



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

“Lost in Translanguaging?: an analysis of multilingual practices in Austrian CLIL classrooms at lower secondary level“

verfasst von / submitted by

Amira Šahbegović

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

Wien, 2017 / Vienna, 2017

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

A 190 344 333

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

Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch
UF Deutsch

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Christiane Dalton-Puffer

Acknowledgments

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr Christiane Dalton-Puffer, who helped me a great deal throughout the entire writing process. Thank you very much for your valuable advice, the constructive feedback and your encouraging attitude.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my siblings for supporting me in this endeavour. The younger ones contributed their part through banter and jokes, which always brightens my day. A special thanks goes to my older sister, who not only encouraged me with her ideas and proofread my thesis but who made sure that I did not starve during this project.

I would also like to thank my friends – no matter if I met them at university or if we have known each other for a long time. In particular, I would like to show my appreciation for H, who has always been there for me.

My deepest gratitude needs to be expressed towards my loving parents, who supported me my whole life and who did not intervene in any of my educational decisions. Without you being you, I would have never been able to reach this point. Thank you so much for your devotion. I love you.

Table of contents

List of abbreviations	i
List of figures	ii
List of tables	ii
1 Introduction.....	1
PART I: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	3
2 Multilingualism	3
2.1 Conceptual background.....	3
2.1.1 Defining multilingualism	3
2.1.2 Different types of multilingualism	8
2.1.3 Multilingualism in Austria	10
2.2 Multilingual education.....	12
2.2.1 From the monolingual habitus to a holistic view on multilingual education.....	13
2.2.2 Aims of multilingual education	14
3 Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)	17
3.1 What is CLIL?.....	17
3.1.1 Definition and development of CLIL	17
3.1.2 Variations in CLIL models	20
3.2 CLIL in Europe	23
3.3 CLIL in Austria	24
3.4 Advantages and challenges of CLIL.....	26
3.4.1 Teachers.....	26
3.4.2 Learners	28
3.4.3 Learning outcomes	30
4 Translanguaging	33
4.1 Theoretical framework	33
4.1.1 The ‘linguaging’ in translanguaging – reflecting on linguistic practices.....	33
4.1.2 Origins and development of translanguaging.....	35
4.1.3 Extending the term beyond Wales – a global take on translanguaging.....	38
4.1.4 Delineation of translanguaging to related terms.....	42
4.2 Research on translanguaging.....	44
4.2.1 Translanguaging in education	45
4.2.2 Translanguaging in content classes.....	49

PART II: EMPIRICAL STUDY	55
5 Design of the empirical study.....	55
5.1 Research context and data	56
5.2 Methodology	59
5.2.1 Classroom-based research	59
5.2.2 Classroom discourse analysis	60
5.3 Procedure and transcription process.....	62
6 Analysis	65
6.1 Translanguaging in numbers.....	65
6.2 Languages in the classroom	71
6.3 Translanguaging practices.....	76
6.3.1 Orienting to language in content	77
6.3.2 Orienting to flow of interaction	83
6.3.3 Miscellaneous	88
7 Discussion.....	92
8 Conclusion	99
9 References.....	102
10 Appendix	114
10.1 Abstract	114
10.2 Zusammenfassung.....	115
10.3 Transcription conventions	116

List of abbreviations

AES	Adult Education Survey
BCMS	Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian
BICS	Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills
CALP	Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
CS	Code-switching
CUP	Common Underlying Proficiency
DLP	Dual Language Programme
EAL	English as an Additional Language
L1	First language
L2	Second language
L3	Third language

List of figures

Figure 1: Types of multilingualism (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 388)	10
--	----

List of tables

Table 1: Differences between the research contexts	59
Table 2: Word count divided into languages used by classroom participants in numbers and percentage – School A	66
Table 3: Word count divided into languages used by classroom participants in numbers and percentage – School B	68
Table 4: Languages detected in the database of School A	68
Table 5: Number of translanguaging instances in School A and School B including both teachers and students	69
Table 6: Number of translanguaging instances separated into the three analytical categories for both teachers and students	70

