to both data collection and analysis applied in the study is a combined one. In order to gain a holistic understanding of the issues at hand, data was gathered from several sources and accordingly the analysis was conducted on multiple levels. On the macro level, international and national language education policies were discussed and examined, while on the micro level, teachers' discourse and classroom practices were studied. Between these two ends, institutional frames including school policies and social variables such as the composition of the student population constituted the meso level.

The focus of the project lies with a single institution, and accordingly with a fairly small group of teachers. However, "[f]or discourse analysis the success of a study is not in the least dependent on the sample size. It is not the case that a larger sample necessarily indicates a more painstaking or worthwhile piece of research" (Potter & Wetherell 1987: 161). Accordingly, both data gathering and analysis followed a qualitative approach. As opposed to large-scale quantitative studies, the advantage of qualitative data lies with its "richness and holism, with

strong potential to for revealing complexity; such data provide ‘thick descriptions’ that are vivid, nested in a real context” (Miles & Huberman 1994: 10). Therefore, this approach is clearly suitable for generating understanding about the issues at question.

4.2.1 Data collection: Teachers in focus

As already noted above, the target group of this research project are in-service English teachers teaching in linguistically diverse Viennese classrooms. As the object of this study is the discourse teachers produce in connection with linguistic diversity and multilingualism, instances of such discourse had to be gathered. Accordingly, qualitative interviewing was chosen to constitute the core of this study as it is the most suitable method for collecting spoken texts from individual informants. The interview’s perhaps most frequently mentioned disadvantage is “that it is prone to subjectivity and bias on the part of the interviewer” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2001: 269). Nevertheless, this issue is not of critical importance to the present study. As Talja (1990: 472) explains, in discourse analysis

The reliability of research results does not depend on the trustworthiness of participants’ answers, because even a speaker who lies applies cultural forms and interpretative resources that, in themselves, are neither true or false, but simply exist (Silverman, 1985). [...] All forms of talk and texts represent situated speech that provides evidence of the various ways in which a particular phenomenon can be approached. Research data do not describe reality; rather, they are specimens of interpretative practices.

With regard to the interview as a research technique, Cohen et al. (2001: 269) further point out that both its benefits and drawbacks lie in direct interaction. While interviewing undoubtedly gives more extensive opportunity to ask questions and request clarifications, the sources of error are typically more numerous in an interview situation than, for example, in questionnaire surveying. Nevertheless, “it allows greater depth than is the case with other methods of data collection” (ibid.). Furthermore, the interviewer’s influence on the responses can be minimized by focused and carefully formulated questions that do not suggest an expected answer to the respondent.

To enable the best possible comparability of individual interviews in the subsequent steps of the research, a standardized semi-structured format seemed to be most beneficial. With this technique, the wording and sequencing of questions is predetermined, and thus respondents are asked the same basic questions, if possible in the same order in order to reduce the interviewer's influence. More importantly, however, this format greatly "facilitates [the] organization and analysis of the data" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2001: 271). As Dörnyei (2007: 136) puts it, this interview type "offers a compromise between the two extremes", the fully-structured and the much looser narrative interviews. Questions need to be largely open-ended, avoiding "ready-made response categories" (cf. *ibid.*). This simultaneously allows interviewees to elaborate on issues, which gives a greater depth to the data. Moreover, it has been argued that open-ended questions yield a "more considered response" and thus "provide better access to interviewees' views, interpretation of events, understanding experiences and opinions" (Silverman 2006: 10). With these criteria in mind, a general guideline was developed for the interviews. Due to the nature of the data which had to be gathered for analysis, it was necessary to allow informants elaboration and long stretches of monologue. In order to encourage respondents to share more details and thus to increase the richness of the data, the initial list of guiding questions was supplemented with further questions based on observed teacher behaviour. For the complete list of the guiding questions, see Appendix 1.1.

As has been argued in section 4.1 above, data on the wider context is indispensable for a discourse analytical approach. Therefore, in order to gather contextual information on the school environment and actual language use practices in the institution, the interviewing method was combined with a quasi-ethnographic approach, namely that of observation. Hornberger (1994: 688-689 *qtd.* Silverman 2007: 133) argues that the ethnographic approach allows "comparison and contrast between what people say and what people do in a given context in order to arrive at a fuller representation of what is going on". As she explains, asking teachers about their approaches is not enough; these must

also be observed in action (ibid.). Similarly, Seidman (2006: 10) argues that a researcher can only gain insight into teachers' behaviour through observation. "It is by comparing and contrasting [the mentioned] dimensions that a realistic and multi-layered description can begin to emerge" (Hornberger 1994: 688-689, qtd. Silverman 2007: 133). In the study at hand, these observations, however, do not aim to confirm whether teachers reliably report on their actual practices, but rather to gain some supporting data for the analysis of individual discourses and by this provide a more solid grounding of the interpretation. Accordingly, to supplement the interview data and increase the validity and reliability of the study, lesson observations were conducted. Each individual interview was complemented with one lesson observation. Importantly, to avoid potential influence on teachers' behaviour, as a rule lesson observations were conducted before the interviews. A further crucial point Cohen et al. (2001: 305) mention is that observation data allow the researcher "to discover things that participants might not freely talk about in interview situations" and, perhaps more importantly "to move beyond perception-based data (e.g. opinions in interviews)".

In addition, lesson observation was the only feasible method to gain insight into teachers' and students' actual language use practices, as it enables the gathering of "live' data from 'live' situations" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2001: 305). As Seidman (2006: 11) maintains, "[i]f a researcher is asking a question such as, 'How do people behave in this classroom?' then participant observation might be the best method of inquiry". Thus, the subject of observation is the social behaviour of groups or individuals. Morrison (1993: 80 qtd. Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2001: 305) further asserts that in educational contexts observation gives the researcher opportunity to gather information on physical setting, human setting, interactional setting and programme setting. For the study at hand, human settings (the structure of the group being observed) and especially interactional patterns (the verbal and non-verbal interactions that take place in the classroom) are of particular relevance. In accordance with this, the lesson observations aimed to explore three things: 1) teacher behaviour with regard to language use (own language use, treatment of students' mother tongues and the

methods used), 2) the linguistic composition of the groups and 3) students' language use. Beside gathering contextual information, the first point also served to generate supplementary questions for the interview, while data on the latter two points were meant to give a holistic image of the institutional context and the teaching environment itself.

Hence, the observations had a narrowly defined focus on language related issues. As Sparadley (1980: 128) explains, this focused type of investigation requires careful planning as the researcher already knows what s/he is looking for. This also includes defining the tool for collecting data. Bloor and Wood (2006: 71) point out that "[o]bservation is generally aided by observational schedules" and accordingly, the observations were conducted with pre-defined guidelines, as the interviews were. In order to ensure the consistency of the observations and, if necessary, facilitate comparability of the data gathered from the individual lesson observations, a uniform observation sheet was developed. In order to gain a more holistic picture, the observation sheet focuses specifically on the issues that are tackled in the individual interviews. Accordingly, various aspects of language use (both of teachers and students) and teaching methods formed the core of the observations. For the full observation sheet, see Appendix 3.

Observations are in essence verbal descriptions of factual information. Analysing observations, however, is an interpretative process (cf. Brown 2004), much like analysing discourse. The gathered data was therefore reviewed several times (cf. Milanowski, Prince & Koppich 2006) and the observations most relevant to the pre-defined categories were compared to the information gained from the interviews in order to see whether and how far teacher's discursive repertoires influence their language use in classroom.

In order to gain more contextual information on the institution where the study was conducted, an extra interview was conducted with the principal of the school in addition to the lesson observations. For this purpose, a separate list of questions was developed, but the main themes and topics remained central. The list of the guiding questions is given in the Appendix 1.2.

4.2.1.1 Formal and technical details

The study was conducted between May-June 2012 in one Viennese school that combines three types of Austrian secondary education (*Bundesgymnasium*, *Realgymnasium* and *Oberstufenreal-gymnasium*). The only criterion when choosing the institution was that its student population should be as diverse as possible – both linguistically and culturally. The chosen school is located in a district of the city where the concentration of citizens with migrant background is relatively high²⁹ and thus the institution educates children of different nationalities from all over the world (cf. section 5.1 for a detailed description).

The selection of the informants was absolutely random, neither gender nor age distributions were considered. The sole criterion for selection was that the interviewee teaches English. As a result, informants differed not only in terms of age or their second subjects, but also in terms of years spent in teaching service (see section 5.1.1 for details). Notably, there was only one male informant among the interviewees. However, this being a qualitative study, the mentioned factors have no direct influence on the results. A short form was filled in before the interviews to gather basic information on the informants' gender, age, mother tongue, on the languages they spoke, the years spent in service and, in case that was applicable, information on international experience. The interviews were conducted in English for a number of reasons. Firstly, as the analysis is done in English, it was reasonable to gather the interview materials in the same language. This way the interviews could be analysed as authentic texts without translations that would have potentially distorted the meanings conveyed in the original utterances. Secondly, all the informants, except the principal, are teachers of English and accordingly it was not a problem for them to express themselves in this language. As the principal is an English-German bilingual, the language of the interview did not cause an obstacle to her either. Finally, in a context where German and languages denoted as migrant languages are traditionally assigned opposing positions (i.e. majority versus minority language or national/official versus vernacular language), English seems to be a quasi-

²⁹ www.wien.gv.at/statistik/daten/rtf/ausland-bezirk.rtf

neutral tool of communication. The interviews were conducted in the rooms of the school and were recorded³⁰. The length of the individual interviews varied between 13-22 minutes.

While the observations, being written descriptions, are ready for interpretation without special processing, the recorded interviews had to be prepared for analysis. Therefore the audio recordings were transcribed for further processing after the interviews were conducted³¹. The transcriptions were prepared in Transcriber 1.5.1³² and imported into ELAN 4.1.2³³ for coding. The following section introduces the framework that was adapted for the analysis of the interviews.

4.2.2 Analytical framework

The analysis of the interview data relies on a combination of qualitative content analysis (hereafter QCA) and discourse analysis (hereafter DA). QCA is, in a sense, the backbone of the analysis; it was used to identify the main themes and categories in the interview texts. This brought transparency into the data organisation and, most importantly, enabled a thematically coherent interpretation. DA, on the other hand, constituted the interpretative framework for the previously coded texts. As Wodak (2008: 2) points it out, “[it] provides a general framework to problem-oriented social research”. DA is an exceptionally powerful analytical tool, as it has the potential “[to make] visible ‘ongoing conversations,’ important debates, and interpretative conflicts existing in the society, and the genuine ambivalence of many social questions and issues” (Talja 1999: 473).

³⁰ The interviews were recorded with Audacity, a free audio editor and recorder (<http://audacity.sourceforge.net/>).

³¹ All interviews were transcribed in accordance with the transcription convention (see Appendix 4).

³² Transcriber is a tool for transcribing, segmenting and labelling speech (<http://trans.sourceforge.net>).

³³ ELAN is a language archiving tool that enables complex annotation on both audio and video (<http://www.lat-mpi.eu/tools/elan>).

Although content analysis has been predominantly associated with quantitative studies, it has found its way into qualitative research with some essential changes (Dörnyei 2007: 245). While chunks of data must be forced into predefined categories in quantitative research, categories emerge from the data itself during the process in QCA. QCA involves a deeper, interpretative analysis that is carried out in several subsequent steps. This “latent content analysis”, as Dörnyei (*ibid.*) calls it, involves pre-coding and coding (second-level coding) for themes, generating ideas and finally establishing patterns. Importantly, coding makes the interpretation more accessible, but in order to achieve this codes must be clearly defined, their meaning must be transparent at the first glance (Dörnyei 2007: 251). Furthermore, the technique employs a “strategy of analytic induction” (Leki & Carson 1997: 48) which, in simple terms, means the repeated scanning of the texts in order identify categories along with the phenomena and attributes that are attached to them, and trying to reveal the patterns that these make up. In this study categories are treated as units of analysis that, although meaningful in and by themselves, must be interpreted in relation to each other.

In the present study, the initial themes of the interviews have naturally defined the major categories, namely those of linguistic diversity and multilingualism. As these notions are also defined by the various languages involved, further key topics were embedded into the interviews, namely that of students’ mother tongues (being the root of linguistic diversity), German (being the major vehicular in the given context) and English (providing the foreign language teaching context that is studied). These themes served as the basis of what emerged as categories. However, an additional theme and several further categories emerged during the initial phase of the analysis. Similarly, sub-categories, which actually serve as the descriptors of the main categories, were also drawn from the interview data during the first steps of the analytical process. Table 1 below summarizes the assembled categories and their descriptors ordered according to the general themes.

Theme	Code	Sub-code(s) / Descriptors
Multilingualism and Linguistic Diversity	Linguistic diversity	Equated with multilingualism
	Individual multilingualism	Definition
		Multilinguals are immigrants
		Difficulty for the students
	Multilingualism in the classroom	Equated with multiculturalism
		Resource for the students
		Resource for the teachers
		Difficulty for the teacher
		Same as monolingual classrooms
		Source of conflict
Languages involved	Mother tongue(s)	Base for learning other languages
		As non-relevant
		Not allowed (rude, impolite)
		Secret language
		Natural to use
		Home language
		German assumed
	German	Poor/lacking competence
		Hard to learn
		Factors influencing competence
		Important
		Base for learning other languages
		Shared/common ground
	English	Equal footing
Teaching practices	Language(s) of instruction	Quasi monolingual norm
		English only
Identities	'Othering'	Migrants as non-German natives
		Migrants as non-German speakers
		Birth place defining nativeness
		Expressed in percentage
Institutional frames	Language related policies	National policy
		School policy

Table 1. *Category assembly*

The categories and descriptors outlined above are not the results of a linear process, but rather a recursive one. During the repeated perusal and coding, several changes had to be made. In the course of the analysis, some of the categories have merged together, while others had to be split. After the coding process, the data was interpreted in thematically organised clusters. Naturally, there are overlaps between the codes and accordingly between the clusters and some utterances fit into several categories. Therefore, the interrelatedness

between certain parts of an interview text or several texts is pointed out throughout the study because only this way could a holistic interpretation be attained. This is especially important, as it has been criticised that in social sciences

text sequences are used as illustrations, sentences are taken out of context, and specific text sequences are taken out of context, and specific text sequences are used to validate or reject claims without relating them to the entire textual material and without providing any explicit justification or external evidence for their selection. (Wodak 2008: 1)

Based on Wodak's (2001, 2008; see section 4.1) four-level framework for analysing discourse, the study applies a top-down approach from the macro level to the micro level. The wider European context and the institutional frames in which the school at question operates were touched upon in the previous sections, while the close analysis of the discourse gathered for the study will follow in the subsequent chapter. The socio-political level has been discussed by referring to the factors that have shaped the linguistic composition of the population of Europe and by examining European language education policies (section 3.1). Institutional frames, on the other hand, were examined through the Austrian Curricula (section 3.2) and via an interview with the principal of the investigated school (section 5.1). The latter gave a better insight into more case-specific institutional language policies that have a more immediate effect on the discourses within the school. The subsequent level of discourse, i.e. teachers' discourse, constitutes the central theme of this study. The data analysis that follows will, therefore, attempt to inspect both the immediate contextual level (i.e. relate utterances in the single interviews to each other) and the intertextual and interdiscursive levels (i.e. relate the single interview texts to each other) while striving to establish meaningful links between all four levels. Relationships on the intertextual and interdiscursive levels refer to the links between the single interview texts in the sense of using the same themes and keywords or concepts (cf. Abell & Myers 2008: 150). The aim of this deeper textual analysis is to map the discursive repertoires of the social actors constituting the target group of this study (cf. Hammersley 2003).

4.2.2.1 Validity and reliability of the approach

The analysis of qualitative interview data can be based on either the factist or the specimen approach (Alasuutari 1995, qtd in Talja 1999). The former focuses on the content of the interview in order to research respondents' attitudes or behaviour, answers are thus expected to reveal the processes or phenomena in the speakers' inner or external reality (Alasuutari 1995: 54, qtd. in Talja 1999 471). "These phenomena or processes are the true object of study, and therefore the factist perspective makes a clear distinction between research data and the reality about which it gives information"(ibid.). Thus, as Talja (1999: 472) explains, "[i]n the factist perspective, the reliability of research results depends on how unbiased and accurate is the information the interview answers provide about the phenomenon studied".

On the other hand, the specimen approach used in this study treats respondents' statements as linguistic expressions, rather than the representations of how these individuals act. Accordingly, in addition to examining content and meaning, the analysis must take the "implications and effects [of the interviewees' statements] in constructing different versions of reality" (Talja 1999: 472) into account. It is important to note that respondents' statements are not treated as true or false, but as cultural forms and interpretative resources. The reliability of the data is, therefore, independent from the trustworthiness of individuals' replies (Silverman 1985, qtd. Talja 1999: 472). Instead, interview data is seen as "situated speech that provides evidence of the various ways in which a particular phenomenon can be approached"; interviewees' statements "do not describe reality; rather, they are specimens of interpretative practices" (Talja 1999: 472). As Talja (ibid.) maintains,

In the specimen perspective, the validity and reliability of research results do not depend on the empirical level, the nature of research materials, or on the nature of researcher-researched interactions. The reliability of findings depends on the verifiability of the researcher's interpretations. The interpretations must, in a consistent and identifiable way, be based on the research data.

Along these lines, the reliability of the informants is not questioned in the analysis at hand. Their statements are not checked against actual practices (e.g. lesson observations) in order to verify their accuracy, but to identify the implications teachers' discursive repertoires have on their teaching practices and how this affects language use in their classrooms.

5 The Viennese Case Study

This chapter constitutes the central part of the study, introducing the institution where the study was conducted, presenting the analysis of the interview data and describing the classroom practices. The brief school portfolio is meant to provide an insight into the institutional frames teachers work in while the lesson descriptions, focusing on language use practices, illustrate how far teachers' discursive repertoires inform their language choices in the classroom. The interview analyses, by closely examining each text in relation to each other, strive to reveal the informants' discursive repertoires connected to issues of multilingualism and linguistic diversity in the EFL classroom.

5.1 Institutional frameworks

The institution in question has over a thousand students, the vast majority being monolingual according to the school registries. Only about 1% of the students are listed as having two mother tongues. Just over 30% of the pupils are registered as German-natives. With 16%, the Turkish speakers constitute the largest group of non-German-natives, followed by speakers of BCS languages with 14.5%. Speakers of Arabic make up the third largest speech community with roughly 9.5%. All other languages have only a few speakers, between 0.1% and 3%. In sum, native speakers of 46 different languages attend the school. The linguistic composition of the school population is clearly diverse.

Being one of the 76 Austrian schools belonging to the UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network, the institution explicitly embraces cultural diversity.

The UNESCO's ASPnet is a global network of 9000 educational institutions in 180 different countries. The mission of the member institutions is "learning to live together in a pluralistic world characterised by cultural diversity"³⁴. As formulated in the website of the Austrian Commission for UNESCO

Schools [that are members of the network] pursue an interdisciplinary, intercultural approach to cooperation and insist on a high degree of teamwork. They apply an integrative style of education that appreciates the element of difference as a key component of its pedagogical work. Practicing democracy is a pre-eminent educational goal. UNESCO Associated Schools proactively commit to human rights, a culture of peace and sustainable development.