1 Introduction

The role of multilingualism in educational contexts has been under scrutiny in recent academic discussions. A change in attitude towards the ability of speaking several languages being of high value has resulted in various actions to foster multilingualism around the world. In Europe, this undertaking is especially reflected in the implementation of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The idea of CLIL can be broadly defined as a dual-focused approach, which aims to consolidate subject and (foreign) language development in educational contexts. One of its main features is that it is rather content than language driven as such classes are timetabled as content classes and taught by content teachers who are usually non-native speakers of the target language. Under these circumstances, using multilingual practices by both teachers and students who can be regarded emergent multilinguals seems inevitable in order to foster an understanding of the subject and make sense of the world. Such multilingual behaviour has been reconceptualised in academia as ‘translanguaging’ – a concept that has gained increasing recognition in multilingual research, especially in educational contexts. This new approach challenges the view that languages are stored separately in a multilingual speaker’s brain. Scholarship in this field rather suggests that there is one linguistic repertoire from which features are strategically selected in order to communicate effectively. Hence, a translanguaging framework focuses on the speakers’ discursive practices as a process rather than on language as a code. CLIL research to date has largely adopted a monolingual orientation concentrating on the learner’s second language, hence appertaining to the belief of language as a system, rather than on the speaker’s engagement in multilingual practices.

In order to fill this research gap, the present diploma thesis will analyse translanguaging instances in Austrian CLIL classrooms at lower secondary level. Since Austrian classrooms can be considered multicultural, hence multilingual, the additional question arises of whether students resort to other languages besides the official media of instruction in CLIL settings, which are German and English. Moreover, it will be investigated for what purposes classroom participants employ translanguaging strategies. Since the data consists of three History lessons and three Biology lessons, it is also of great interest to see whether there are

any differences in the usage of translinguaging in natural science and social science classes. For clarification, this study tries to answer one main research question and three additional sub-questions, presented here in bullet form:

- Do classroom participants practice translinguaging in a CLIL setting at lower secondary schools in Austria?
 - Are classroom participants resorting to their full linguistic repertoire, in other words, are they also using other languages in the classroom besides the two official media of instruction?
 - For what purposes is translinguaging employed in the classroom?
 - Is there a difference in the usage of multilingual resources between CLIL in natural science and in humanities lessons?

The first part of this paper is concerned with the theoretical underpinnings of this thesis. The second chapter therein explores the concept of multilingualism more precisely by discussing its definition, various types and the current situation in Austria. Furthermore, section 2.2 examines the changes and the aims of multilingual education. In the subsequent chapter, one type of multilingual education – namely CLIL – will be reviewed more closely. At first, the approach and its variation will be outlined followed by a short discussion on CLIL in the European and Austrian context. The last part of this chapter refers to the advantages and challenges of implementing CLIL in classrooms. The fourth section of this paper addresses the main topic of the thesis, translinguaging, by describing the presuppositions of its emergence and the development of the notion. Chapter 4.1.4 tries to demarcate the concept from other related terms. Following, a literature review on translinguaging in education is presented. The second part of this thesis attends to the empirical part of this study. The fifth chapter characterises the design of the investigation by describing the research context and the data as well as the methodology and the research procedure. The following section (chapter 6) depicts the core of this work, which is the analysis of the data. It is divided into a brief quantification part (chapter 6.1), research into existing languages in the transcripts (chapter 6.2) and the examination of translinguaging instances (chapter 6.3). Subsequently, the outcomes of the investigation (chapter 7) are discussed and the last section (chapter 8) summarises the main findings of this thesis.

PART I: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

2 Multilingualism

“Multilingualism is a source of strength and opportunity for humanity. It embodies our cultural diversity and encourages the exchange of views, the renewal of ideas and the broadening of our capacity to imagine.”
– Irina Bokova, UNESCO Director-General

Even though multilingualism is not a recent phenomenon, it has become more prevalent over the last few decades particularly due to globalisation, transnational mobility and the development of new technologies. These factors have not only contributed to the increased visibility of multilingualism but have also augmented the value of being able to speak several languages. (CENÓZ & GORTER 2015: 1) As the quote above indicates, the benefits of multilingualism are evermore appreciated and thus, speaking more languages is being promoted in the general public. Owing to this mounting significance in modern society, multilingualism has also gained attention in scholarship, especially in applied linguistics (CENÓZ 2013b: 4). As this diploma thesis investigates translanguaging in CLIL – the former relating to multilingual behaviour and the latter to multilingual education –, the necessity arises to consider multilingualism more closely at first. Therefore, this chapter will initially attempt at defining the concept and subsequently explore different types of multilingualism. Following, the multilingual situation in Austria will be regarded since this study is situated in an Austrian educational context. Next, multilingual education will be studied briefly before elaborating on CLIL, which constitutes a certain type of multilingual education, in the ensuing chapter.

2.1 Conceptual background

2.1.1 Defining multilingualism

Despite appearing to be a seemingly simple concept, providing a comprehensive definition of multilingualism poses some difficulties due to its complexity. The notion itself is used in manifold ways as the phenomenon may occur in various situations and is further influenced by different factors, such as linguistic, cultural, social and political ones. One essential issue that needs to be taken into account is the number of languages involved. The term

‘multilingualism’ means ‘many languages’ and hence, obviously refers to more than one language. However, the question arises whether two languages can already be regarded as many or whether it is more appropriate to use the word ‘bilingualism’ for such instances. (CENOS 2013b: 2) In language research, most scholars adhere to a numeric scale by differentiating between mono-, bi- and multilinguals but this is not a universal practice. Some researchers make a binary distinction between monolingual and multilingual speakers, where the latter also encompasses bilinguals. Likewise, other scholars use this binary distinction with the terms monolingualism and bilingualism; they then define bilingualism – despite being etymologically incorrect – as knowing two or more languages. In other words, their usage of the notion bilingualism also includes multilingualism. (KEMP 2009: 15) In this thesis, the phenomenon will be referred to as multilingualism since one part of the study investigates whether more than two languages occur in the classroom and so it is believed that the preferred term will avoid confusion. The question of nomenclature and other matters that will be discussed in the course of this section have complicated the characterisation of multilingualism since the beginning of research into this topic, which is the reason why there have been various attempts at defining the term.

The historical development of the notion of multilingualism reaches back to the 1930s. One of the first scholars to make an attempt at delineating multilingualism was the German linguist BRAUN (JESSNER 2008: 16) who proposed to view it as “aktive vollendete Gleichbeherrschung zweier oder mehrerer Sprachen” (BRAUN 1937: 115) [“active balanced perfect proficiency in two or more languages” (JESSNER 2008: 16)]. In his essay, BRAUN acknowledges the difficulty of defining multilingualism but even so differentiates between natural, meaning acquired from birth, and learned multilingualism. The latter can, according to BRAUN, also result in active balanced proficiency but this is rather exceptional because it is linked to specific circumstances (1937: 115). In a similar vein, BLOOMFIELD (1933: 56) maintains that a multilingual speaker needs to have “native-like control of two or more languages”. At that time, and for a long time afterwards, scholars used the educated native speaker as a reference for achieving communicative competence in a language. However, as VALDÉS (2005: 414) indicates, the perfect and equal knowledge of different languages is hardly obtainable as individuals rarely have access to two or more languages in exactly the same contexts for each domain of communication. With the publication of his monograph in

1963, VILDOMEČ is the first one to report on the advantages of multilingualism. He also stresses the distinction between bi- and multilingualism but his distinction does not hinge on the number of languages known but on the degree of language proficiency. According to VILDOMEČ (1963), the former relates to the mastery of two languages, whereas the latter indicates the familiarity of more than two languages.

A more recent definition has been provided by the EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2007: 6), which determines multilingualism 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 this regard, the EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2007: 6) views language as any variant a group uses for its accustomed code of interaction including regional languages, dialects and sign languages. Furthermore, this definition combines societal and individual multilingualism (CENOZ 2013b: 2). The former indicates the coexistence and use of multiple languages in a society, whereas the latter denotes the knowledge of several languages by one speaker. With regard to societal multilingualism, a discrepancy between a country's official language(s) and its linguistic reality exists at times. Not all individual citizens of multilingual countries, like Belgium and Switzerland, are inevitably multilingual speakers. Whereas, officially monolingual states, such as France or in this case Austria, might have considerably large multilingual populations. (LI WEI 2008: 3-4) Multilingualism at the individual level is also often referred to as 'plurilingualism', a terminological consequence attributable to the European Union's increasing emphasis on multilingual education over the last decades. (JESSNER 2008: 18) The institution has formulated the goal of "mother tongue plus two" meaning that it aims at European citizens being proficient in two additional languages besides their first language by implementing various measures (FRANCESCINI 2011: 345). Such targeted promotion clearly indicates that multilingualism has undergone a change in perspective from having negative cognitive implications, which was reinforced by early research into bilingualism, towards being an asset (CENOZ 2013b: 1).