The institution is, on the whole, strongly oriented towards diversity and espouses cultural and ethnic heterogeneity. The principal stressed the importance of internationalism and explained that the appreciation of the existing diversity is part of the school's corporate identity. However, not all educators seem to see things the same way. As she put it, "we, as a school, stress the internationalism of our school and how enriching it is. Sometimes I feel that not everybody means the same things. We've agreed on a corporate identity, and everybody agreed to it. But I don't think everybody attaches the same meaning to it". This suggests that there might be considerable variation in how teachers interpret and work with this diversity.

Regarding language use, there is no explicit policy that favours a certain language or languages. The principal stated that she would not allow a policy that would, in any way, prevent students from using their mother tongues outside the classroom. "That would take away pieces of their identity". Nonetheless, the language of instruction is in essence always German. In spite of this, the principal noted, some teachers in the school would nicely incorporate "bits and pieces" from students' backgrounds. It is not clear whether this means elements of the heritage culture, the language, or both.

Multiculturalism and diversity is promoted in the school; this does not, however, encompass linguistic diversity. Rather, as the interview with the principal

³⁴ Austrian Commission for UNESCO, http://www.unesco.at/bildung/unescoschulen_eng.htm

revealed and as the analysis of the teachers' interviews will show, diversity is seen solely in terms of cultural or religious differences. The physical environment of the school reflects this stance in the photos and posters put on display in the corridors and the classrooms: photos mirror cultural and ethnic differences in that they show students with various backgrounds, while the posters in the classrooms made by students display heritage countries. In contrast, the linguistic landscape of the school leaves students' mother tongues invisible. Among all the student posters and all the notices in the building there were none that reflect the existing linguistic diversity as everything was in German only. Hence, although diversity is given exceptional attention and is treated as something enriching and positive, this does not seem to apply to students' heritage languages.

Remarkably, what is evident from the institutional environment seems to apply to teaching practices as well. As the data below will reveal the majority of the interviewed teachers, if utilizing diversity as a resource in their classes, would capitalize elements of students' heritage cultures but not their languages. Moreover, with regard to language use, many cater for the use of German over students' first languages, even outside the teaching context.

5.1.1 Teachers' profiles

For the sake of anonymity, teacher' names are changed throughout the study. As noted above in section 4.2.1.1, the interviewed teachers had quite disparate profiles regarding their age, second subject and teaching experience; one thing they all had in common was their mother tongue, namely German. Furthermore, all the informants can be regarded multilingual, as in general they speak at least two languages. The time they have spent in service varies between 3-30 years and thus their experiences considerably differ with regard to classroom practices.

Aaron belongs to the age group 40-49 and has been in service for 17 years. His second subject is German. He reported English as the only language he speaks beside his mother tongue. Marie has taught English and history for 28 years and

belongs to the 50-59 age group. She speaks German and English. Grace belongs to the youngest age group (30-39). She reported only German as her mother tongue, but listed English, French, Italian and Spanish as the languages she spoke. Among all the informants she reported the most languages. Her second subject is French and she has been in service for 8 years. In addition to English, Paula (age group 40-49) teaches philosophy and psychology. She has been in service for 3 years only. Among all the interviewees, Paula has the least teaching experience. She speaks English and French as foreign languages. Tiana belongs to the 50-59 age group and has taught English and French for 19 years. Accordingly, she speaks English and French in addition to her mother tongue. Elena belongs to the same age cohort. She has been teaching English and history for 30 years; this makes her the most experienced among the interviewed teachers. Clara, like Grace, belongs to the youngest age group (30-39) and has 5 years of teaching experience. Her second subject is French and these are also the foreign languages she speaks.

5.2 Interview Analysis

This section summarizes the results of the interviews. The data was analysed in category sets, they are presented here in the same manner. As the analysis will show, teachers' discourses partly overlap with Dooly's (2005, 2007, 2009) findings outlined in section 3.4 above. Table 1 in section 4.2.2 summarizes the themes, the categories and their descriptors that provide the framework for the analysis. The subsequent sections are, therefore, organised according to the main themes that are then elaborated using the categories and their descriptors. The discussion of the interview analysis follows in chapter 6, while the lesson observations focusing on language use practices are presented in section 5.3.

5.2.1 Multilingualism and linguistic diversity

The first few interviews made it apparent already that teachers make no distinction between linguistic diversity and multilingualism. The vast majority of

the informants, as illustrated in excerpt 1, have never heard of linguistic diversity and the question addressing the issue was confusing to most.

Ex. 1

INTER aha, how- and (.) in your opinion what is linguistic diversity then.
AARON i have NO idea.
INTER okay well how would you define if erm linguistic diversity and
 multilingualism. is there a difference to you.
AARON ah i see. yeah. no. i've never heard the latter.
INTER mhm. okay.
AARON i just had gender diversity.

With one exception, all other teachers, like Aaron, had no concept of linguistic diversity and talked about multilingualism instead. Thus, because the informants used the term *multilingual* instead of *linguistically diverse*, linguistically heterogeneous classrooms will also be referred to as multilingual classrooms in the analysis below. Importantly, the initial theme '*multilingualism*' had to be divided into two separate categories, namely those of '*individual multilingualism*' and '*multilingualism in the classroom*', each being assigned different attributes.

5.2.1.1 Individual multilingualism

The assembly of descriptors shows that individual multilingualism connotes various concepts. As the analysis below will confirm, the sub-category '*definition*' revealed a variety of different views on individual multilingualism, touching upon the form of acquisition, language use patterns and linguistic competences, but it also yielded partly contradictory statements.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
Individual multilingualism	Definition	all informants
	Multilinguals are immigrants	CLARA, TIANA, (GRACE)
	Difficulty for the students	CLARA, TIANA

Table 2. *Descriptor assembly for the category individual multilingualism*

All interviewees defined multilingualism as the ability to speak or use multiple languages and regarded their students as multilinguals. Interestingly, however, for most teachers a speaker was only then multilingual if s/he had naturally acquired the languages involved. Accordingly, the home context seemed especially relevant for a number of informants.

Ex. 2

MARIE [...] yeah so if you grow up and that you you you learn the language which is also from your parents [...] multilingualism that's the when a child grows up also and learns the languages and which is naturally. not at school. mix it up here and there and the parents, one parent speaks english and the other parent speaks german, so that would be multicul- multilingualism for me.

Marie explicitly states that in order to become multilingual an individual must “grow up” with the languages and acquire them naturally, outside the school context. Therefore, she attaches an important role to parents’ language use and comments on the natural language learning process of a multilingual child who would spontaneously switch between codes. Yet, when talking of language use in the family Marie refers to English and German only. Importantly, English – but in the context of migrant languages German as well – in Austria is a language that is associated with the educational context rather than with home languages. She does not mention any of her students’ mother tongues (importantly, as she notes at one point, none of her learners are German-natives); instead, as an example, she points to parents speaking major vehiculars that have been traditionally denoted as more prestigious than, for instance, migrant languages. Interestingly, this contradicts much of the discourse that constructs multilinguals as those who have migrant backgrounds, as part of the analysis will show. Furthermore, the way Marie constructs the image of the multilinguals, disregarding their *de facto* home languages, seems to have a strong influence on her teaching practices as well as on how she treats languages other than English and German. As will be demonstrated, Marie favours German above other languages and is likely to disallow the use of students’ non-German mother tongues in and outside the EFL classroom (see Ex. 24 in section 5.2.2). A further noteworthy element in this stretch is that Marie refers to the one-parent-one-language principal (e.g. Döpke 1992) that is rarely the case in the Austrian context for children with migrant

parents, as they would usually acquire German outside the home and not in the family. Thus, it seems that she pictures an idealistic situation that recalls the context of functionally multilingual families who speak highly valued vehiculars instead of using one or more varieties associated with foreigners and migration.

In the following excerpt, another teacher, Grace, also emphasises the “natural” use of one’s linguistic repertoire and denotes great importance to the nuclear family. Here too, the home context seems to play the decisive role in the construction of multilingualism. The fact that she mentions German as the language that is used outside the home, especially in the school, indicates that for her multilinguals are those who are believed not to speak the majority language at home. In this sense, German is constructed as the language of the public domain, rather than that of more private contexts. This clearly opposes Marie’s concept of German as a home-language. In contrast to Grace, Marie mentioned German as one of those languages that her multilingual students speak at home.

Ex. 3

GRACE	well they depending on the on the context and depending on the situation aa use different languages. naturally. so for example when they when they are at home speaking or with with their parents or their their brothers or sisters that they use a different language then when they are out in the park with their friends for example. or when they are at school. i do think that most of them use english or use german. speak german when they are at school
-------	--

In the next turn, this view is reinforced. Grace is very hesitant to accept the idea that German-natives can become multilinguals and she is trying to find a context that would suit the argument. Finally, she settles with the conception that German-natives are multilingual only in specific situations. What she suggests is that German-natives are essentially monolingual, except if they, as tourists, travel to other countries. This implies that language competence is not the only factor in defining multilingualism; in addition to having competences in several languages (preferably learned in the home context) one must have a history of ‘travel’. It seems only obvious that this connotation is established based on the idea that individual multilingualism is the result of migration.

Ex. 4

- INTER and what about learning foreign languages at school. do you consider those kids who have german as a first language multilingual. i mean german as a first language and then learn a foreign language at school. do you consider them then multilingual later on. or do they become multilingual.
- GRACE i. it depends i think. but but but probably yes. i mean if you if you take it in a very- yeah yeah. and if you define it like that they can use different languages depending on where they are. so if they go on holiday and its a holiday situation they go somewhere to an english speaking country as a tourist, and if it's only for two weeks i do think that when they speak english there and at that time then well, if they can make themselves understood, amm i think they are multilingual.

This strong link between multilingualism and dislocation (migration or travel) seems to be a quite stable element in the teacher discourse and is shared by several informants. Excerpt 5 shows that Tiana also relates competence in multiple languages to the notion of migratory movement.

Ex. 5

- INTER
TIANA and do you consider the individual students that you teach also multilingual. amm, most of them actually are. yeah. amm. okay they all are they have the mother tongue, they have german, as the (.) kind of mother- mother tongue. and some of them even have more then just one. so there are some people who came from armenia then went to russia and other parts amm afganistan pakistan and so on. chechnya and other countries.

Importantly, Tiana also touches upon the issue of German as a quasi-mother tongue, which points to the vagueness of the concept of mother tongue. As will be demonstrated in section 5.3.2, the issue of mother tongue is by far not a simple one. Nevertheless, all informants, including Clara in the following extract, referred to mother tongues when talking about multilingualism and language competences. Yet, unlike Grace and Tiana, Clara explicitly stated that a multilingual individual is someone “that comes from a different country”. This, however, does not clearly refer to the place of birth but rather to her students’ migratory background. This becomes clear when in a later turn Clara mentions non-German native students born in Austria (see Ex. 36 in section 5.2.3).

Ex. 6

- INTER and how would you- your own definition of multilingualism. (-) you have this am how would you define multilingualism in your own-

- CLARA a real multilingual person for me would be someone who speak both the languages as a mother tongue. being raised up with both languages.
- INTER okay. so if somebody am learns a language at school that doesn't qualify as multilingual?
- CLARA amm (.) i'd have to think about it. probably yes. probably yes. amm (.) a mul- so you mean you'd say that someone who's german and learns english (-)
- INTER i'm asking whether that that to you that means multilingual
- CLARA i wouldn't have thought so. i wouldn't have thought so. multilingualism for me is rather if you someone who learns it at home. that comes from a different country.

In Clara's words, only an individual "being raised up with both languages" is a "real multilingual". She also maintains that multilingualism is not something that education can influence; to her, as to Marie, multilinguals are only those who learn their languages at home. Notably, she refers to only two languages when speaking of multilingualism, using the word *both* twice, without doubt referring to German and a migrant language. Again, as in the case of Marie (see Ex. 2 above), this contradicts Clara's subsequent statements in which she notes that children only speak their mother tongues in the family and accordingly need to learn German outside the private domain.

In the next excerpt, Elena makes a clear distinction between the home language and German, reinforcing the idea that multilingualism is strongly connected to the family background. However, the extract also shows that she is the only teacher among the informants who saw foreign language competences as part of the multilingual repertoire of her students. Remarkably, no one else seemed to perceive the potential of foreign language teaching to produce multilingual individuals. Thus, unlike most of her colleagues, Elena did not link multilingualism to the form of its acquisition.

Ex. 7

- INTER [...]. and how do you consider your individual students, the one that you teach. are they also multilingual?
- ELENA of course they are. because they know their home language, they have to know german quite well, to be able to succeed here and they have english, some of them have french or italian so they are multilingual.

Excerpt 7 further illustrates the importance attached to German competence. As Elena points out, good competence in German is essential for students "to be able

to succeed here”. The deictic expression *here* in the given context can refer both to the school but also to the Austrian context into which education institutions are embedded. Section 5.2.3 below addresses this issue in more detail.

As the extracts above have demonstrated, teachers’ definitions of individual multilingualism frequently include the notion of migration or migratory background in some form. Clara’s assertion in excerpt 6, namely that multilinguals “[come] from a different country”. also points to the idea that language essentially equals nationality (and perhaps ethnicity, the two terms often being used interchangeably in everyday speech). In the following few lines, Marie uses the term *nationalities* to elaborate on the previous utterance “how many different a languages we have got”.

Ex. 8

INTER	mhm. so you consider each class in this school multilingual as well then
MARIE	yeah of course. of course. unfortunately i can't tell you how many different a languages we have got, the nationalities, but there must be about thirty something like that at least. from a language learning perspective.

She uses the word *nationalities* to refer back to and explain what she means by *different languages*. Hence, it seems that students’ nationalities already imply a certain language, disregarding the fact that nationality neither equals ethnicity nor does it necessarily define one’s mother tongue. As Brizič (2008) rightly argues, teachers are usually not aware of the fact that students often belong to a linguistic minority in their home country and therefore the national language is perhaps their second or even third language. A considerable number of the students coming from the countries of former Yugoslavia or Turkey have this multilingual background (ibid.: 232). Therefore, as Brizič maintains, for these children “mother tongue education” (*Muttersprachlicher Unterricht*) often only deals with the official language of the heritage country (ibid.), while the subject “first modern foreign language” (*Erste lebende Fremdsprache*), in our case EFL, is likely to be their third or fourth language.

Clearly, the category of individual multilingualism is a highly complex one, encompassing a great range of attributes. Interestingly, however, students’

individual multilingualism was never constructed as a potential resource; instead, some of the interviewees argued that it constitutes an obstacle to learning of English. In excerpts 9 and 10 Clara claims that for her students “it's more difficult [...] to learn more languages” because they simultaneously need to deal with German as well. In a sense this suggests that German has not been acquired after all. It is further remarkable how Clara denotes German as a “foreign language”; it seems that because migrants are strongly associated with foreignness, Clara constructs her native language as foreign for those who come “from a different country” (Ex. 6). This then suggests that students with migrant backgrounds are essentially regarded as the “Other”. The issue of othering is addressed in detail in section 5.3.6.

Ex. 9

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | mhm. and does [the german competence of the students] have any influence to your english teaching? in any way. |
| CLARA | i think it does. amm (.) maybe it does just because of the fact that it's more difficult for them to learn more languages they have to still in a way learn german as a foreign language a bit. am and a plus the the new language english. so it definitely affects the the english classroom as well let's say. |

Ex. 10

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | that's why that would be my next question whether this kind of- the fact that there are so many languages in a classroom and they kind of share german as as a second language maybe or a third language, whether that's kind of a any kind of a hindrance or an obstacle for the english lesson. |
| CLARA | yes. i definitely think so. yeap, yeap. it makes things more difficult for them. because it's just not only the second language, like it was for me when i learned english for english but it's the third language, or maybe even fourth, could also be. |
| INTER | so you think that makes, makes it more difficult for them. |
| CLARA | yeah. i think so. i have the impression that it does. |

In excerpt 10, although the question addressed the issue of multilingual classrooms, Clara comments on individual students' competence. Notably, she never mentions this to be a difficulty for the teachers. The only agents in this category are the students; nevertheless, Clara does not elaborate on why learning a third or a fourth language would be more difficult than learning a second one. Nevertheless, it seems that to her, students' existing linguistic repertoire constitutes an obstacle to foreign language learning. Similarly, Tiana

also noted that learning a foreign language that is not a second language is a “bit more complicated” (Ex. 43 in section 5.2.4).

5.2.1.2 Multilingualism in the classroom

Even though the category ‘*multilingualism in the classroom*’ had to be treated separately from ‘*individual multilingualism*’, several of the descriptors are related to concepts discussed in the previous section, as table 3 below shows.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
Multilingualism in the classroom	Equated with multiculturalism	MARIE, GRACE, CLARA
	Resource for the students	GRACE, AARON
	Difficulty for the students	CLARA
	Resource for the teachers	AARON, GRACE, MARIE
	Difficulty for the teacher	PAULA, MARIE
	Not different from monolingual classrooms	TIANA, AARON, MARIE
	Diversity as a source of conflict	PAULA

Table 3. *Descriptor assembly for the category multilingualism in the classroom*

What emerged as perhaps most prevalent from the transcripts is that the interviewed teachers equate multilingualism with multiculturalism. When asked about multilingualism, several informants talked only about multiculturalism fully disregarding the linguistic factors. Clearly, they see diversity in cultural rather than linguistic terms, meaning that they seem to conceptualise diversity as a range of various customs, traditions, beliefs and behaviours without making an immediate link to languages. Considering the institutional context it seems probable that these discourses are directly informed by the general school policy that emphasises interculturalism, pushing the issue of linguistic plurality into the background (cf. section 5.1). As the principal pointed out, the school as an entity treats its existing internationalism as a resource; the languages present in the institution were not mentioned in the same way. Even though the principal had an extraordinarily positive attitude towards multilingualism, this does not seem to surface in institutional policies and as a result, the linguistic repertoires of the school population are barely capitalised upon.

Ex. 11

- INTER [...] and amm do you a think that there is a difference between multilingualism and linguistic diversity? or have you ever heard this distinction between these terms.
- MARIE aa (.) multiculturalism you mean also a- because

When Grace was asked to estimate the number of various languages in the school, she referred to “cultural backgrounds” and “different countries” and equated that with languages only after a direct question. This utterance implies that she associates the plurality of the student population with heritage cultures and countries rather than with languages.

Ex. 12

- INTER do you know approximately how many languages there are in the school?
- GRACE amm well amm i as i am the class teacher of a fourth form, amm i think that there are out of twenty-four students they have erm twenty different cultural backgrounds. twenty different countries.
- INTER okay and that means also various languages.
- GRACE yeah, also.

Further, in her next turn, where she points out in what way diversity can be a resource for the EFL lesson, she refers solely to culturally related things, and makes no mention of students’ linguistic repertoire as a potential asset.

Ex. 13

- INTER and do you find that their kind of linguistic background can be am an asset IN ANY WAY. can you use it this linguistic background or cultural background for your lesson in some way.
- GRACE of course. of course. amm. (.) ja i do think that amm (.)students from different cultural backgrounds can amm or that that a lesson can benefit from that. from them. their background. especially when it comes to to to discussions for example, they can they have more to say, somehow. when you talk about i dunno celebrations, yeah. a a just before christmas we had this big discussion going on about how to celebrate christmas, some of them don't celebrate christmas at all, of course. some others do and they do it in totally different ways, so it can be enriching. yeah.