The recognition of multilingualism as a beneficial resource is, nevertheless, dependent on the prestige a language enjoys. Through languages, such as English and German, which have

a high reputation and are usually perceived as advantageous, “elite multilingualism” (CENOS 2013b: 1) is established. Thus, speaking these languages serves as a marker of high status resulting in their being taught as subjects in schools. (CENOS & GORTER 2010: 38) Furthermore, it should be noted that elite multilingualism appears to encourage the use of clear boundaries between languages (CENOS & JESSNER 2009: 123), an understanding that has to be acknowledged when examining (trans)linguaging in multilingual settings (further discussion see chapter 4.1.1). In contrast, “folk or nonelite multilingualism” (CENOS 2013b: 1), which is more widespread than its counterpart, incorporates languages that are used by minorities or immigrants. This kind of multilingualism is often assumed to be a burden, especially at the individual level, and is therefore partly or fully neglected in many educational settings. CENOS (2013b: 1) states that students “who speak languages with a low status in a given society are expected to become monolingual in the high-status language”, which is particularly the case with migrants. In general, migrant languages commonly have low prestige in the host country. (CENOS & GORTER 2010: 44) In these circumstances then, language is not seen as a useful tool by society but rather becomes an ethnic marker. Therefore, taking all these points into consideration, it can be stated that the maintenance of a certain language in a new environment relies heavily on its reputation.

English, however, does not only have high prestige, as has been mentioned above, but enjoys a specific status in the multilingual context. Its increasing role as a global lingua franca is of vital importance in the development of multilingualism (CENOS & JESSNER 2009: 124). In most European countries, English is learnt as the first foreign language in schools, a circumstance that is genuinely embraced by both parents and students (JESSNER 2008: 42). Research as well appreciates the language’s contribution towards multilingualism. GRADDOL (2004: 1330), for example, asserts that English will play a major role in creating new generations of multilingual speakers in the future. STAVANS and HOFFMANN (2015: 124-131) even postulate a multilingualism with English, which is characterised by its high variation in the acquisition process and also in its usage. It is further assumed that English could serve to foster language learning by activating and aiding cognitive processes and could additionally lead to the development of language awareness in multilinguals, in other words establishing openness to linguistic diversity. (JESSNER 2008: 42) As a reaction to this wide appreciation, critics (KRUMM 2005; HUFSEIN 2005) have claimed that learning other languages before

English would be more beneficial and that students would stop learning other languages due to the predominance of English. For this reason, various actions by political institutions, such as the European Commission, have been proposed to counteract this apprehension and thus, to establish a multilingual Europe. Still, it needs to be taken into account that despite these efforts, policy makers responsible for language decisions often disregard such provisions due to a variety of reasons. A good case in point constitutes the dominance of English in the school curricula, which can be particularly seen in the language choices for CLIL implementation.

With reference to the aspects discussed, the term multilingualism encompasses different examples of multilingual speakers who acquire numerous languages at varying stages. Children who grow up with two or more languages from birth, for instance, can be labelled multilingual. Furthermore, migrants who move to a new linguistic environment, such as Turkish children learning German in Austria, are also regarded as multilingual. Students learning a first foreign language, which in most cases is English, at any point in their life as well as pupils who additionally learn a second or even a third and a fourth foreign language also fall into this category. (JESSNER 2008: 19) The acquisition process of each of these examples proceeds heterogeneously. Whereas only two routes for second language (L2) acquisition, learning the L2 parallel or consecutively to the L1, have been determined, CENOZ (2000: 40-42) defines at least four types of acquisition order for speakers of more than two languages:

- i. simultaneous acquisition of L1/L2/L3
- ii. consecutive acquisition of L1, L2 and L3
- iii. simultaneous acquisition of L2/L3 after learning the L1
- iv. simultaneous acquisition of L1/L2 before learning L3

However, this classification promotes the notion of languages being stored separately in the brain, a view that has often been under scrutiny recently (for further discussion see chapter 4.1.1), and in addition, reflects the additive type of multilingualism. It therefore seems necessary to examine this and other forms of multilingualism more closely.

2.1.2 Different types of multilingualism

Traditional notions of multilingualism are either subtractive or additive. In the subtractive model, the person knows a first language and a second one is added while the first is subtracted. This form of multilingualism can particularly be encountered in places where monoglossic ideologies persist. In these circumstances, for instance, children who speak a language other than that of the state need to abandon their L1 and adopt the dominant language. (GARCÍA 2009: 51-52) Hence, the learner's bilingualism is not progressing towards the goal of total acquisition of both languages but rather towards ultimate attainment of monolingualism. (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 387) Additive multilingualism means that speakers enlarge their linguistic knowledge simply by adding whole autonomous languages. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 12) In contrast to the subtractive form, the development of the first language remains. (CENÓZ 2013a: 5-6) An example of this kind of multilingualism would be students whose L1 is not the medium of instruction entering school and acquiring a second language. Thus, they become speakers of both languages. (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 387) GARCÍA and LI WEI (2014: 11-12) regard this type of multilingualism also as 'dual' due to the established treatment of languages as self-contained systems of structures attributable to Saussure, which consequently evoked the view in research of bilingualism being the alternative use of two languages. However, in these conceptualisations of multilingualism, the languages are believed to have a linear relationship, an understanding that is lately transforming into a more dynamic one.