Notably, although Grace talks exclusively about cultural diversity, she constructs it as a resource for the lesson that includes both agents: the learners and the teacher. In contrast to the case of individual multilingualism, where it was constructed solely as a difficulty and only for the learners, both positive and

negative descriptors emerged for the category '*multilingualism in the classroom*'. Yet, as the descriptor assembly shows, Grace was one of the two teachers who referred to the existing plurality as a resource, without limiting it to one agent only. The next excerpt illustrates that Aaron, very much like Grace, connotes "diversity" with culturally conditioned variables, such as beliefs. He treats diversity as a resource of the teacher, something that a teacher "can work with". Although he did not point it out explicitly, he also refers to this diversity as a resource for the class.

Ex. 14

INTER	amm. is for instance this diversity you have in your classroom can be an asset in any way. you think.
[...]	
AARON	yes. very much so. amm, you have different attitudes, a lot of different life stories, amm you have a variety of experiences (.) that you wouldn't that in my classroom we just didn't exists. we all basically had the same story more or less. and these kids have all kinds of different stories, different beliefs, different degrees of beliefs (.) and that amm (.) that creates (.) a lot of tension, but it's sort of creative tension. once you once you (.) find out (.) aam where the potential lies you can actually really work with that.

The concept that Aaron refers to as "creative tension" is clearly not interpreted as a resource by all. Rather, some see it as a source of conflict and accordingly try to refrain touching upon issues of nationality or ethnicity. As excerpt 15 demonstrates, Paula argues that learners with particular ethnic backgrounds bring tension into the classroom.

Ex. 15

INTER	mhm. and what about the cultural backgrounds, cause that is also i assume very DIFFERENT within the classroom, do you use it as for instance a a teching content, in any way? well if it's appropriate.
PAULA	a not really. we've we've used to have lessons on multicultural britain it was called, in one of the books. and it's sometimes a bit like er buffet or some sort of er where students bring meals but apart from that no because the last couple of years we always had this erm sort of problems between amm albanians and serbs, and and and turkish and serbs, and so (.)
INTER	as in conflict situations?
PAULA	as in conflict situations yes and and erm you you have to be very careful you have to really know a lot about these things in order not to bring up any rivalries or or whatever.
INTER	may i ask what it was if it's not to private what happened.
PAULA	no no not that politically there is it always a tension, and of course the kids hear that at home and they and that sort of bring that into the classroom and amm, so i generally try and avoid the topics, of nationality. you know. amm

Notably, Paula also rejected the idea of capitalising on linguistic diversity in her English lessons. As she argues, there are too many different languages in the classroom which makes their integration into the EFL lesson non-viable. Importantly, as excerpt 31 in section 5.2.2 shows that Paula is of the opinion that the teacher must be competent in all the languages students speak in order to employ them for her teaching. This belief seems to have a profound effect on her classroom practices.

Ex. 16

- | | |
|-------|--|
| INTER | german and- and do you think that their language background can be amm in any way a resource? for your english lesson. have you been thinking about- |
| PAULA | well i haven't found any way to sort of integrate into my lessons. because my- no because it's so there is such a diversity in there and there are so many different languages in one classroom, that's you know i don't see how really. |

Also, like many others, Paula broaches her learners' lack of German competence, and claims this to be the source of what she constructs as '*difficulty for the teacher*'. While the majority of the teachers argued that working with linguistically heterogeneous classrooms is not different from other contexts, Paula maintained that it is "more challenging" due to learners lack of competence in German.

Ex. 17

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | how do you find actually TEACHING these linguistically MIXED classrooms. is it any different from monolingual classrooms? or- |
| PAULA | mmm (.) it is definitely more challenging. amm. because amm as i said very often amm it is their german that is causing us problems, and i find it very difficult to explain i em it's easier in the first grades where you explain things like that you can point at like desk or chair or whatever. amm but amm if amm amm more abstract vocabulary is is definitely more difficult to teach. |

This short extract further also implies that it is not the linguistic composition of the student population that constitutes an obstacle to the EFL lesson. As the following example demonstrates, Aaron holds a similar belief, with the difference that he sees the various levels of (linguistic) competence of his students as the source of difficulty.

Ex. 18

- INTER and how do you find teaching amm english to these linguistically mixed classrooms. is it any different to other classes?
- AARON nnn not the language mixture is not difficult. the level of competence is difficult to teach. because on the one end you some very bright not so very educated some very good students, and the on other hand you have some still bright young people. whose english and whose german is really bad, so so if you have people of this mixed level of ability classes that's hard but that doesn't depend on language.

It seems thus that it is not the linguistic heterogeneity that constitutes an obstacle for the teachers, but rather other factors that are not necessarily language-related. Tiana, for instance, maintained that teaching linguistically mixed groups is “not very different” from teaching monolingual classrooms.

Ex. 19

- INTER how do you find teaching erm these linguistically mixed classrooms. do you find it any different to other teaching contexts or- monolingual classrooms.
- TIANA amm yeah. mmm (.) difficult to say cause i have been teaching for such a long time only such classes. it is amm (.) not very different. (.) amm as i already said amm maybe you have some other knowledge, you can amm find certain languages but in general it's not not that difficult

In consonance with her other arguments, Clara mentions that the lack of a common mother tongue in mixed language classrooms is difficult for the students, rather than for her as a teacher. It should be noted that she had also denoted individual multilingualism to be a difficulty for students (Ex. 9 in section 5.2.1.1).

Ex. 20

- INTER and how about you as a teacher. do you find it more difficult? in any way that there is not one common mother tongue for them. in the classroom.
- CLARA do i find it difficult. (.) not really difficult. for me it's not difficult. it's more difficult for them probably. to learn english. but-

Remarkably, only one of the interviewees defined linguistic diversity as a resource for the learners without seeing it as an asset for the teacher. The next extract shows that Marie sees a potential in using students' linguistic repertoires in order to teach vocabulary. Yet, when asked whether she capitalizes on this resource, she notes that “diversity comes in with the topics”. This then is in line

with practices reported by other informants, namely that diversity is enriching in the sense of cultural exchange.

Ex. 21

- INTER mhm. yes. and do you think so if if you say linguistic diversity is not a challenge it can be or could be a kind of a resource in any way. or cultural diversity.
- MARIE yes of course. because then they say oh yes i know that word from, it's the same in my language.
- INTER okay. and do they really say that.
- MARIE ja ja sometimes. ja. ja. sometimes. even if a for instance those learning the italian or latin and then they said oh ja in latin it's also it's all, i know that word.
- INTER so this kind of comparative approach helps then.
- MARIE mhm. i think it also helps them then the with the also a enlarging their vocabulary. because then they remember it more easily. i think.
- INTER and does that influence your teaching in any way or the materials that you use if you have like these linguistic classrooms. linguistically mixed classrooms.
- MARIE aaamm the diversity comes in with the topics. [...]

Furthermore, it is also interesting that while Marie says that students recognise lexical similarities between English and “their language”, when elaborating on the issue and giving an example she – once more (cf. Ex. 2) – only refers to those languages that are taught at school and makes no mention of students’ mother tongues. It appears that she avoids acknowledging that students would use their heritage languages in the EFL lesson. On the whole, several descriptors of multilingualism incorporate the notion of mother tongue, though in different ways. How the interviewed teachers construct the concept is discussed in the following section.

5.2.2 Confusing concepts of students’ mother tongues

The category ‘*mother tongue(s)*’ yielded very diverse descriptors. As shown in the assembly below, several negatively loaded attributes were attached to the concept. Further, as will be argued in the detailed analysis, in some instances informants express strongly opposing and contradictory views. It is not always clear whether the interviewees construct students’ mother tongue(s) as immigrant languages or as German. In the present context students’ mother

tongues refer to heritage languages, i.e. languages other than German that children acquire at home, from their family.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
Mother tongue(s)	Base for learning other languages	PAULA, CLARA
	As non-relevant	PAULA
	Not allowed (rude, impolite)	MARIE, PAULA, ELENA
	Natural to use	GRACE
	Home language (heritage language)	MARIE, GRACE, CLARA
	German assumed	CLARA, PAULA, TIANA

Table 4. *Descriptor assembly for the category ‘mother tongue(s)’*

Extract 22 below broaches the issue of mother tongue(s) on several levels. While talking about her practices of language use in the EFL lesson, Marie contradicts herself: she explains that grammar must be taught in German because it is the students’ mother tongue, but then corrects herself by saying it is the language learners know best. She further adds that utilizing both languages is “easier”; yet, she does not define the agents and thus it is not clear whether using German makes the teaching or the learning of English easier. The question arises because in multiple instances she – and also other informants – talks about students as having poor competence in German (see section 5.2.3). It is thus debateable whether this approach benefits the learners. Moreover, instead of saying that German is used as a vehicular because it is the only shared language in the classroom and therefore a common point of reference, Marie argues that students’ must know German best “because [they] are in Austria”. This not only disregards students’ mother tongues and positions them as invaluable and illicit, but also underlines the ongoing public and political discourse that regards proficiency in the state language as the most crucial factor for integration (cf. section 3.3).

Ex. 22

INTER	and amm which languages do you use in the classroom.
MARIE	amm quite a lot of englisch of course from the very beginning.
INTER	do you happen to use german for for some-
MARIE	no no mostly it's if i explain grammar of course i do it both ways, because you have to explain it in the mother tongue, also not mother tongue in this case but in the in the in the language they know best. so which in that case would be german then, because we are in austria. i do it both ways. because it's

easier. i explain it and also am later on when we revise it then we also discuss it in english. but mostly grammar is also in german. explain it in german.

The confusion around the definition of mother tongue (When is a language a mother tongue?) becomes even more evident in Marie's slightly puzzling utterance. She first points out that there is a plurality of languages in the school, then simultaneously regards German as students' mother tongue and as a second language. Clearly, Marie is indecisive about what can be regarded as a mother tongue.

Ex. 23

INTER	mmm my first question would be amm do you consider your this school multilingual?
MARIE	yes of course ((laughs))
INTER	and and
MARIE	cause there are so many languages we have got students a wh- and their mother tongue is is german. so most of them also consider german as a second language and so it's very difficult.

The next extract is one that seems to carry great weight with regard to language use patterns in the EFL classroom, but also outside that context. In a row of subsequent turns. Marie elaborates on how she disallows the use of students' mother tongues. As she puts it, "we don't want that" which implies the school as a collective rather than herself only. The stretch below reveals that she forbids students to speak in their heritage languages also in their private time, during the breaks and the repeated use of the phrase "we don't want that" emphasises the strength of her statement. Marie stresses that "at school the school language is German", and accordingly she reports "just tell[ing] them off" when despite the warnings students would still use a language other than the school vehicular. It is remarkable that she considers this practice to be a school policy when, according to the principal, there are no such regulations in the institution.

Ex. 24

INTER	and what is your opinion on students using their first languages, whether it's german or any other language in the classroom. have you noticed that they do that, sometimes.
MARIE	aaa in our school, also beginning of the school year mmm aa they parents can sign that they want them to improve their mother tongue, [...]

INTER mhm. and would they use these mother tongues in your english lesson. have you ever noticed.

MARIE no. no. and we don't want that. no. i mean they they they tend or they try also if if you have got also erm if you have got especially the turkish boys. or girls. so the- so they try it. but if it if you go to the classroom at break time and you listen and then suddenly you think it's not german what are you talking about, and then you tell them we don't want you that. and it's also unfair and it's impolite. so ja. once they understand it. but of course also it happens. and then but then you just tell them off. and they say no no no either you use english in the lesson of course or you stick to german. but at school the school language is german.

INTER mhm. is that a is that a school policy or-

MARIE more or less ja. ja. ja. ja.

INTER i understand.

MARIE ja. we don't want that. ja.

INTER cause i somt- in not in your lesson but in one of the lesson observations i've heard i think it was serbian or bosnian or croatian-

MARIE mhm. we don't want that. no. no. it depends on the teacher, maybe teachers don't mind but i do a lot. ja. and i get really angry. if they stick to it.

Furthermore, she attaches the adjectives “unfair” and “impolite” to students’ language use practices and with that suggests that their language use is not appropriate. In a very similar manner, Paula also “disencourages” [sic.] students from speaking their heritage languages, as “it's rude to speak a language in front of people who can't understand the language”. The use of these negatively-charged adjectives hints at a negative perception of students’ language use patterns that involve the heritage languages.

Ex. 25

INTER and what is your opinion on students using their first languages, whether it's german or any other language in the english lesson.

PAULA eerm well normally, amm, normally they try and avoid it during- in front of you know when i'm sort of close to them. in school we sort of disencourage that. amm,

INTER within the english lesson you mean or you in general.

PAULA in general.

INTER is that a kind of school policy you have? or? depends?

PAULA am i i really wouldn't know. we tell them it's rude to speak a language in front of people who can't understand the language. you know. amm but erm especially with those who're like new fifth forms. erm they take a while. like the one you saw. so they take a while but i think sixth formers wouldn't do it anymore. normally if they sort of tend to stick to the common language.

INTER so they use they would use outside the classroom they would also use german.

PAULA use german. yeah.

As Paula points out, “they take a while” but, eventually, stop using their first languages. It thus seems that teachers successfully prevent the usage of students’

mother tongues students' mother tongues by suggesting that its use is rude, impolite and inappropriate in public. These practices not only undermine the prestige of the heritage languages but, as the principal emphasised, it takes away parts of individuals' identities. Very much like Marie and Paula, Elena also insists on her students using only German beside English in the EFL lesson. She believes that speaking languages in front of those who do not understand them is "impolite". As the following extract shows, the only acceptable situation to use one's mother tongue is when nobody can hear it except those who are competent in the given language. This suggests that migrant languages are accepted as long as they are 'invisible' to their environment.

Ex. 26

ELENA	in aaa amm in the breaks a it's a private thing. i i always tell them as long as nobody is near who doesn't speak the language it's okay. but for example when we do an excursion, am we go by train or we go by bus, i always tell them to speak german to each other. because well a people stop listening when they understand what you are talking. somehow i mean noticed that. and when i for example when we went to ireland, i went with a lot of classes, (-) they spoke english. their when they were being in public. it's practice and and it's i think it's polite.
-------	--

From what Tiana reports, it seems that these prohibiting practices rooted in discourses that construct the use of students' mother tongues as illicit, "impolite" and "rude" have resulted in the decreasing use of heritage languages in school.

Ex. 27

INTER	and what about outside the classroom do you hear them use first languages maybe in pairs or groups.
TIANA	sometimes but amm it has amm a amm i think amm some five years ago i heard turkish and other languages more often. so maybe they all rather stick to german.

Among all the informants only Grace talked about using heritage languages as "natural". For her, prohibiting these practices and insisting on German instead was not an issue. As the extract shows, and as argued in section 5.3.5 below, she adheres to an English-only norm. In this respect, she really places all learners on equal footing as for her, German competence is not a decisive factor for teaching or learning English.

Ex. 28

- INTER no. what's your opinion about them using their first languages whether it's german-
- GRACE i think it's natural. of course i mean a in the in the lesson or in the class that you observed, a there were two sisters sitting in the last row, amm and well i i think it's just natural? when they when they speak in their native language. from time to time. it's just something
- INTER that doesn't bother you
- GRACE no not at all. because they don't do it excessively. i think that plays a big role. if they'd do it all the time or every lesson then i would have a problem with it definitely. but as far as it's like that, every now and then, it's okay for me.
- INTER amm you would have a problem with that cause then they're not using english or?
- GRACE yeah. because i want them to a you know a i want them to use english during the english lesson.

Some of the teachers argued that students should have a good command of their first languages as that is the basis of successful foreign language learning. As the examples below show, Clara and Paula both emphasise the importance of learning one's mother tongue because proficiency in that language determines how well one can learn other languages.

Ex. 29

- CLARA and also if they if they learn amm their their mother tongues, like at school they can learn turkish here also and and arabic and we try really try to motivate them and a lot of children take this chance because i think this is a big advantage in life. if they really can speak their mother tongues really well. and it's also important to speak their mother tongues well in able in order to be able to speak or to learn any other language, like englsh. so it's really important and that's what i try to tell to parents a to send their children to am mother tongue courses here at the school so that they will be able to learn english or french later. cause it's so important to to am be able to speak one language perfectly³⁵. your mother tongue. so if they can't speak german perfectly and they can't speak let's say turkish perfectly this definitely has a negative consequence on foreign language classrooms as well.

Ex. 30

- PAULA okay. i would have amm (.) afternoon, i would have afternoon i would have extra languages in in EVERY mother tongue that we have in school. you know we we do offer arabic classes here and turkish classes amm amm but i would have EVERY kid trained in the mother tongue. you know, to amm am a level amm amm an a you know that a level that they want to reach at the a (spel) levels. just what we do with their own kids. you know. give them that kind of schooling in their mother tongue that they need.
- INTER and why do you think that would be important.
- PAULA a because i think they can only master a foreign language if if they mastered their own. if they've got that kind of fluency and understanding and er and

³⁵ Clara could not clearly define what knowing or speaking a language "perfectly" means; yet it can be assumed that by this she refers to a high level of proficiency without the traceability of competences in other languages (e.g. without a recognisable accent or grammatical inference).

really amm (.) i i yeah deep rooted knowledge and feeling for their own language only then can they go out and master a second language er to that extent.

What these excerpts also show is that mother tongue education is not considered to be an end in itself (it should not be learned for the sake of the mother tongue), but is rather seen as preparation for learning German and, later on, foreign languages. What seems very contradictory, however, is that Paula views students' mother tongues as irrelevant from the perspective of the EFL lesson. To her, none of the languages could be a resource in the classroom as long as the teacher is not proficient in them. This way of thinking puts the teachers into focus rather than the learners and suggests that only the teacher's linguistic repertoire can be capitalized upon. Some more student-centred methods that have been successfully applied in teaching English as a second language (ESL), where learner groups are in essence multilingual, could be implemented in the present context as well. Various forms of project work and cooperative or collaborative learning have been proven effective in many cases (cf. Christian et al. 1990, Dörnyei 1997, Felberbauer 2007, Jacob & Mattson 1990, Madinabeitia 2006, Morgan 2001, Oxford 1997).

Ex. 31

- INTER and do you amm do you usually ask your students what their first language is or
PAULA no
INTER it's not relevant for for your english teaching.
PAULA well i- it's not really relevant because i only speak a few words of a serbian or croatian so that's the only thing that comes in handy here. and i do not speak any of the other languages so amm so and i don't know about most of their grammar, you know. amm but so it doesn't there's really no point. me asking.

Instances where the mother tongue was constructed as the “home language” occurred when the informants defined the concept of multilingualism. As argued above in section 5.2.1.1, informants used the category “home language” to denote migrant languages; only Marie made a reference to German as the language that multilinguals speak within the family (Ex. 2). Notably, these findings are very similar to what Dooly (2005, 2007, 2009) found studying teacher discourses in similarly multilingual contexts. She also identified contradictory definitions of the notion of *mother tongue*. On the one hand, it was constructed as the school

language, while on the other it was used to refer to migrant languages, i.e. to denote the opposite of the school language.

5.2.3 “They should speak German perfectly of course”

The descriptions “poor competence” or “lacking competence” were assigned most frequently to the category ‘German’. Those teachers who commented on this brought up the issue several times, stressing that students’ lacking proficiencies may cause obstacles in English lessons on several levels. A repeatedly addressed problem resulting from this was the teaching vocabulary.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
German	Poor/lacking competence	MARIE, CLARA, PAULA, ELENA, GRACE
	Factors influencing competence	AARON
	Important	CLARA, ELENA
	Shared/Common ground	ELENA, CLARA, PAULA
	Base for learning other languages	CLARA, PAULA
	Hard to learn	MARIE, ELENA

Table 5. *Descriptor assembly for the category ‘German’*

Marie explains in a very detailed manner how students “don’t know their grammar” and “don’t know so many words”. In her opinion, this is due to the fact that students “tend to speak also the mother tongue” at home, while German is used in the educational context only. In her utterance “they don’t pick [German] up somewhere else”, the phrase *somewhere else* seems to denote domains outside of the educational setting. This then implies that in Marie’s discursive repertoire students’ whole private domain is exclusively in their mother tongue. Furthermore, Marie is (indirectly) indicating defective language use which underlines the construction of students with migrant background as “different” and “opposing”, i.e. those who do not comply with the expected norm (see section 5.3.6). Further, by indicating the contrast of the home-school context and noting that this makes language teaching (especially that of German) “really really difficult”, Marie suggests that students’ language use patterns are viewed as a hindrance, and therefore inappropriate.

Ex. 32

- MARIE aaaa, well on the whole, ah we expect them a to know their german quite well when they come from also from primary school, but this is not really the case. because amm when they come here the mark is very good mark but also when they start and having german lessons the german teachers hah (-) also WONDERING. what they learned because also they have to start from the very beginning. so it's really really difficult. they don't know their grammar, they don't know so many words also they never heard words also [...]that is because they really speak german at school in the class and to their colleagues and with the teacher of course. BUT at home, they tend to speak also the mother tongue. and if they don't read or if they don't read or they don't pick it up somewhere else, then it's really really difficult. i don't want to be a german teacher and i'm so glad to teach english it's (-)

For the very same reasons Marie mentioned, Clara tries to provide her students with as much German input as she can. In the following utterance, she points out that “parents [...] don't speak German perfectly” and therefore, as a teacher, it is her task to speak German with the children. She further maintains that although she is an English teacher, it is more important for her that students “speak German perfectly”. This hints at the important role of the majority language, not only in school, but in the wider public context as well. This was also demonstrated with extract 7 above (section 5.2.1.1) in which Elena asserts that German competence is inevitable for children in order to succeed both at school and in Austria. Hence, teachers' discourse mirrors the commonly accepted idea that proficiency in the majority language is the basis of integration and accordingly educational (and later on professional) success.

Ex. 33

- INTER and how about outside the classroom, do you use then rather german or english with them.
- CLARA outside the classroom? amm it depends. sometimes i speak english also with them because i really like that. but also german because i also have them in the afternoon because it's aaa you know ganztagesklasse (German: whole-day class), and i also speak german with them because you know i have the feeling that they need people to speak german with them. because they're here the whole day and this is the advantage that they have, over other classes only stay until like two o'clock. a because at home they don't have german speaking parents. or maybe parents that don't speak german perfectly. so i think it's really important amm very important that they speak german. english okay. of course it's important i mean i'm an english teacher but amm above this they should speak german perfectly of course. so i think they should speak german with the teachers.

As pointed out in section 5.2.2, Paula is one of those teachers who argue for discouraging students from speaking their mother tongues at school. Interestingly however, by saying “I really wouldn't know”, she admits that she is not very familiar with the German competence of her learners, as she speaks to them in English only. Paula's teaching practices are essentially based on this English-only norm; yet, she allows the use of German but not the use of students' mother tongues in her lessons. Accordingly, it can be argued that she, as most of her colleagues, barely adhere to a quasi-English-only norm (see section 5.2.5). Furthermore, it appears that Paula's arguments are contradictory with regard to her knowledge of students' German competence. While first she claims not to know about her learners' level of competence, in a subsequent turn she comments on “how poor [students'] German [is]”. Another issue that Paula takes to foreground is that of language competence being defined by one's birth. She reveals her expectation that if students were “born [in Austria], and brought up [in Austria]” their competence in German would be native-like (cf. section 5.3.6). This, however, disregards the fact that most of the children with migrant backgrounds often only come in contact with German in kindergarten or in their first school year. Moreover, her expectation towards students' language skills underlines the traditionally accepted discourse according to which the learning of a second language (or that of any further language) as well as competence in the second language should replicate that of the mother tongue and as long as language use does not resemble this native-norm it is considered as defective and incomplete (cf. Ortega 2010).

Ex. 34

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | so you said that most of your students are non-german natives and amm what i would like to know is how do you assess their knowledge of german. could you assess it in general. is it any good or not good. or does it vary. |
| PAULA | i i really wouldn't know. because most of the time i speak english to them. so with some of them i i really i i went to ireland with some of them now, and i this was actually the FIRST time i heard them speak in german. and amm i had been teaching them since september but i talk to them in english. i wouldn't know. and i was surprised amm many of them they were all born here because i had to collect the passports and- |
| INTER | yeah this one class you mean yeah |
| PAULA | this one class. and they were all born here, and brought up here and erm i'm s- really shocked how poor their german was. |

In a subsequent turn Paula also adds that students' lacking German competence causes difficulties for the English lesson. Here, she points to German, rather than students' mother tongues, being the basis for foreign language learning (cf. Ex. 29, section 5.2.2, where she presents the same arguments for students' mother tongues).

Ex. 35

- INTER okay. i see so not linguistically that's not what you mean that they that- their german is poor. cause some of your colleagues meant when kids from different schools it might influence their level of german that that might also cause difficulties.
- PAULA well that their poor knowledge of german definitely causes difficulties because ar er in english in the in the higher grades we're trying to teach them amm a degree of english which their haven't the same er they haven't mas-sort of fine very fine sort of connotations and collocations that they haven't mastered in german. you know.

It is also significant to note that Clara compares the language use of children with immigrant background to that of German-natives, clearly defining the former as those that diverge from the norm (cf. section 5.2.6 on “Othering”). Just as Paula in extract 34 above, Clara also communicates her expectation that children born in Austria should have the same level of competence as native speakers do. This suggest that birth place should determine language competence; however, this expectation seems to contradict the fact, noted by Clara as well, that students from migrant families are not likely to have extensive contact with the majority language before they enter school (Ex. 33).

Ex. 36

- CLARA it varies. it does. it definitely does. some of them speak german perfectly. very good. and aaa but others although they were born in austria don't really speak german the way you would expect it from a german native speaker.

The only teacher among the interviewees who showed awareness of why students hold various levels of proficiency in German was Aaron. He points to several factors that influence children's acquisition of German. Thus, instead of underestimating his learners' skills, he identifies the reason for the variation between the students. Notably, he also mentions birthplace as a factor

influencing competence; however adding that socialisation in the Austrian educational system is equally decisive. Thus, this implies that birthplace in itself cannot determine proficiency in a language; it is rather the interplay of various factors that shape the process of acquisition and accordingly linguistic competence.

Ex. 37

- | | |
|-------|--|
| INTER | okay. mhm. (.) and how would you evaluate those students' german competence who are non-german natives. what would you say. |
| AARON | that varies a great deal. depends on how (.) whether or not they were born and socialised here, socialised in our educational system, and if they were not born here at which age they came here. that's crucial and then the next crucial factor is how educated the parents are. |

As the next extract will show, German proficiency is assigned great importance. Here Elena mentions the school setting only and notes that because all lessons are held in the school vehicular it is “substantial”. What this example also shows, however, is that German is considered to be difficult to learn, which is very much in compliance with the popular belief suggesting the same.

Ex. 38

- | | |
|-------|--|
| INTER | mhm. and what do you think those kids who are multilingual and have another mother tongue than german, how would you assess their german competence in general. |
| ELENA | aah well what they tell me, german is very difficult for them. it really is and as it is in all the subjects, (.) very important, i was looking for another word, substantial, amm (.) that's a the big problem. |

Crucially, German was denoted as a ‘*common ground*’ in two different ways. On the one hand, Clara describes it as a vehicular for speakers of different languages, while on the other hand Paula argues that it constitutes a common ground between nationalities. In both these meanings, German essentially functions as a vehicular; a quasi-neutral³⁶ tool for communication. In the latter sense, however, Paula refers to it as the factor that averts conflicts arising from the existing diversity.

³⁶ In essence no language is really neutral.

Ex. 39

- INTER and how about outside the classroom, is [using mother tongue] also typical for them? outside the classroom. or the teaching context.
- CLARA amm (.) not necessarily. they do speak german a lot. am a reason for this is prob- definitely because we have so many different languages that they need to have a common language.

Ex. 40

- PAULA no no not that politically there is it always a tension, and of course the kids hear that at home and they and that sort of bring that into the classroom and amm, so i generally try and void the topics, of nationality. you know. amm
- INTER cause i might imagine there mmm could have been verbal abuse of something-
- PAULA (.) oh YES. there's always something. when we went to ireland we had a the one is from the also an albanian from kosovo, and amm amm there is always a bit of tension between the serbian people and- but i mean normally it's not a problem at school.
- INTER okay.
- PAULA but i think it's also because we encourage them to speak german and have a common ground here. you know and- amm

Considering the roles assigned to German, it seems that it plays a substantial role not only in the EFL lesson but also in the wider institutional context. It has also been highlighted that competence in the majority language is indispensable for children with migrant backgrounds for integration seems to be measured in terms of German proficiency (cf. chapter 3).

5.2.4 English as equal footing

Two contrasting attributes were assigned To the category '*English*'. On the one hand it was viewed as an '*equal footing*' where all learners start with the same chance, while on the other it was argued that for multilinguals it is '*more difficult*' to learn English. Dooly's (2005, 2007, 2008) study yielded very similar results (see section 3.4). While pre-service teachers constructed English as an equal footing for students having different mother tongues, in-service teachers attached more negative attributes to teaching English to linguistically mixed classes. Notably, some argued that those children who are not proficient in the majority language have no real need to learn English. As demonstrated in section 5.2.3 above, in the Viennese context EFL teachers often denote greater

importance to the teaching of German than that of English for they see it as more crucial.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
English	Equal footing	MARIE, ELENA
	More difficult	TIANA, CLARA

Table 6. *Descriptor assembly for the category English*

The next two extracts demonstrate how teachers believe English to be easier for the learners, as a group, because they all start with the same level of competence. Both Elena and Marie contrast this with the teaching and learning of German that is, in their opinion, more difficult.

Ex. 41

ELENA english is easier for them. it's something where all of them start at the same level, in the first class (-)think so it's easier for them than german.

Ex. 42

INTER mhm. and so amm in general you would say that teaching a linguistically diverse classroom where there are many languages and they're all different, is not any different from teaching any other-

MARIE no. no. certainly not. there's a big difference in teaching english and german. because the advantage is that EVERYbody starts the same level.

Tiana on the other hand expressed the exact opposite of what was pointed out above. To her English is “more complicated” due to students’ existing linguistic repertoires. She also points to the fact that German is more accessible to learners as they come in contact with the language in spontaneous situations, while English is not so pervasive in their everyday lives.

Ex. 43

INTER [...] what is your personal opinion about is- is their german competence enough (.) for for erm-

TIANA sometimes. yes. sometimes german is really good. impressive. because some of them have been in austria only for lets say five years amm yeah. so it's (.) i think it's easier for for a german because they hear it, they have to live with it, english as the kind of second third or whatsoever language is a bit more more complicated

On the whole, English was not mentioned frequently in the interviews. Teachers' discourse revolved mostly around German and students' mother tongues, and thus it seems that these are perceived as having a much more important role in the educational context than the foreign language itself. Also, as has been argued in section 5.2.1.1, informants do not recognize the potential of foreign language teaching in producing multilingual speakers; multilingualism is seen in terms of migrant languages and German, whereas English barely seems to play a role in this discourse.

5.2.5 Quasi-English-only norm: Language use in the classroom

The category '*language(s) of instruction*' is a subcategory of the theme '*teaching practices*'. As the assembly of descriptors shows, teachers either adhere to a quasi-English-only or an English-only norm.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
Language(s) of instruction	Quasi-English-only norm	all informants
	English-only norm	GRACE

Table 7. *Category and descriptor assembly for the theme teaching practices*

The list of descriptors above shows, that only one teacher claimed to apply an English-only strategy in her EFL lessons. As Grace explains, she avoids using German whenever possible and tries to make sure that she provides her learners with the necessary tools in English so that they can use the target language only in her lessons.

Ex. 44

- INTER mhm. okay. cause i noticed that in your lesson, the one i observed, the you were teaching only in english. is that
- GRACE yeah i try to. because i try to provide a amm, i try to give them the phrases and the the expressions so that they can interact with the other students during the english lesson. so they can amm you know ask for whatever they want to ask or er pose the questions they want to pose in english. amm i feel that sometimes, yeah especially th- the language that is needed for interaction for spontaneous interaction during a during an english lesson for example. when they do it spontaneously when they when they want to say something spontaneously, like can i open the window? i mean they would do it in their native language. amm and so i try to provide them with the in the

- first few weeks i try to provide them with the necessary language so that they can do so that they can ask these questions in english. so i think that am for classroom interaction amm is important. and we as the teachers or i for me i feel i feel that i have to provide them with the necessary vocabulary.
- INTER and is there anything that you kind of teaching them in german maybe. grammar s- some some (-)
- GRACE i try to avoid that. in fact. amm, (.) yeah as i said i try to avoid that. i try to explain everything in english and yeah.

In another turn she explains how she tries to create natural situations for students to use English with her. Importantly, Grace also points out that she wants her learners to speak English in her lessons and, unlike her colleagues, she does not mention the use of German in this contexts. Other informants, as it has been shown (e.g. Ex. 24), noted several times that if students are not using English in the EFL lesson, they should use German (and not their heritage languages).

Ex. 45

- GRACE yeah. because i want them to a you know a i want them to use english during the english lesson.
- INTER obviously
- GRACE and i always try to you know when i when i meet them in the corridors, a i greet them in english. and so i try to amm yeah also speak about their marks for example about their grades about their homework and so on. i try to give them feedback in in englisch as well.
- INTER so outside the classroom context you would also try to-
- GRACE as well as well. yeah and now i'm happy when i meet them and they greet me, hello, good morning, a so it makes me happy somehow because i feel that they have understood what i mean.
- INTER so they respond then also in english.
- GRACE yeah yeah. so they feel that it's natural. that's the language that they use when they when when when they talk to me.

The English-only norm that Grace adheres to puts all learners on equal footing. As the lesson observations have shown (see section 5.2), Grace's teaching practices are strongly influenced by this norm. For the students, this means that their English learning, and accordingly their assessment, is not dependent on their German skills. In contrast, all the other informants seem to conform to a quasi-monolingual norm. They claimed to use English for the most part, yet reported to explain complex things as, for instance, grammar in German. This seems especially relevant as they talk about their learners as deficient users of German (see sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.6). Several of the interviewees emphasised that children lack a native-like vocabulary in German and accordingly do not

understand the language properly, which has a negative impact on how English can be taught. This then questions the legitimacy of their language use practices. If children's German competence do not meet the teachers' expectations, how can it be beneficial for them to learn English through the medium of German?

Ex. 46

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | and which languages do you use giving instructions or teaching content or grammar of vocabulary |
| ELENA | a a er english is is as far as it is possible. |
| INTER | and do you sometimes use german. you find it necessary to use german. |
| ELENA | yes. and especially in in the in the first four forms. |
| INTER | mhm. and are there like special areas where you think german is more beneficial than english if you for instance teach grammar i dunno- |
| ELENA | yes. if you, but that's very seldom, if you just explain if you ah how to build a tense for example, and i say it in english and in german, to make sure- |

Elena explains that she is using German in the beginners' classes "to make sure" that learners understand the teaching content. She follows this practice more extensively with younger groups of learners who were reported to have especially weak competence in German. Several informants recounted how children who come from primary schools do not meet expectations regarding German proficiency (see section 5.2.3). Similarly, Tiana also accounts for using German especially if she "[has] to teach some difficult grammar point". Yet, sometimes due to learners' lacking German competence "it doesn't really work" and thus she must stick to English. The fact that using German is not always helpful in the given context and, eventually, the teacher must rely on English only, casts doubt on the usefulness of this partly bilingual approach when in the groups studied none of the learners had German as their first language.

Ex. 47

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | and in which languages do you teach them. i mean in your english lessons. which which erm languages do you usually use |
| TIANA | normally i use english. but am if you have to teach some difficult grammar point you try to explain it in german. but sometimes it doesn't really work. |
| INTER | aha. so it's so you- |
| TIANA | cause if yeah if the german's not good enough yeah. then stick to english. |

Like Tiana, Aaron also reports using German for teaching "complex" and "complicated" content. As he explains, he uses the school vehicular for these purposes "in order to save time".

Ex. 48

- AARON well some things that i explain in german if they are too complex or too complicated or takes too long to explain in english amm (.) because they are complex amm can be understood in german but those who don't speak german well, so that effects it but that's very mediet [sic.]³⁷ effect, not a immediate
- INTER mhm. and you would for instance for teaching grammar you would also use english and german.
- AARON yeah. if it saves time, if it's about terminology, especially grammatic terminology, (.) it is known from german it is it is unknown in the english language and it's it's part of the teacher business. so in order to save time, those things are german.

As shown in the extract, Aaron uses German if teaching grammatical terms because, as he explains, students know them from German. An important factor here is that he simultaneously teaches his classes German as well and is in a position to teach his learners German outside the English lesson. Aaron is thus aware of his students' linguistic competences and, in a sense, tries to utilize this. However, students' mother tongues remain in the background, which again underlines that fact that only those languages which the teachers also has command of are capitalized on in the English lesson. As has been exemplified with excerpt 31, some of the informants constructed learners' heritage languages as "irrelevant" if the teacher had no competence in them. Informants' statements thus imply a rather teacher-centred approach. A more student-centred approach would necessitate multiple language integration in order to utilize the repertoires of the multilingual students. This practice could assist students learning and would simultaneously be a validation of their heritage languages (cf. Dooly 2008).

On the whole, however, the vast majority of the interviewed teachers seem to comply with a quasi-English-only norm, i.e. they claim to use English most of the time, expecting their students to talk in the target language, yet both the teachers and their leaners use German extensively in the lessons. Accordingly, it is not a genuine monolingual English-only norm, but rather a partly bilingual one that explicitly excludes the use of students' heritage languages (languages other than German). The norm, as it seems, emerges as the result of students' perceived lack

³⁷ The informant uses the term *mediate effects*, perhaps in the sense of *indirect effects*.

of German competence. Clara legitimizes her practices by saying that relying on German is “helpful” because learners occasionally “just don't know the German words”. She, again, stresses that she wants students to learn German (cf. Ex. 33), arguing that otherwise they would not be able to make use of the teaching materials. Clara insists on her students working with bilingual dictionaries and finding the German equivalents of the English concepts so that they “understand what [a] word means in their mother tongue”. Yet these sources are German-English and so it is unclear how this would help learners in understanding what certain vocabulary items mean in their heritage languages if they are lacking the necessary German competence. Further, by pointing out how “awful” students’ German spelling is, Clara justifies her teaching practice, explaining how she corrects learners’ errors.

Ex. 49

- | | |
|-------|--|
| CLARA | amm i TEND to use more german now amm for instance when i translate things. i have them what which i didn't do at the beginning of my teaching experience AT ALL because usually you are taught not to use german you know, am and only english talking, so i tried to do that at first but then here i have the feeling that it is also helpful to use german sometimes because i because sometimes they just don't know the german WORDS and i also want them to learn GERMAN you see so- |
| INTER | so you're kind of trying to (-) be a bit of a german teacher- |
| CLARA | yeah yeah. i want them to underSTAND if they really- if they if they know what this word means in german because otherwise they can't learn the vocabulary, they have this list- |
| INTER | aa the concept- |
| CLARA | yeah. if they have the vocabulary, they have the vocabulary list in the book and the workbook with the german word and if the don't understand what this word MEANS in their mother tongue it is a problem, so we i have them write vocabulary, the first form and i also have a very close look at their german SPELLING, and if they get the words right if they have the german right, german word if they found the german word, because for some words it doesn't say the german definition there's always a list of words and then above that you have the word file where there where you only have the english words and i want them to find out the german translation, i don't tell them usually, i want them to find it out themselves, am using a dictionary and amm and then i correct that. and the spelling very often is awful. the german spelling. |

The quasi-English-only norm, as briefly noted above, also manifests itself in the fact that teachers want their students to use only English in the EFL lesson, but while learners’ heritage languages are undesirable, German is naturally allowed as a tool of communication in the classroom (see section 5.2.3) and, as has been

demonstrated, some of the interviewed teachers even enhance the learning of the majority language during English lesson.

On the whole it seems that the multilingual learners' perceived lack of German proficiency, i.e. the fact that they do not seem to meet teachers' expectations based on the monolingual norm of nativeness, triggers the discourse transmitting that migrant children have a greater need to develop their German skills than to learn English. In the context of EFL it is also relevant to mention that teachers of English seem to believe that it is their responsibility to teach students German as well. In her study, Dooly (2005) also found that teachers believe that learners who have no perfect command of the school languages "don't need real English" (see section 3.4, Dooly 2005: 154). As demonstrated in section 5.2.3 above, German competence plays an exceptionally important role in the discourse about multilingualism and linguistic diversity, it appears that these seemingly firm discourses directly inform teachers' classroom practices.

5.2.6 Constructing identities: Non-nativeness as a basis for 'othering'

Diversity is essentially rooted in a concept we call 'otherness'. The terminology *othering*, *otherness* and *the Other* found its way into educational research from cultural studies, especially from feminist theory. According to Dervin (2012: 187) "Othering is [a] form of social representation, which is very much related to stereotypes". As he explains, othering is the practice of differentiating "in-group from out-group and Self from Other" (ibid.). In other words, it is the construction of individuals or certain groups as 'different' and 'opposite' with which the actor cannot identify with (cf. Dooly 2009: 60). This practice simultaneously means attaching categories to people based on stereotypes. Stereotypes have been defined as "a set of beliefs about the characteristics of a social category of people" (Bar Tal 1996: 342 qtd. Dervin 2012: 186) and, traditionally, we divide them into "auto-stereotypes, which regard people's in-group and hetero-stereotypes which are related to an out-group ('the Other')" (Dervin 2012: 186). These categories "lead people to subscribe themselves and ascribe others to one group or another," (Spotti 2006: 123) and enable people to form discourses

about who is, for example, Austrian and who is not. Spotti (ibid.) further maintains that discourse models are produced and authorised by multiple agents. In connection with the Dutch context, Spotti (ibid.) explains that

These agents may be either an institutional body, e.g. the Dutch Ministry of Education, issuing macro-discourses, or individuals (re)formulating these macro-discourses in their micro-discourses during social interactions (cf. Cherryholmes, 1988). For instance, the models that the categories *autochtone leerlingen* (native pupils) and *allochtone leerlingen* (immigrant minority pupils) hold within a country's educational discourse, see certain pupils being ascribed to certain characteristics, e.g. country of birth, school results, language problems. These characteristics may then inform the discourse and thought of a class teacher as well as his/her actions during classroom interactions, thus leading him/her to categorise pupils as belonging to one group or another. This ascription is then drawn not only on the basis of his/her own understanding of what an immigrant minority pupil is, but also through what s/he might have taken on board from those macro-discourses issued by institutional bodies (cf. Koole & Hanson, 2002).

It should be noted that this is in line with Wodak's (2001, 2008) context-based model of discourse, according to which micro level discourses are dependent on discourses on the meso and macro levels. The categories native (non-immigrant) pupils and immigrant pupils mentioned by Spotti (2006) are focused upon both in European and in Austrian language education policies as well as in institutional and wider public discourses. In how far these discourses influence teachers' discourse about their learners' identities is, however, not clear. Nevertheless, as the excerpts below will demonstrate, teachers do make a distinction between native and immigrant learners on several levels.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
'Othering'	Migrants as non-German natives	CLARA, GRACE
	Migrants as non-German speakers	ELENA
	Birth place defining nativeness	CLARA, (TIANA)
	Expressed in percentage	TIANA

Table 8. *Descriptor assembly for the category 'Othering'*

As the descriptor assembly shows, language constitutes a substantial element of the construction of migrants as Others. Teachers' discourse suggests that migrant students share the attribute of being '*non-German natives*' or '*non-German speakers*', regardless of their level of competence. While none of the

informants explicitly pointed out their native status during the interviews, they all indicated German as their single mother tongue in the forms they filled out. This is especially relevant as it positions them as the norm against which they construct their students. As pointed out in section 2.1, nativeness is traditionally understood as a birth right that cannot be replaced by experience, and accordingly, migrant children are always constructed the Others, based on their assumed non-nativeness.

To the question whether the school under investigation is multilingual Paula gave a positive answer without hesitation. When talking about the classes she teaches, she points out that those are “hundred per cent migration background”. On the one hand this shows that she associates multilingualism (in the sense of linguistic diversity) with migration, on the other hand that she contrasts migrant children with German natives and accordingly constructs them as non-natives.

Ex. 50

- INTER so my first question is, an introductory question, whether you consider the school as an institution multilingual. this school.
PAULA yes.
INTER mhm. and what about- amm the classes you teach.
PAULA ahh well the most of my classes i've got one hundred per cent migration background. amm i only teach one class where there are mostly a german-native speakers but also a few amm as a few non-german natives. but all the others i don't have ANY german-native speakers.

In the same manner, Elena points out that the majority of the school population is made up of migrants who are “non-native speakers in German”. Also, she uses the expression “German speaker” to denote natives.

Ex. 51

- INTER do you think that this school is multilingual? the institution.
ELENA yes.
INTER mhm. and how about the classe- classes that you teach.
ELENA amm. (.) normally in most classes we have only one or two german speakers with different types of classes. the sports classes there are a lot of german speaker, native speakers. but a and maybe in the amm music classes as well, but in all the other classes, amm the majority amm migrants not-non-native speakers in german.

In a subsequent turn, Elena directly attaches the attribute “non-German speakers” to non-German natives, which evokes the association that they are not only deficient users but, in a sense, ‘non-users’.

Ex. 52

- INTER mhm. and what do you think those kids who are multilingual and have another mother tongue than german, how would you assess their german competence in general.
- ELENA aah well what they tell me, german is very difficult for them. it really is and as it is in all the subjects, (.) [...] and of course sometimes, especially in the lower classes realise, YOU as the teacher a because history is my other subject, that they don't quite understand. what they are reading. [...] because the- well the books are not written for non-german speakers there.

The implications drawn from the next excerpt are twofold. On the one hand, Tiana, similarly to Elena, contrasts German-speaking students with “people with other languages” as if the latter would have no competence in German, while on the other hand her statement implies that multilingual classes are simultaneously non-German speaking.

Ex. 53

- INTER and what about the classes that you teach. are they-multilingual
- TIANA most of the classes are actually i've got a sports class aaa and they're aaa almost ninty-five percent are german-speaking. aaamm so there's always only one or two amm people with other languages. but all the other classes are multilingual.

No traces of self-definition can be found in either Tiana's or in Elena's arguments; yet, unlike them, Grace juxtaposes non-natives with herself. The excerpt below implies that for her, “linguistically diverse groups” are made up of deficient users of German rather than multilingual individuals, and accordingly “monolingual groups” consist of German natives.

Ex. 54

- INTER one important question is how do you find teaching english to linguistically diverse groups. is it any DIFFERENT to teaching monolingual groups for instance. or do you-
- GRACE yeah as i said before. perhaps when it comes to teaching vocabulary. yeah. the- that does definitely make a difference. because if you feel that that students don't understand a phrase in german, one that you find absolutely a NORMAL and perhaps it's even an expression or phrase that you use quite frequently and they they've just never heard it, or if it's a saying. you know. so the- that's when you have problems.

By implicitly referring to herself as a 'normal user' of German, Grace positions herself as a native speaker and constructs non-natives (users by experience) as deficient, arguing that this deficiency constitutes an obstacle to teaching English. To her, it is thus not the linguistic heterogeneity that causes problems for the EFL classroom, but rather students' lack of competence in German. This is especially remarkable as Grace is the only teacher among the informants who truly holds to an English-only norm in her lessons. It might be, however, that perhaps she applies this strictly monolingual strategy in order to avoid difficulties arising from the use of German.

Although language seems to play a particularly important role in othering students, the factor of "Austrianness" also seems to be prominent. Several informants used the expression "different background" to denote migrant students. While talking about using students' cultural backgrounds as a resource in the EFL classroom Tiana reinforces the meaning of "different" as "migrant" by using the category "hundred per cent Austrian" to emphasise the qualities of the non-migrant student population. In the given context she probably denotes German-speaking students with "hundred per cent Austrian", those born and raised in Austria by German-speaking Austrian parents with no traceable migratory backgrounds. Accordingly, students with a 'history of migration' – whether first, second or third generation migrants – are constructed as 'non-Austrians' or 'partly Austrian'. It seems thus that in the teacher discourse the categories 'Austrian' and 'migrant' are not overlapping but rather mutually exclusive and assumed language competence is not detachable from these concepts. Furthermore, the term 'non-German speaking' seems to be a euphemism used to avoid perhaps the more discriminatory expressions 'migrant background' or 'non-Austrian'.

Ex. 55

- | | |
|-------|---|
| INTER | okay. and amm do you think that this linguistic diversity can be used or the cultural backgrounds can be used as a kind of a resource within the english classroom. |
| TIANA | of course it can of course yeah. |
| INTER | and what about cultural background |
| TIANA | yeah. of course. yeah. yeah. amm when i started here, i did certain am kind of games where there was one austrian, a hundred percent austrian talking to someone with am amm (.) different background and the problem ist hat at the moment you can't find the hundred percent austrian background. |

As the examples above show, language – or rather language competence – perceived as non-native or deficient is a core constituent of the identity of students with migrant background and is closely intertwined with the notion of non-Austrianness. In extract 56, Clara contrasts the studied institution with another school where students are “only Austrian”, clearly defining students with migrant background as non-Austrian.

Ex. 56

CLARA	[...] i think they should speak german with the teachers.
INTER	and how do you, in general-
CLARA	am but at this school sorry, and yeah in other schools it's different, when you have only austrian students it's completely different situation.

Relating this to other categories in this study, a general pattern seems to emerge. In the teachers' discourse about individual multilingualism, mother tongues or German competence, othering appears to be a constant underlying component. Multilingual individuals are essentially constructed as migrants, as non-German natives and accordingly as non-Austrians. Clearly this may affect teaching practices on several levels and teachers may apply various strategies to deal with learners whom they construct as deficient. As Clara reported, she devotes a lot of effort to teach her students German “above English”, whereas Grace uses exclusively English. Regardless of the approach, however, teachers strive to cope with the ‘otherness’ of their learners and the ‘otherness’ of the multilingual context.

5.2.7 Institutional Frameworks

Applying Wodak's definition of discourse (2001, 2008; see chapter 4), the analysis of institutional frameworks within the teachers' discourse is inevitable, as it might show if and how far teachers' construction of this theme complies with and is informed by wider discourses. As the assembly below shows, issues of national policies have been touched upon in all interviews; however, the topic did not provide the expected content, as teachers proved to be mainly

uninformed about these regulations. Accordingly, it is not clear how far these influence their own discursive practices or their teaching. Questions of school policy, in contrast, yielded quite dense discourse with fairly contradictory statements.

Category	Descriptors (Sub-categories)	Occurrences
Language related Policies	National policy	all informants
	School policy	MARIE, PAULA, GRACE

Table 9. *Descriptor assembly for the category language related policies*

As the extracts below show, the majority of the interviewees agreed that there are no legal norms within the Austrian educational system that address issues of multilingualism and linguistic diversity.

Ex. 57

- INTER and with regards regulations within the educational system not just in this school. amm do you think that the curricula says anything about multilingualism or linguistic diversity in any way? amm with regard to teaching english,
- PAULA (.) no,
- INTER or is there something something- (PAULA indicating no) mhm.

Even when the question explicitly addressed the issue of the Austrian Curricula, teachers said there was no mention of multilingualism or linguistic diversity. In the extract below, Tiana clearly states that there is no mention of the issue.

Ex. 58

- INTER amm to you amm know about amm any kind of i dunno regulation or for instance do the curricula mention multilingualism or linguistic diversity in (.) in any way. how it should be treated or-
- TIANA the curriculum does not really mention that. no no.

Even a more precise question pointing at the section of the Curriculum on modern foreign languages yielded the same response.

Ex. 59

- INTER okay. and amm what concerning the curricula, i would have one question and that would be whether you think that there there is any mentioning of multilingualism in the curricula or diversity does the curriculum-

CLARA	not that i know. i have to admit. i don't know. i've never seen it. no i don't think so.
INTER	but the foreign languages, cause there is one particular document about teaching modern foreign languages, is there any contentwise-
CLARA	i don't think so. no no.

Although the Austrian Curricula explicitly deals with multilingualism and linguistic diversity, pointing to the former as one of the aims of the educational system (cf. Zwitter 2012; see section 3.2), informants had, without exception, no knowledge of this. It seems likely that these teachers are only acquainted with certain sections of the Curriculum (for secondary schools), presumably those addressing the education of the “first modern foreign language” (*Erste lebende Fremdsprache*). It is thus unclear if and how far the actual teaching practices of the studied group of teachers are influenced by national language education policies. The questions that arise are: 1) Why are teachers not familiar with the contents of the entire Curricula?, and 2) How far can these policies influence classroom practices if they are not known to teachers?

In contrast, informants had diversified views regarding school policies. As illustrated by extract 24 in section 5.2.2 above, Marie claimed that there is a school policy forbidding the use of students’ mother tongues, while all her colleagues stated the opposite, namely that there is no school policy on language use. In extract 60 below, Grace immediately associates the question on school policy on the use of first languages as one that forbids it, rather than one that would support it. In the next turn she elaborates on the issue by saying that although there are no such regulations within the institution, “most teachers want their students to speak German”. This statement implies that even if there is no official school policy, there is an implicit norm promoted by teachers. As has been demonstrated, some of the EFL teachers do restrict the use of students’ mother tongues in the favour of the school vehicular (see section 5.2.3).

Ex. 60

INTER	okay. and is there any school policy on using first languages within the school? so is there-
GRACE	do you mean that they have to use german.
INTER	german for instance, yeah.

GRACE	there is nothing like there is no such regulation or anything. i think that most teachers want their students to speak german. but there is no such thing as a school policy or regulation or anything like that.
INTER	i was asking cause some schools there there are
GRACE	yeah yeah. right. i least i haven't heard of it.
INTER	but i don't know, it depends maybe from from the institution itself whether-
GRACE	i didn't know how how or whether this would be legally okay. you know, in AUSTRIA. i would doubt that.
INTER	yeah yeah but there is no nothing like this in the school-
GRACE	no no

In the last few turns, Grace points to the potential legal constraints of a school policy that would restrain students' language use. The utterance "you know, in AUSTRIA" hints at Grace's view that due to the traditionally democratic practices such norms would be unacceptable. The use of the expression *you know* further signals that this is common knowledge, familiar to and shared by all. This implies that even though the existing regulations supporting multilingual language use practices have no direct influence on teachers' discourse or practices due to the fact that they are not aware of these, the political discourse that promotes equal rights in general seem to have some effect on the way they think about legal possibilities.

Overall, it seems that teachers are not entirely confident about either the legal or the institutional frames they work in. This is especially pervasive with regard to international and national language education policies and accordingly it is difficult to assess whether and how far these influence teaching practices in the classroom. Thus, although multilingualism and linguistic diversity are defined as a goal of both European and Austrian language education policies, in practice teachers do not seem to draw on them.

5.3 Language use practices in the classroom

Having examined teachers' discursive repertoires, this section summarizes the finding of the lesson observations, reporting on students' and the teachers' language use patterns within the classroom, in order to investigate whether and how far teachers' discursive repertoires influence their language choices in the EFL lesson and accordingly the language use patterns of their learners.

5.3.1 “It's part of the teacher business”. Teachers’ language use practices

As Aaron argued, language choices are “part of the teacher business” (Ex. 48). And indeed, in the EFL lesson the teacher continuously makes decisions about using either the target or another language. Without doubt, teachers’ language use practices in the foreign language classroom have a profound effect on the language choices of the students and accordingly also on how the target language is learned. Therefore, it is essential to look at what languages teachers use in which contexts and how these shape students’ practices. Accordingly, in this section the individual lesson observations are summarized³⁸ in order to demonstrate the actual language use patterns of teachers and to examine whether and how far these are determined by teachers’ discursive repertoires. Except one (taught by Clara), all observed groups were senior classes, from 5th (14-15 year-olds) to 7th grade (16-17 year-olds). The only junior group in the sample was a 1st (10-11 year-olds) grade. The descriptions are kept concise, focusing exclusively on language use patterns and related issues in the lesson.

Aaron communicated with his students mostly in English, but used code-switching extensively. German words, phrases or sentence chunks were embedded in the sequence of English utterances. When teaching and revising vocabulary, an English-language explanation or example was always accompanied by a German translation. When students were using their mother tongues among each other, they were never interrupted by the teacher. On another occasion, when a student inquired the meaning of a word in German, the teacher replied “in English” and gave the translation only when the student asked the question in English. The language choices Aaron made did not seem to follow a clear pattern; although frequently relying on the target language he often used German, not always with an identifiable reason.

Grace was the only teacher in the sample who adhered to the English-only rule. She explained vocabulary and all tasks in English by giving examples and demonstrating what should be done. Revision of grammar was also only in

³⁸ The lesson observations are introduced in the order they were conducted.

English, students were also expected to reply in English. The teacher only used one German phrase during the lesson. All communication with the students, be it content-related or connected with classroom management, be it collective or individual conversation, was in English. When students replied to her in German, her reaction was “Could you say that in English?” or “Pardon?”. Nevertheless, when they talked among each other in German or in another language, the teacher never interrupted. Hence, Grace’s language choices and teaching practices fully rely on her discursive repertoire. She adheres to an English-only norm, supplying her learners with input exclusively in the target language.

Similarly, Tiana used English with the students most of the time; however, German equivalents of English utterances were sometimes given as well as the translations of some words. Students addressed the teacher in German most of the time, while her answers altered between English and German, without a clearly identifiable pattern. Students predominantly used German during the lesson, only when an answer was expected in the target language did they speak English. Other languages were not used in the lesson. On the whole, as most of her colleagues, Tiana adheres to the quasi-English-only norm, her language choices being informed by her discursive repertoire. On the other hand it seems that students’ language use greatly influences Tiana’s own practices. As she pointed out in the interview, most of her students, regardless of their mother tongues, use German among each other. Accordingly, being familiar with her learners’ linguistic repertoires, she relied both on the target language and German. This also illustrates how the teaching environment itself shapes teachers’ discursive repertoires.

Marie often spoke in English during the lesson but used German extensively, with frequent intra-sentential switches. On the whole, the teacher served as a bilingual dictionary in the lesson, translating German words to English and vice versa. Students addressed her and talked to her in German; English was used very seldom. Often, Marie had to explicitly ask students to reply to her in English, which implies that her learners are much more confident using the school vehicular than in the target language. Being aware of this Marie relied on German

to a large extent; remarkably, however, during the interview she emphasised that her learners' German competence is often exceptionally weak. This suggests that students' language use influence Marie's own language choices, yet based solely on the collected data it is unclear which factors influence her discursive practices.

In the lesson Paula taught, German and English were used interchangeably. Even though the teacher used English most of the time, she too, like other informants, switched to German when explaining vocabulary. Students largely used German, both when addressing the teacher and when talking to each other. Due to the continuously increasing noise level it was rather difficult to judge whether learners used languages other than German and English. It is noteworthy that Paula maintained she had no knowledge of her students' German competence, despite the fact that they often addressed her in German and used the language extensively during the lesson.

Elena predominantly used English during the lesson with occasional switches to German. In contrast, outside the teaching context she only spoke German with her students. During the lesson, students used a mixed code of English, German and their mother tongues. A group of six male students were observed extensively using BCS languages, depending on the situation, either in combination with German or English. The conversations that were audible were concerned with the presentation one of the students had held. When, however, the teacher noticed students were talking in their mother tongues among each other she said in a scolding manner "Once again, talk in English. It's an English lesson". However, when students used German in the same way, she did not interrupt; she asked learners to talk in English only if German was used in task related situations. Clearly, both Elena's language choices and the way she handles students' language choices are in accordance with her discursive practices. While she allows learners to use the school vehicular, she strictly forbids them to speak their mother tongues; thus, her practices seem to be strongly affected by her belief that using a language that is not shared by all is "rude" and "impolite". As the section on students' language use will reveal,

however, the learners themselves seem to be open to the use of multiple languages. Accordingly, it seems that it is rather the teachers who are disgruntled about not understanding what their students say, for they assume that children rely on their mother tongues only to exclude non-speakers.

The group taught by Clara was the only first form observed within this project. For classroom management and teaching grammar points, Clara used German, only occasionally embedding English phrases, while in other contexts the target language and German were used interchangeably. English utterances were often immediately summarized or translated into German. During an exercise, when the teacher checked if students were proceeding, she also only talked to the learners in German. During a vocabulary task where students had to match images to new words, the teacher always wanted them to translate the English word into German as well. Similarly, in a listening comprehension, learners could respond to questions in German. Languages other than German and English were not used during the lesson. It seems thus that Clara's teaching practices fully rely on her discursive repertoire. As she pointed out several times during the interview, it is crucial for her to support her learners in learning German, as good competence in the school vehicular is a necessity and thus her language choices seem comply with this belief.

Naturally, these observations were very limited in scope and duration; nevertheless, some patterns still seem rather prevalent. In sum, teachers' language use practices imply that they adhere to a quasi-English-only norm in their classrooms. While they wish their students to use only English in lessons, they themselves use a mixed code, often without perspicuous reasons. On the other hand, this quasi-monolingual norm also refers the practice that allows students to use German beside English among each other, but not their mother tongues. Furthermore, for the majority of the observed informants teaching vocabulary frequently means translating new words into German. On the whole, it seems that although students show openness to more diversified and creative forms of language use (see section 5.3.2 below for some examples), their linguistic repertoires are not taken into consideration in the foreign language

classrooms. As the interview analyses also revealed, in some cases students' mother tongues are not only neglected, but explicitly forbidden.

5.3.2 Students' language use practices

As outlined above in section 5.1, the institution in question is characterised by great linguistic diversity. As a result, in most of the observed groups, students predominantly use varieties of German as a vehicular language when talking to each other. Yet, as a rule, whenever two or more students share another vehicular, they would – with varying frequency – use that language. As school statistics show, speakers of Turkish, Arabic and the so-called BCS languages are present in large numbers, thus these languages are more often used in the classrooms. Clearly, those students who are the single speakers of a particular language will always stick to the school vehicular, as there are no other interlocutors sharing their variety. Notably, it was observed that seating order in the classrooms, if not determined by the teacher, is often shaped by linguistic or cultural factors³⁹. In several groups children with a shared mother tongue or mutually intelligible languages sat in pairs or groupings. Similarly, in one group, female pupils wearing headscarves sat separately. However, no overt tension or conflict situations resulting from linguistic or cultural differences were noticed. On the contrary, informal conversations with the students in the breaks or in the lessons suggest that in general they are exceptionally open to using a range of languages. This openness became evident when, during a break, students used highly mixed codes in communication with each other. It seemed that some of the students are familiar with words and phrases from each other's languages and would use these to convey culturally related meanings. This form of language use is what Rampton (1997, 1999) calls language crossing.

The term 'language crossing' (or 'code-crossing') refers to the use of a language which isn't generally thought to 'belong' to the speaker. Language crossing involves a sense of movement across quite sharply felt social or ethnic boundaries, and it raises issues of legitimacy that participants need to reckon with in the course of their encounter. (Rampton 1997: 1)

³⁹ Of course, the influence of gender is much more dominant; yet in addition to this, language and cultural affiliation seem to play a significant role.

Notably, Rampton (ibid.: 8) illustrated that language crossing “was a significant practice in the negotiation of an emergent sense of multiracial youth community” which is perhaps also reflected in the present case-study. However, except one such encounter outside the lessons, pupils typically used some variety of German. As a result, neither multilingualism nor the existing linguistic diversity was prevalent in their classroom communication or outside the lessons. The root of this mainly monolingual practice seems to lie with an implicit rule promoted by teachers, namely that German should be used even outside the classroom. As the interviews revealed, although there is no such explicit school policy, some teachers explicitly forbid the use of students’ mother tongues in and sometimes even outside the lesson. Furthermore, as the language use of teachers showed, heritage languages seem not to be legitimate in EFL lessons. Teachers seem to rely solely on German and English, completely disregarding students’ multilingual repertoire.

6 Discussion

All things considered contradictions seem to arise both from teachers’ individual arguments and also on the level of collective discourse. This does not in itself mean that there are no identifiable patterns in teachers’ discursive practices, it rather means that on the one hand there is no entirely unified discourse about the issues that have been touched upon in this study, while on the other hand there is a lack of confidence about what is the accepted discourse and consequently the accepted practice. With respect to teaching practices this results in a variety of approaches that are not necessarily beneficial in the existing multilingual context. In general, it seems that language use practices in the classroom, both those of the teacher and those of the students, largely depend on the individual teacher’s discursive repertoire.

Regarding the concept of mother tongue, there seem to be several interpretative conflicts. First, while language education policies separately refer to the language

of instruction and students' mother tongues as a potential resource in language teaching, teachers seem to discern that the two are the same, and thus rely solely on German, disregarding learners' heritage languages. Furthermore, it seems that teachers are uncertain about the notion of mother tongue in general. They describe their students as multilinguals, arguing that they are competent in German and their heritage language and acquire both as a mother tongue in the home context. However, they simultaneously construct their learners' German competence as deficient, unsatisfactory and non-native like. There is thus an obvious contradiction in teachers' discursive repertoire.

Perhaps the most crucial point for the present study is, however, that German is constructed as the principal language of instruction, which greatly influences how foreign languages are taught. It has two significant implications. In the context of "traditional" foreign language teaching, German is the starting point, the basis teachers try to build on. In contrast, in the context of mother tongue education, German is the end point; as teachers' discourse and the previously discussed literature shows, heritage languages are taught only to ensure children become proficient in German and not as an end in itself. Further, the data revealed that a number of teachers believe that they are also responsible for teaching their learners German. From the perspective of learning English, teaching German during the EFL seems somewhat absurd.

The analysis opens up a number of questions that would need further investigation. As several teachers noted, using students' cultural backgrounds as a potential asset and cultural diversity in the institution is, in general, appreciated and utilized in some way, it remains unclear why linguistic diversity is not treated in the same way. The matter is of fundamental importance as language is an equally strong element of identity and should, therefore, not be handled as irrelevant. In linguistically diverse contexts, it would be especially important for teachers to give room to heritage languages as "[their] different patterns of interaction can motivate pupils to feel positively about their language diversity" (Martin 1997: 101). Furthermore, it seems obscure that while multilingualism is constructed as something positive and teachers strive to teach

their students more languages, migrant children's languages, which in essence result in multilingualism, are disallowed and that multilingual practices are prohibited in favour of a monolingual norm. What teachers' discourse revealed is that students' heritage languages are constructed as illicit as the common perception is that the use of a language that is not intelligible to all is exclusive and gives rise to inequalities. In fact, however, it is the migrant children who are treated unequally in that they are denied communicative practices that are natural and inevitable for their linguistic development. Yet, "Byrnes and Cortez (1996) have shown that teachers' frustrations about their own inability to understand a child from a different cultural and linguistic background may turn into negative feelings toward the student" (Dooly 2007: 98), and most likely toward her/his language use as well. The fact that in the EFL lesson teachers would only capitalize on languages that they are familiar with highlights the underlying tension of not being able to understand the languages spoken by students. Clearly, with the existing linguistic diversity educators cannot be competent in all languages present. Nevertheless, this does not exclude the possibility of multiple language integration, i.e. to draw from these languages, if only occasionally or to a minimal degree, as this practice would validate learners' heritage languages as legitimate. However, the obstacles to applying a multilingual model lie not only in teachers' competences, but perhaps also in the deeply rooted 'monolingual habitus' (Gogolin 1994) of Austrian schools.

[In a recent] study on the language awareness of teachers (Vetter 2008a), where [Vetter] examined the predisposition of language teachers at the secondary level to adopt multilingualism as the objective of their teaching. Her multi-methods approach shows that, although the cognitive component of teachers' awareness is compatible with the state of the art of multilingualism research, teachers perpetuate the monolingual 'habitus'." (Dalton-Puffer, Faistauer, Vetter 2012: 189)

The vast linguistic diversity in Viennese schools, however, is not unique. As has been argued, it is typical of most urban areas, and thus methods that have proven to be successful in such contexts could be adopted. García and Sylvan (2012) report on International High Schools in New York City that by working with a multilingual-plurilingual approach optimize the potentials of the existing linguistic heterogeneity of the student population. In these schools

Teachers, who may or may not speak the home language(s) of any particular student or group of students, encourage individual students to use their home languages to make sense of their learning. The students' language practices are flexible and dynamic, responding to their need for sense-making in order to learn. However, teachers also encourage groups to practice language in non-exclusionary ways and will do so themselves whenever possible. In working with one particular student or group of students with whom the teacher shares language practices, the teacher may use those practices. Sometimes, the teacher may ask students to explain using their home language. However, mindful of not excluding anyone, teachers use English when speaking to a whole class with diverse home languages. (ibid. 397)

Clearly, implementing a completely multilingual approach on the institutional level (meaning all, also non-language subjects) would be problematic in most Austrian schools as they involve organisational as well as financial issues; however, for the teaching of EFL there are less demanding approaches and methods⁴⁰ that have been proven successful in similarly multilingual contexts.

For instance, it has been illustrated that methods allowing students with different linguistic backgrounds to work in small collaborative or cooperative groups and draw from their native languages are most fruitful in multilingual settings (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009, DeFazio 2010, Jacob and Mattson 1990, Reif-Breitwieser 2004). Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009: 234), for example, suggest time-outs for group work that allow minority language groups to "share and consolidate what they have managed collectively to glean from the instruction through L2", which simultaneously supports checking accuracy of understanding and provides an opportunity for students to help each other. Jacob and Mattson (1990: 231) explain that the effectiveness of cooperative learning approach lies in the combination of cooperative task structures and cooperative reward structures (i.e. groups are assessed collaboratively). This allows students with different levels of proficiency to work together on a same content-based task. In contrast, in traditional group work, reward structures are often competitive or individualistic (ibid.). Research has shown (see in Oxford 1997 and Dörnyei 1997) that cooperative learning results not only increase

⁴⁰ A method is a technique or procedure used in teaching, while an approach is a set of beliefs, principles and assumptions about the nature of language learning and teaching (cf. Brown 2002). Hence, a method is the practical realisation of a certain approach.

student motivation and academic achievement, it also improves attitudes toward cultural prejudices. Similarly, Jacob and Mattson (1990) report improvement of social relations among speakers of various languages⁴¹, this being a clear advantage in linguistically mixed classrooms.

Furthermore, the combination of the foreign language and content has been successful in teaching English. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is one of the relatively well known forms of combining the teaching of language and content.

CLIL is about using a foreign language or a lingua franca, not a second language (L2). That is, the language of instruction is one that students will mainly encounter in the classroom, given that it is not regularly used in the wider society they live in [...] CLIL lessons are usually timetabled as content lessons (e.g., biology, music, geography, mechanical engineering), while the target language normally continues as a subject in its own right in the shape of foreign language (Dalton-Puffer 2011: 183-184).

Content-based language instruction – that is, incorporating content material into language classes – works in a similar manner and as Christian et al. (1990) have shown, it is particularly effective in classes with language minority students as it equally helps them acquire knowledge and improve their language skills. DeFazio (2010), a teacher of ESL, employs this content-based approach; one of his key principles is to let students use their L1. As he explains, “native language is encouraged to help students understand the material they are working on” (ibid. 213). He also encourages students to translate for each other: students with low level of English proficiency are paired with more proficient learners who translate for them, if no such student is available in the class, teacher seeks resources outside the classroom (ibid.). Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009) also suggest that newcomers are assigned a bilingual helper.

Furthermore, a multilingual comparative approach has also been advocated in foreign language learning contexts (e.g. Hufeisen 2004, Kemmeter 1999, Wildenauer-Józsa 2004). As Hufeisen (2004: 22) explains, addressing elements of students’ mother tongues or languages other than the target language and the

⁴¹ Jacob and Mattson (1990) speak of native and non-native speakers in ESL.

language of instruction⁴² in foreign language lessons encourages students to rely on their linguistic repertoire when working on a given task on the one hand and teaches them not to treat their languages entirely separately on the other. In linguistically diverse classes, this approach allows teachers to rely on their learners' linguistic repertoires rather than exclusively on their own. This puts the teacher in a completely new role as s/he cannot be competent in all the languages present in the classroom. Accordingly learners are given new responsibilities (Wildauer-Józsa 2004: 2004).

There are several other innovative approaches, such as Jigsaw tasks, peer practice, or cooperative projects, learning stations and other forms of unrestricted learning where students can collaborate, interact and most importantly use their first languages while exploring the target language are proven to be beneficial.

Yet, these multilingual practices would necessitate a positive attitude towards the learners' heritage languages. In the present study, however, students' mother tongues are often considered to be an obstacle and the reason for their lack of competence in and erroneous use of the majority language. As Dooly (2007: 98) points out, a study conducted by Ovando and Collier (1985) showed that the mistakes made by language minority students are perceived "as undesirable cultural traits of certain immigrant groups, and consequently teachers see changing those cultural traits as the goal of education". This latter belief might well be the result of current public discourses where immigrant groups are characterized "as being in need of integration" (Extra & Verhoeven 1998 as qtd, in Extra & Yağmur 2004: 20). And indeed, some of the English teachers reported on how they assist their students in learning German better in order to help their integration. Obviously, these practices are driven by good intentions, and of course, a common vehicular is inevitable in contexts where such a great range of different languages are present; however, this should not be done at the expense of heritage languages. The issue is, of course, highly relevant for the teaching of

⁴² In foreign language teaching the target language and the language of instruction might overlap, but as the present study has illustrated, it is not always the case. As has been shown, teachers of EFL often rely on the school vehicular when teaching English.

EFL as well. The pressure put on teachers to impart native-German competencies often influences language use in the classroom.

Regarding classroom practices, vocabulary teaching emerged as most problematic. This, however, is an issue in any English teaching context with mixed groups, especially in ESL contexts, it is not something that cannot be solved by additional materials such as bilingual dictionaries in students' heritage languages. Notably, however, informants did not express a need for similar teaching aids.

It is also striking that teachers have virtually no knowledge of the fact that the curricula addresses issues of multilingualism, which implies that regulations have little effect in practice if they are unknown to practitioners, i.e. to those who should employ them, or work towards the aims that are laid down in those regulations. What also deserves serious consideration is that teachers do not seem to believe that they can raise or educate children to become multilingual, although this is the explicit aim of both EU and Austrian language education policy. The reason for this seems to be that they do not consider competence in the so-called foreign languages or languages generally taught at school as part of a multilingual repertoire. Instead, multilingualism is linked to migration and immigrant languages. Further, even though the majority of the teachers defined individual multilingualism as knowing or using several languages, what their related arguments suggest is that multilingual competence can only be acquired, and not learned; as some pointed out, only those who grow up multilingually are "real multilinguals". Individual multilingualism is thus not only defined as competence in multiple languages; it is also determined by speaker's linguistic and ethnic background as well as their language use patterns. As regards legislation, this also means that there is a considerable gap between theory and practice. Accordingly, it seems that legislation is not effective as it has very limited influence on how (foreign) languages are taught.

Concluding remarks

The study at hand attempted to discuss some of the issues connected to teaching EFL in linguistically mixed classrooms. On the whole, the central question of the study yielded rather contradictory results. In teachers' discursive repertoires, multilingualism as an abstract notion, i.e. the knowledge of multiple languages, was constructed as positive; yet when the concept was linked to language teaching, multilingual competence was often referred to as deficient and hindering. Accordingly, as teachers' discourse revealed, students' multilingualism is never utilised in the EFL context. In a similar manner, as has been pointed out above, German was defined as the only legitimate school vehicular and as the principal language of instruction, while the use of students' heritage languages was regarded as illicit. Thus, in teachers' discourse, German was clearly superior to learners' mother tongues.

Although the Curricula provide that learners should be encouraged to draw from their mother tongues and that they should learn a conscious approach to the school vehicular as well as their heritage languages, informants showed no attempts to reach this goal. Teachers' discourse only revolved around learners' German competence, their mother tongue being mentioned either as an obstacle or merely as a basis to learn the majority language.

Strictly speaking, linguistic diversity in the classrooms was not regarded as a burden as such, but its potential was not mentioned either. Rather, the languages themselves, whose presence results in the existing heterogeneity, as well as their use were denoted as problematic or hindering for EFL lessons. For example, students' lacking German proficiency was often ascribed to the fact that they would rather use their heritage languages in the private domains, and this deficit was, in turn, referred to as the dominant problem when teaching English in linguistically mixed classrooms. The school vehicular was further constructed as a necessity not only in an educational but also in a wider societal context; teachers argued that German competence is essential in Austria and that German is the only common ground for people with various cultural and linguistic

backgrounds. Hence, in practice diversity seems to be perceived as positive only as long as everybody speaks the same language.

All things considered, it seems that although teachers consider multilingualism as positive in general, this does not influence their discourse on language teaching or multilingual classrooms. Consequently, students' linguistic repertoires are not considered as a resource and accordingly are not utilized in the EFL lesson in any form. Only very few consider learners' heritage languages as a legitimate communication tool; others rather discourage or disallow their use. The issues tackled in the thesis are, however, very complex in nature, therefore this study can by no means be considered exhaustive. Several questions mentioned in chapter 6 above must be investigated in more detail in order to get a more complete picture and a better understanding of the social practices that shape the discourses investigated.

Bibliography

Legal and policy documents

- Schulunterrichtsgesetz – SchUG. Bundesgesetz über die Ordnung von Unterricht und Erziehung in den im Schulorganisationsgesetz geregelten Schulen, Nr. 767/1996. [Act on School Education - SchUG. Federal Law on the organization of teaching and education in schools regulated by the Act on School Organisation].
- BM:UKK. 2008. *Language Education Policy Profile. Austria*. Vienna: Ministry of Education, the Arts and Culture and Ministry of Science and Research.
- BM:UKK. 2011. "Gesetzliche Grundlagen schulischer Maßnahmen für SchülerInnen mit einer anderen Erstsprache als Deutsch. Gesetze und Verordnungen". In: *Informationsblätter des Referats für Interkulturelles Lernen* 1/2011. [Legal foundations of school activities for students with a first language other than German. Laws and Ordinances. In: Information sheets of the Department for Intercultural Learning 1/2011] (15th ed.) Wien.
- BM:BWK. 2002. "Gesetzliche Grundlagen schulischer Maßnahmen für SchülerInnen mit einer anderen Erstsprache als Deutsch. Gesetze und Verordnungen". In: *Informationsblätter des Referats für Interkulturelles Lernen* 1/2002 [Legal foundations of school activities for students with a first language other than German. Laws and Ordinances. In: Information sheets of the Department for Intercultural Learning 1/2002] (4th ed.) Wien.
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR)*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
<http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf> (15 Nov. 2010)
- Commission of the European Communities. COM(2003) 449 final. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions. Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006*. Brussels.
- Commission of the European Communities. COM(2003) 449. *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-2006*. Brussels.
- Commission of the European Communities. COM(2005) 356. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. The European Indicator of Language Competence*. Brussels.
- Commission of the European Communities. COM(2005) 596 final. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions. A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*. Brussels.

- Commission of the European Communities. COM (2007) 554. *Communication from the Commission to the Council. Framework for the European survey on language competences*. Brussels.
- Commission of the European Communities. COM(2008) 566 final. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social committee and the Committee of the Regions. Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and shared commitment*. Brussels.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2007. *Final Report. High Level Group on Multilingualism*. Belgium: European Commission.
- Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers. 1982. *Recommendation R No. (82) 18 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States Concerning Modern Foreign Languages*.
- Official Journal of the European Union. 2006. *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning* (2006/962/EC).
- Verordnung des Bundesministers für Unterricht und Kunst vom 14. November 1984 über die Lehrpläne der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen* [Ordinance of the Federal Minister for Education and Art of 14 November 1984 on the Curricula of Secondary Schools]
- Verordnung des Bundesministers für Unterricht und kulturelle Angelegenheiten, mit welcher die Lehrpläne der Volksschule und der Sonderschulen erlassen werden; Bekanntmachung der Lehrpläne für den Religionsunterricht an diesen Schulen* [Ordinance of the Federal Minister for Education and Cultural Affairs by which the Curricula for Primary Schools and Special Education Schools are Enacted; Notification on the Curricula for Religious Education at these Schools]

Literature

- Abell, Jackie; Myers, Greg. 2008. „Analyzing Research Interviews“. In: Ruth Wodak & Michal Krzyzanowski (eds.). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Plagrave Macmillan: Houndsmills, 145-161.
- Abendroth-Timmer, Dagmar; Breidbach, Stephan. 2010. „Mehrsprachigkeit und Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik“. In: Dagmar Abendroth-Timmer & Stephan Breidbach (eds.). *Handlungsorientierung und Mehrsprachigkeit. Fremd – und mehrsprachliches Handeln in interkulturellen Kontexten*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main, 11-20.
- Adler, Max K. 1977. *Pidgins, Creoles and Lingua Francas*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Alasuutari, Pertti. 1995. *Researching Culture. Qualitative Methods and Cultural Studies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Austrian Commission for UNESCO.
<http://www.unesco.at/bildung/unescoschulen_eng.htm> (26 Aug. 2012).
- Béacco, J-C. (2007). *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
<http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Linguistic/Source/Guide_Main_Beacco2007_EN.doc> (15 Aug. 2012).

- Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund nach Geschlecht, Altersgruppen und Bezirken 2008*. www.wien.gv.at/statistik/daten/rtf/ausland-bezirk.rtf
- Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund nach Herkunftsländern 2007 und 2008*. www.wien.gv.at/statistik/daten/rtf/einwohner-migrationshintergrund.rtf > (18 Aug. 2012).
- "Bilingualism and Multilingualism". Malmkjær, Kristen (ed.). 2002. *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge: 64-75.
- Blommaert, Jan; Verschueren, J. 1998. *Debating diversity: Analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, Jan; Rampton, Ben. 2011. "Language and superdiversity". In: Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton & Massimiliano Spotti (eds.). *Language and superdiversity* 13(22). UNESCO & Max Planck Institute, 1-21.
- Bono, Mariana; Stratilaki, Sofia. 2009. "The M-factor, a bilingual asset for plurilinguals? Learners' representations, discourse strategies and third language acquisition in institutional contexts". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6(2), 207-227.
<<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t794020038>> (7 June 2012).
- Bloor, Michael; Wood, Fiona. 2006. *Keywords in Qualitative Methods. A Vocabulary of Research Concepts*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Borg, Erik. 2003. "Discourse community". *ELT Journal* 57(4), 398-400.
- Brizic, Katharina. 2008. "Das geheime Leben der Sprachen. Gesprochene und verschwiegene Sprachen in Herkunfts- und Einwanderungsgesellschaft und die Rolle sprach(en) politischer, gesellschaftliche, familiäre und individuelle Faktoren im Spracheweb von Migrantenkinder in Österreich". In: Elizabeth Furch & Harald Eichelberger (eds.). *Kulturen Sprachen Welten. Fremdsein als pädagogische Herausforderung* (2nd ed.). Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, 231-235.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2002. "English language teaching in the 'post-methods' era: Toward better diagnosis, treatment and assessment". In: Jack C. Richards & Willy Ardan Renanyda (eds.). *Methods in language teaching. An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 9-18.
- Brown, James Dean. 2004. "Research Methods for Applied Linguistics: Scope, Characteristics, and Standards". In: Alan Davies & Catherine Elder (eds.). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 476-501.
- Cabaroglu, Nese; Roberts, Jon. 2000. "Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE programme". *System* 28, 387-402.
- Casanova, Ursula. 1991. "Bilingual Education: Politics or Pedagogy?". In: Ofelia García, Colin Baker (ed.). *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education. A reader Extending the Foundations*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 15-24.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2009. *Towards Multilingual Education. Basque Educational Research from an International Perspective*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Genesee, Fred (eds.). 2001. *Trends in Bilingual Education*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk. 2010. "The Diversity of Multilingualism in Education". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 205, 37-53.

- Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta; Jessner, Ulrike (eds.). 2001a. *Looking Beyond Second Language Acquisition. Studies in Tri- and Multilingualism*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Hufeisen, Britta; Jessner, Ulrike (eds.). 2001b. *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition. Psychological Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Jessner, Ulrike. 2009. "The study of multilingualism in educational contexts". In: Larissa Aronin & Britta Hufeisen. *The Exploration of Multilingualism. Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition*. Benjamins: Amsterdam, 121-138.
- Christian, Donna et al. 1990. "Combining Language and Content for Second-Language Students". In: Ofelia García, Colin Baker (ed.). *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education. A reader Extending the Foundations*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 216-222.
- Cherubim, Dieter. 2006. "Das Konzept der 'Verkehrssprache' und die frühen geographischen Berichte über Nordeuropa. In: Anne Arold (ed.). *Deutsch am Rande Europas*. Tartu University Press. 13-31.
- Cohen, Louis; Manion, Lawrence; Morrison, Keith. 2000. *Research methods in education*. (5th edition). London: Routledge.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Faistauer, Renate; Vetter, Eva. 2011. "A Country in Focus. Research on language teaching and learning in Austria (2004–2009)". *Language Teaching* 44(2), 181-211.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2011. "Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principle". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31, 182–204.
- De Cilla, Rudolf. 1998. *Burenwurscht bleibt Burenwurscht. Sprechenpolitik und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit in Österreich*. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.
- DeFazio, Anthony J. 2010. "Appendix. Linguistics in the ELL Classroom". In Aida Walqui & Leo Van Lier. *Scaffolding the Academic Success of Adolescent English Language Learners: A Pedagogy of Promise*. San Francisco: WestEd, 199-215.
- Dervin, Fred. 2012. „Cultural identity, representation and Othering“. In: Jane Jackson (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. Oxon: Routledge, 181-210.
- Döpke, Susanne. 1992. *One Parent One Language. An Interactional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1997. "Psychological Processes in Cooperative Language Learning: Group Dynamics and Motivation". *The Modern Language Journal* 81(4), 482-493.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods*. Oxford: OUP.
- Dooly, Melinda. 2005. "How Aware are They? Research into Teachers' Attitudes about Linguistic Diversity". *Language Awareness*, 14(2-3), 97-111. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668827>> (5 June 2012).
- Dooly, Melinda. 2007. "Constructing differences: A qualitative analysis of teachers' perspectives on linguistic and cultural diversity". *Linguistics and Education* 18, 142–166. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2007.05.001>> (5 June 2012).

- Dooly, Melinda. 2009. "Doing Diversity. Teachers' construct of their classroom reality". Maurizio Gotti (ed.). *Linguistic Insights. Studies in Language and Communication* 82. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Dooly, Melinda. 2008. "Multiple language Integration: Introduction". In: Melinda Dooly & Diana Eastmen. *"How we're going about it": Teachers' Voices on Innovative Approaches to Teaching and Learning Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 15-17.
- Eagly, H. Alice; Chaiken, Shelly. 1993. *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Forth Worth: HBJ.
- Edwards, John. 1994. *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.
- Edwards, John. 2010. *Language Diversity in the classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, Guus; Yağmur, Kutlay. 2004. "Multidisciplinary perspectives". In: Guus Extra & Kutlay Yağmur. *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 9-105.
- Fairclough, Norman; Mulderrig, Jane; Wodak. Ruth. 2011. "Chapter 17. In: Teun A. Van Dijk. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage Publications, 357-378.
- Felberbauer, Maria. 2007. „Englischunterricht in der multilingualen Integrationsklasse der Sekundarstufe I“. In: *Erziehung und Unterricht* 3-4/2007, 270-274.
- Fuch, Elizabeth. 2008a. "Kinder mit Migrationshintergrund im Bildungssystem". In: Elizabeth Fuch, Harald Eichelberger (ed.). *Kulturen Sprachen Welten. Fremdsein als pädagogische Herausforderung* (2nd ed.). Innsbuck: Studien Velag, 67-73.
- Fuch, Elizabeth. 2008b. „Das Unterrichtsprinzip ‚Interkulturelles Lernen‘ und der Lehrplan-Zusatz ‚Deutsch für Schüle mit nichtdeutscher Muttersprache‘ Bildungspolitische Aufträge und pädagogische Realität. Eine empirische Untersuchung bei Grundschullehrerinnen in Wien“. In: Elizabeth Fuch, Harald Eichelberger (ed.). *Kulturen Sprachen Welten. Fremdsein als pädagogische Herausforderung* (2nd ed.). Innsbuck: Studien Velag, 236-241.
- Fuch, Elizabeth. 2009. *Migration und Schule. Eine empirische Untersuchung an Grundschullehrerinnen*. Wien: Lit Verlag.
- Funk, Bernd-Christian. 2000. *Einführung in das österreichische Verfassungsrecht*. (10th ed.). Leykam Kurzlehrbücher: Wien.
- Gallois, Cindy; Watson, Bernadette, Brabant, Madeleine. 2007. „Attitudes to language and communication“. In: Marlis Hellinger & Anne Pauwels (eds.). *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, 595-618.
- García et al. 2006. „Weaving Spaces and (De)constructing Ways for Multilingual Schools: The Actual and the Imagined“. In: Orfelia García, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, María E. Torres.Guzmán (eds.) *Imagining Multilingual schools. Languages in Education and Globalization*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd,.
- García, Ofelia; Sylvan, Claire E. 2011. "Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities". *The Modern Language Journal* 95, 385-400.
- Garrett, Peter. 2010. *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Gogolin, Ingrid. 1994. *Der Monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Waxmann: Münster.
- Hammersley, Martyn. 2003. "Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: Methods or Paradigms?". *Discourse Society* 14, 751-781.
- Haller, Michaela. 2007. *Der schulische Fremdsprachenunterricht in Österreich. Erste Ergebnisse einer Studie zum Schuljahr 2004/2005*. Graz: Österreichisches Sprachen Kompetenzen Zentrum.
- Herdina, Philip; Jessner, Ulrike. 2002. *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hufeisen, Britta. 2004. "Deutsch und die anderen (Fremd)Sprachen im Kopf der Lernenden". *Fremdsprache Deutsch Heft 31/2004 – Sprachenvielfalt im Klassenzimmer*, 19-23.
- Jacob, Evely; Mattson, Beverly. 1990. "Cooperative Learning: Instructing Limited-English-Proficient Students in Heterogeneous Classes". In: Ofelia García, Colin Baker (ed.). *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education. A reader Extending the Foundations*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 231-236.
- Jessner, Ulrike. 2006. *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals. English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jäger, Siegfried. 2001. "Discourse and knowledge: theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis". In: Ruth Wodak & Michel Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 32-62.
- Jørgensen, Norman. 2005. „Linguistic Minority Students as Languageers. Languageing in Grade 4 of the Køge Project“. In: Ingrid Gogolin et al. *Migration und Sprachliche Bildung*. Waxmann: Münster, 139-149.
- Kemmeter, Luise. 1999. *Multilingual gestütztes Vokabellernen im gymnasialen Englischunterricht*. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main.
- Leki, Ilona; Carson, Joan. 1997. "Completely Different Worlds": EAP and the Writing Experiences of ESL Students in University Courses". *TESOL Quarterly* 31(1), 39-69.
- Lutsch, Christian. 2010. "Mehrsprachigkeit: Anwendungsperspektiven und Anforderungen im Berufsbildenden Bereich". In: David Newby, Michaela Rückl, Barbara Hinger (eds.). *Mehrsprachigkeit: Herausforderung für Wissenschaft und Unterricht. Forschung, Entwicklung und Praxis im Dialog*. Praesens Verlag: Wien, 85-103.
- Madinabeitia, Sonia Casal. 2006. „Cooperative learning“. In: *GRETA Journal*, 14/1&2. GRETA Association: 80-84.
<<http://gretajournal.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/file/15rev1.pdf>> (25 Dec. 2010).
- Marshall, Catherine; Rossman, Gretchen B. 1989. *Desingning Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Martin, Deirdre. 1997. "Introduction. Language diversity in education." *Educational Review* 49(2), 101-103.
- Milanowski, Anthony T.; Prince, Cynthia D.; Koppich, Julia. 2006. *Observations of Teachers' Classroom Performance. Guide to Implementation: Resources for Applied Practice*. Center for Educator Compensation Reform.
- Miles, Matthew B.; Huberman, A. Michael. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis. An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Morgan, Carol. 2001. "Multilingualism and Multilingual Language Learning". In: Walter Weindinger (ed.). *Bilingualität und Schule? Ausbildung, wissenschaftliche Perspektiven und empirische Befunden*. Wien: öbv&hpt, 41-49.
- Muehlmann, Shaylih. 2007. "Defending diversity: Staking out a common global interest?". In: Duchêne Alexander & Monica Heller (eds.) *Discourses of Endangerment*. New York: Continuum, 14-34.
- Muller, Alexandra; Beardsmore, Hugo Baetens. 2010. "Multilingual Interaction in Plurilingual Classes - European School Practice". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7(1); 24-42.
<<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t794297780>> (1 Sept. 2012).
- Oomen-Welke, Ingelore; Krumm; Hans-Jürgen. 2004. "Sprachenvielfalt – Eine Chance für den Deutschunterricht". *Fremdsp*
- Ortega, Lourdes. 2010. "The Bilingual Turn in SLA". Plenary delivered at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics. Atlanta, GA, March 6-9.
- Oxford, Rebecca L. 1997. "Cooperative Learning, Collaborative Learning, and Interaction: Three Communicative Strands in the Language Classroom". In: *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 81, No. 4. Blackwell Publishing: 443-456 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/328888>> (15 Sept. 2012).
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 2012. Online source. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <<http://www.oed.com/>> (3 June 2012).
- Ó Riagáin, Pádraig. 2008. "Language Attitudes and Minority Languages". In: J. Cenoz & N. H. Hornberger (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed.), Volume 6: *Knowledge about Language*. USA: Springer, 329-341.
- Österreichische UNESCO-Kommission. <<http://www.unesco-schulen.at/>> (27 Aug. 2012).
- Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse Analysis. An Introduction*. Continuum: London.
- Pinterits, Manfred. 2001. „Mehrsprachige Kinder an Wiener Schulen – die Vielfalt akzeptieren“. In: Walter Weindinger (ed.). *Bilingualität und Schule? Ausbildung, wissenschaftliche Perspektiven und empirische Befunden*. Wien: öbv&hpt, 22-29.
- Potter, Jonathan; Wetherell, Margareth. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology. Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rampton, Ben. 1997. "Language Crossing and the Redefinition of Reality: Implications for Research on Code-switching community". *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 5, 1-21.
- Rampton, Ben. 1999. „Minority Languages: A view from research on 'language crossing'". *Bulletin Suisse de linguistique appliquée* 69(2), 97-117.
- Reif-Breitwieser. 2004. "Wir sprechen zehn Sprachen". Bericht über ein multilinguals Sprachenprojekt in mehreren Teilen". *Fremdsprache Deutsch Heft 31/2004 – Sprachenvielfalt im Klassenzimmer*, 30-35.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 2002. "The Impact of Language Policy on Endangered Languages" *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4(2), 1-28.
<www.unesco.org/most/vl4n2romaine.pdf> (16 Aug. 2012).
- Smit, Ute. 1996. *A New English for a New South Africa? Language Attitudes, Language Planning and Education*. Wien: Braumüller.

- Seidman, Irving. 2006. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research. A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silverman, David. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Shohamy, Elana. 2006. "Imagined Multilingual Schools: How Come We Don't Deliver?". In: Ofelia García et al. (eds.). *Imagining Multilingual Schools. Languages in Education and Globalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 171-183.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 1988. „Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children“. In: Ofelia García, Colin Baker (ed.). *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education. A reader Extending the Foundations*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 40-62.
- Sparadley, James P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2008. "Investigating Language Education Policy". In: K. A. King and N. H. Hornberger (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd edition), *Volume 10: Research Methods in Language and Education*. USA: Springer, 27-39.
- Spotti, Massimiliano. 2006. "Multilingual Migrants and Monolingual Teachers: The Discursive Construction of Identity in a Flanders Primary School". In: Clare Mar-Molinero & Patric Stevenson (eds.). *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices. Language and the Future of Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 191-205.
- Spradley, James P. 1980. *Participant Observation*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Talja, Sanna. 1999. „Analyzing Qualitative Interview Data: The Discourse Analytic Method“. *Library & Information Science Research* 21(4), 459-477.
- Yağmur, Kutlay; Extra, Guus. 2011. "Urban multilingualism in Europe: Educational responses to increasing diversity". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1185-1195.
- Van Parijs, Philippe. 2008. "Linguistic diversity as curse and as by-product". In: Xabier Arzoz (ed.) *Respecting Linguistic Diversity in the European Union*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17-46.
- Vetter, Eva. 2011. "Multilingualism pedagogy – building bridges between languages". In Julia Hüttner et al. (eds.). *Theory and Practice in EFL Teacher Education. Bridging the Gap*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 228-246.
- Wei, Li. 2008. "Research Perspectives on Bilingualism and Multilingualism". In: Li Wei (ed.). *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 3-17.
- Weidinger, Walter. 2001. "Bilingualität und Schule – Zahlen, Fakten, Trends am Beispiel der Wiener Pflichtschulen". In: Walter Weidinger (ed.). *Bilingualität und Schule? Ausbildung, wissenschaftliche Perspektiven und empirische Befunden*. Wien: öbv&hpt, 12-21.
- Wildenauer-Józsa, Doris. 2004. "Ich vergleiche immer'. Wie erwachsene Deutschlernende ihre Sprachkenntnisse einsetzen: Beispiel Grammatik." Bericht über ein multilinguals Sprachenprojekt in mehreren Teilen". *Fremdsprache Deutsch Heft 31/2004 – Sprachenvielfalt im Klassenzimmer*, 38-42.

- Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The discourse-historical approach". In: Ruth Wodak & Michel Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 63-94.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2008. „Introduction: Discourse Studies – Important Concepts and Terms“. In: Ruth Wodak & Michal Krzyzanowski (eds.). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Plagave Macmillan: Houndsmills, 1-29.
- Wright, Noleine. 2008. "School Language Policies". In: S. May and N. H. Hornberger (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd edition), *Volume 1: Language Policy and Political Issues in Education*. USA: Springer, 243–252.
- Zwitter, Deva. 2012. *Legal and Institutional Framework Analysis: Hungarian in Austria*. Vienna: European Language Diversity for All.
<<http://phaidra.univie.ac.at/o:105397>> (5 May 2012).

Appendix

1. Question sets

1.1. Teachers

I. TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

1. Do you consider your school multilingual?
Do you consider the classrooms you teach multilingual?
Do you consider your INDIVIDUAL students multilingual?
2. How would you define multilingualism?
What is then linguistic diversity to you?
3. To your knowledge, what are your students' first language or languages?
4. How would you evaluate those students' German competence who are non-German natives/to whom German is a second language?
° If answer negative > Do you consider this as a hindrance in any way for your English lessons?

II. TEACHING

B. LANGUAGE USE

5. Which language or languages do you use as the language of instruction (*Unterrichtssprache*) in your English lessons?
only German / only English / both German and English/Other(s)?

Why do you think using only that/both of those/those language(s) as the language of instruction in the English lesson beneficial for students?
6. What is your opinion about using students' mother tongue(s) in the English lesson (among themselves, during exercises, with you)?
7. To your knowledge which language or languages do students use among themselves? In the English lesson and/or breaks.
° From a pedagogical perspective, what is your opinion about their language use?
8. Which language or languages do you use with your students outside the classroom? Why?

C. LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

9. How do you find teaching English to linguistically diverse groups (classrooms where students have different first languages)?
° Is it easier or more difficult than in linguistically homogeneous groups?)

- ° How is it easier/more difficult?
 - ° Is there a need for additional resources?

 - ° In your opinion, in what way is linguistic diversity in the classroom a challenge in the English lesson? (different L1s)

 - ° In your opinion, in what way is linguistic diversity in the classroom an asset in the English lesson? (different L1s)
10. How does a linguistically diverse group influence your teaching? (methods/approaches or materials you use)?
 11. Which methods/approaches do you find particularly useful in such groups? (in teaching different skills for English)

III. FRAMEWORK FOR MULTILINGUALISM

12. What do regulations within the educational system say about multilingualism and linguistic diversity?

What practical influence does this have on your teaching?

IV. CLOSING QUESTIONS

13. If you had unlimited financial assets (plenty of money), what would you do to support teachers like yourself – teachers teaching multilingual classrooms in Austria?
14. Do you have any additional comments with regard to linguistic diversity in general?

1.2. Principal

I. TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

1. Tell me a little bit about this school.
How is it different to other schools?
What is the student population like?
2. Do you consider your school multilingual?
Do you consider your INDIVIDUAL students multilingual?
What is multilingualism to you? How would you define multilingualism?
3. To your knowledge, what are the students' first language or languages?
How many languages are there present?
How do you define linguistic diversity?

II. LANGUAGE USE

4. How would you evaluate those students' German competence who are non-German natives/to whom German is a second language?
° If answer negative > Do you consider this as a hindrance in any way for the teaching of English or foreign languages?
5. To your knowledge which language or languages do students use among themselves? In the English lesson and/or breaks.
6. What is your opinion about using students' mother tongue(s) in the English or foreign language lessons?
(among themselves, during exercises, with you)?
7. Is there any (official or unofficial) school policy with regard to language use in the institution?
Why is this important?

III. TEACHING

A. GENERAL

8. As a the principal of the school, what do you consider to be the most important teaching aims for English classes?
What about language education in general?

B. LANGUAGE USE

9. In your opinion which language or languages should be used as the language of instruction (*Unterrichtssprache*) in the English lessons?
Why do you think using that/those language(s) as the language of instruction in the English lesson beneficial for students?

C. LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

10. As the principal of the school, do you think that teaching EFL linguistically diverse groups (classrooms where students have different first languages) is in any way different to other teaching contexts?

° Is there a need for additional resources?
(material = e.g. technical, dictionaries; teachers = with special skills, more aware, multilingual themselves)

° Is it easier or more difficult than in linguistically homogeneous groups?
° How is it easier/more difficult?

° In your opinion, in what way is linguistic diversity in the classroom a challenge in the English lesson? (different L1s)

° In your opinion, in what way is linguistic diversity in the classroom an asset in the English lesson? (different L1s)

11. How does a linguistically diverse group influence the way you teach at this school? (methods/approaches or materials you use)?
12. Do you think that non-German native students' mother tongues should be addressed in the English lesson in any way? How/Why?

IV. FRAMEWORK FOR MULTILINGUALISM

13. What do regulations within the educational system say about multilingualism and linguistic diversity?

V. CLOSING QUESTIONS

14. If you had unlimited financial assets (plenty of money), what would you do to support teachers teaching linguistically diverse classrooms in Austria?
15. Do you have any additional comments with regard to linguistic diversity in general

2. Interview protocol

I. PERSONAL DATA

1. Gender F M

2. Age under 30
 30-39
 40-49
 50-59
 60+

3. Which language or languages do you regard as your mother tongue/first language?	
4. What other language(s) do you speak?	

II. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

5. (Beside ENG) what is your second subject?	
6. How many years have you spent in teaching service?	
7. Have you worked or studied abroad? If YES, where and for how long?	

3. Lesson observation sheet

Informant (anonimized):

Date:

Time:

Group (size, mother tongues, gender distribution):

Lesson content:

Short description:

Observed behaviour	Observations/Observers comments
Language(s) of instruction	
LU for class management	
LU teaching (new) <i>vocabulary</i> language use	
LU teaching <i>grammar</i> language use	
LU teaching <i>pronunciation</i> language use	
LU teaching <i>four skills</i> language use	
Materials used	
Any other language used than ENG/GER? In what form?	
LU teacher: individual/private conversation	
LU outside classroom	
Switches to (a) language(s) other than English (T or Ss)	
LU Ss: What language they use 1) among each other 2) with the T?	
Any kind of 1) conflict situation 2) misunderstanding 3) difficulty arising from LD?	
How is LD used as an asset?	

* note: LU= language use; T = teacher; S = individual student; Ss = students

4. Transcription convention

Spelling

sentence	The interviews are transcribed orthographically, using British spelling (including the use of hyphens).
YES	Capital letters are only used to mark emphasis.
i'm	Verb contractions such for all forms of <i>be</i> , <i>will</i> , <i>have</i> and <i>would</i> and their negatives are used whenever uttered in this form.
gonna	Phonological reductions for <i>dunno</i> , <i>gonna</i> , <i>wanna</i> , <i>cause</i> are used.
volksschule	Non-English (here German) words are spelled according to the standard spelling (with umlauts).
unicef	Acronyms are neither marked nor spelled with capitals.

Intonation at the end of prosodic unity

.	falling intonation
?	rising-falling intonation

Pause

,	micro pause with stable intonation
(.)	short pause (few seconds)
(...)	long pause

Emphasis

YES	capitals indicate additional stress/emphasis
-----	--

Unfinished words

multicul-	a hyphen at the end of cluster indicates that word was not completed
-----------	--

Comments

()	editorial comments are given in parenthesis (spel) = spelling (laughing) = laughter (irrelevant) = removed sequence
(-)	unintelligible sequences are replaced as with this symbol

Zusammenfassung

'They should speak German perfectly of course'.

Lehrerdiskurs über Sprachenvielfalt im EFL-Klassenzimmer

Die Anzahl verschiedener Sprachen an Wiener Schulen hat sich durch Migration in den letzten Jahren deutlich gesteigert; fast die Hälfte der schulpflichtigen Hauptstädter hat eine andere Muttersprache als Deutsch. Oft stellt sich diese wachsende Sprachenvielfalt, für Institutionen und Pädagogen, als eine Herausforderung dar; sie berichten, dass der Umgang mit solch sprachlich durchmischten Gruppen eine Erschwernis sei und problematisieren die Sprachkompetenz ihrer Schüler. Das Ziel dieser Studie ist herauszufinden, wie Lehrer sprachliche Diversität und individuelle Mehrsprachigkeit wahrnehmen und wie sie schlussendlich die vorhandenen Sprachen betrachten. Der Fokus dieser Untersuchung liegt bei dem EFL-Klassenzimmer (English as a Foreign Language), weil Sprachpädagogen unausweichlich mit den verschiedenen sprachlichen Repertoires ihrer Schüler umgehen müssen. Mit einer diskursanalytischen Herangehensweise will diese Arbeit versuchen, die diskursiven Repertoires der Lehrer über Sprachenvielfalt und Mehrsprachigkeit herauszuarbeiten. Um dieses Arbeitsziel zu erreichen, wurde eine Reihe von individuellen Interviews und Stundenbeobachtungen durchgeführt. Interviewpartner waren EFL-Lehrer eines Wiener Gymnasiums, welches eine sprachlich durchmischte Schülerschaft aufweist. Die Hauptfragestellungen waren folglich:

- Wie wird Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachenvielfalt in Lehrerdiskursen konstruiert?
- Welchen Wert besitzt Englisch (die Zielsprache), Deutsch (die offizielle Mehrheitssprache) und die Herkunftssprache der Schüler (welche nicht Englisch oder Deutsch ist)?
- Welche Sprachpraktiken werden in dem EFL-Klassenzimmer als legitim angesehen?
- Beeinflusst der Lehrerdiskurs die Sprachpraktiken in EFL-Unterrichtsstunden?

- Welche Rolle spielen gesetzliche Sprachpädagogikverordnungen und Sprachenpolitik (international, national oder institutionell) im Lehrerdiskurs über Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachenvielfalt?

Die Analyse zeigte, dass es den homogenen Diskurs über Themenkomplexe in Zusammenhang mit Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachenvielfalt so nicht gibt, denn es herrscht ein Mangel an Sicherheit, was denn nun der anerkannte Diskurs wäre, was dann auch in der Verunsicherung über die anerkannte Praxis resultiert. In Hinsicht auf pädagogische Praxis schlägt sich dies in der Vielzahl von Herangehensweisen nieder, welche nicht notwendigerweise nützlich in diesem Kontext der Mehrsprachigkeit sind. Generell muss aber beachtet werden, dass scheinbar die Sprachpraktiken im Klassenzimmer, von Lehrern und Schülern, größtenteils auf dem individuellen, diskursiven Repertoire des Lehrers beruhen.

Bezüglich des Konzeptes der Muttersprache bestehen einige interpretative Konflikte über die generelle Aussage des Konzeptes. Sie beschreiben Schüler als mehrsprachig, mit dem Argument, dass sie Deutsch sowie auch ihre Herkunftssprache kompetent beherrschen und beides innerhalb der Familie als Muttersprache gesprochen wird. Andererseits konstruieren die Lehrer die Deutschfähigkeiten des Schülers als mangelhaft, unzufriedenstellend und nicht einheimisch genug. Der vielleicht unerlässlichste Punkt dieser Studie ist jedoch, dass Deutsch als die primäre Unterrichtssprache konstruiert wird, was einen erheblichen Einfluss auf die Art und Weise, wie Englisch unterrichtet wird, ausübt. Gleichzeitig muss angeführt werden, dass einige Lehrer den kulturellen Hintergrund ihrer Schüler als potentiell wertvoll betrachteten. Kulturelle Diversität wird in Institutionen generell wertgeschätzt und auf irgendeine Weise genutzt; und doch werden die Muttersprachen der Schüler, und die damit verbundene Sprachenvielfalt, nicht in gleicher Weise behandelt. Die Analyse des Lehrerdiskurses zeigte, dass die Muttersprachen der Schüler als unerlaubt (z.B.: einige Lehrer verbieten den Gebrauch der Muttersprachen der Schüler, sogar außerhalb des Unterrichts) konstruiert wurden, grundlegend auf der weit verbreiteten Ansicht, dass der Gebrauch einer Sprache, die nicht von allen

verstanden werden kann, als ausschließend gilt und zu Ungleichheit und Benachteiligung führt.

Es ist bemerkenswert, dass Lehrer praktisch kein Wissen über die Teile des Lehrplans haben die sich mit Fragen der Mehrsprachigkeit befassen. Dies suggeriert, dass Regelungen in der Praxis wenig Einfluss haben, wenn sie nicht von den Praktizierenden wahrgenommen werden, z.B.: jene, die diese Regelungen betreffen und somit auch ausführen sollten oder zielführend in die Richtung der ausgelegten Regelungen arbeiten. Was ebenfalls besondere Berücksichtigung verdient, ist, dass Lehrer nicht daran glauben, dass sie Kinder so fördern und erziehen können, damit diese als mehrsprachig aufwachsen, obwohl dies beides explizite Ziele seitens der österreichischen und europäischen Spracherziehungspolitik darstellt.

Weiters, obwohl die Mehrheit der Lehrer individuelle Mehrsprachigkeit als das Beherrschen oder Benutzen mehrerer Sprachen versteht, argumentieren Lehrer, dass multilinguale Kompetenzen erworben, jedoch nicht erlernt werden können; wie manche hervorhoben, seien nur jene, die mehrsprachig aufgewachsen sind, 'echte Mehrsprachige'. Individuelle Mehrsprachigkeit ist also nicht nur als die Beherrschung mehrerer Sprachen definiert; sie ist auch durch den sprachlichen und ethnischen Hintergrund der Person sowie deren sprachliche Handlungsmuster bestimmt. Bezüglich der Gesetzgebung bedeutet dies also eine bemerkenswerte Lücke zwischen Theorie und Praxis. Dementsprechend scheint es, dass die Gesetzgebung nicht effektiv ist, wenn man ihren tatsächlichen Einfluss auf die Lehrpraxis von Fremdsprachen beachtet.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich anmerken, dass, obwohl Lehrer Mehrsprachigkeit generell als etwas Positives einschätzen, dies noch lange nicht ihren Diskurs über Sprachpädagogik oder mehrsprachige Klassen beeinflusst. Folglich werden die sprachlichen Repertoires der Schüler nicht als Ressource gesehen und werden somit auch nicht in dem EFL-Klassenzimmer in irgendeiner Form genutzt.

Curriculum Vitae

Hajnalka Berényi-Kiss

Personal Data

Date of birth: 4th August 1985
Place of birth: Subotica, Serbia
Citizenship: Serbian and Hungarian

Language Skills

Hungarian: mother tongue
English: C1+
Serbian: C1-
German: B2+

Education

- 2008 – 2012** *Teacher Qualification Degree, English and Hungarian*
(Lehramt UF English UF Ungarisch), University of Vienna - Vienna
- 2005 – 2007** *Developmental Community Youth Work and Leadership*
School of Education and Communication, Jönköping University
– Subotica/Novi Sad
- 2001 – 2005** *Customs-officer*
High School of Economics "Bosa Milićević" - Subotica

Work Experience

- 2012 – 2013** *Assistant*
Centre of English Language Teaching, University of Vienna – Vienna
- 2009 – 2013** *Project Assistant*
University of Vienna, Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies,
Project ELDIA – Vienna
- 2008 – 2010** *Tutor*
For Hungarian Language Courses and Finno-Ugrian Linguistics.
University of Vienna, Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies – Vienna
- 2006 – 2007** *School secretary*
Philological Gymnasium Kosztolányi Dezső – Subotica
- Workshop leader*
Project Youth Policy and Action Plan Vojvodina - "Udruga Građana CroV -
Subotica
- Trainer and project leader* (Encouraging youth action in rural
areas) - Youth Centre of Forum Syd (Omladinski Centar) – Subotica
- 2005 – 2006** *Project coordinator and office manager*
Youth Centre (Ifjúsági Központ) - Subotica
- 2004 – 2006** *Member of decision-making board*
Youth Fund Balkans, Forum Syd - Subotica

Publications

- Forthcoming Berényi-Kiss, Hajnalka; Laakso, Johanna, Parfuss, Angelika.
Hungarian-speakers in Austria. A Case-specific Report. Working
Papers in European Language Diversity. Mainz &c.: ELDIA.
- Forthcoming Berényi-Kiss, Hajnalka. "From Rights to Language Use Practices. A
case-study on the Hungarian-speakers in Austria". *Conference
Publication: Conference on Minority Representation and Minority
Language Rights*.

Conference Presentations

- 28th Feb. - "Data made accessible. The multifaceted nature of linguistic
03rd Mar. research data". *Third International Conference on Language
2013 Documentation & Conservation (ICLDC)*, University of Hawai'i.
Honolulu, Hawaii.
- 12th Oct. "From rights to language use practices. A case-study on the
2012 Hungarian-speakers in Austria". *Conference on Minority
Representation and Minority Language Rights*, Sapientia Erdélyi
Magyar Tudományegyetem. Cluj Napoca, Romania.
- 25th Sep. "Hungarian in Austria. A case-specific report". Joint presentation
2012 with Prof. Laakso. *ELDIA Regional Conference "Old and new
Multilingualism"*. Finno-Ugristik Universität Wien. Vienna, Austria.
- 16th Mar. "Who needs Hungarian? A case-study on the Hungarian-speakers
2012 in Austria". *Fourth International Symposium on Multilingualism*,
University of Tampere. Tampere, Finland.
- 25th Nov. "Flying under radar range. Hungarians in Austria?" Joint
2011 presentation with Mag. Angelika Parfuss. *Methoden der Kultur-
und Sprachvermittlung*, Institut für Slawistik der Humboldt-
Universität. Berlin, Germany.