The shift from dual to dynamic multilingualism has been initiated on the basis of changing perceptions in this field of research. In the 1980s, GROSJEAN (1982) argued that bilinguals are not simply two monolinguals in one person. Beforehand, CUMMINS (1979: 202) postulated that the proficiency of multilingual speakers in each of their languages is not stored in an isolated and independent manner. The researcher introduced the concept of the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP), which indicates that even though the structural elements of the languages seem to differ externally, there is cognitive interdependence, which enables linguistic practices to be transferred. More recently, HELLER (2007: 15) also criticised the notion of multilingualism as consisting of separate codes and therefore defined the concept as

sets of resources called into play by social actors, under social and historical conditions which both constrain and make possible the social reproduction of existing conventions and relations, as well as the production of new ones.

On the one hand, this definition takes cognisance of the ideologies surrounding languages and on the other hand, it emphasises the processes and practices relating to language. The focus on processes led to the essential characterisation of dynamic multilingualism as drawing from one joint linguistic repertoire.

Drawing on CUMMINS (1979) and HELLER (2007), GARCÍA (2009: 53-54) was then the first to propose that multilingualism¹ should be considered dynamic rather than linear. According to this model of multilingualism, language practices of multilinguals are complex as well as interrelated. Furthermore, dynamic multilingualism goes beyond CUMMINS's (1979) idea that languages are interdependent; instead it indicates one linguistic system incorporating features that might either be practiced in relation to already constructed language practices or create new ones. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 14) These linguistic practices are then seen as "the center of how language practices occur and the goal for communication in an increasingly multilingual world" (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 388). Dynamic multilingualism in the 21st century can, according to GARCÍA (2009: 52-55), be divided into 'recursive dynamic' and 'dynamic'. The former depicts the development of multilinguals or communities who have experienced a high degree of language loss and so have to regain parts of their former language practices. These individuals or societies move forwards and backwards along a multilingual continuum. The latter characterises the progress of different language practices that are used for communication in a growing multilingual world. (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 388)

Through the use of metaphors and images, GARCÍA (2009: 7-8; 45-54) tries to illustrate and clarify the concepts of multilingualism. The dissimilarities between traditional notions and dynamic multilingualism have been visualised with reference to different vehicles, as presented in Figure 1. The concept of subtractive multilingualism can be viewed as a unicycle where one wheel implies one language. The additive type is represented through two

¹ GARCÍA uses the term 'bilingualism' in several of her works (GARCÍA 2009; GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011; GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014) but by this she also includes other terminology such as multilingual or trilingual (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 48). However, this paper remains referring to the term 'multilingualism' in order to avoid confusion and for better readability.

balanced wheels of a bicycle. Dual multilingualism has long been linked to the concept of balanced bilingualism in which the speaker's competence of both languages is equally developed. BAKER (2011: 8) refers to this type as an "idealized concept" as rarely anybody is linguistically competent in the same way across all situations, as has already been mentioned in chapter 2.1.1. MOORE and NIKULA (2016: 212) even label balanced multilingualism as a "myth" stemming from previous deficiency theories about bilingualism that has led to the use of a wide range of alternative terms for bilinguals. However, dynamic multilingualism can be seen as an all-terrain vehicle with speakers activating their whole linguistic repertoire "to adapt to both the ridges and craters of communication in uneven (and unequal) interactive terrains" (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 16). Additionally, GARCÍA (2009: 7-8) compares dynamic multilingualism with a South Asian banyan tree to capture its reality. The seeds of these trees germinate in the cracks and crevices of a host tree and then the tree grows in every direction. Similarly, dynamic multilingualism emerges "in the cracks and crevices of communication with others who language differently, gradually becoming in and of itself a way of languaging through complex communicative interactions" (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 16). Thus, this form of multilingualism constitutes the goal for communication in a growing multilingual world. As this study is situated in an Austrian context, a closer look at the multilingual situation in Austria in general and specifically in schools needs to be taken.

Subtractive
Bilingualism



Additive
Bilingualism



Dynamic
Bilingualism



Figure 1: Types of multilingualism (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 388)

2.1.3 Multilingualism in Austria

Austria can be considered a multicultural, hence multilingual, country. Besides several autochthonous language communities receiving constitutional status, multilingualism in this country is constantly rising especially due to migration as varied surveys conducted by

STATISTIK AUSTRIA, the state's Federal Statistics Bureau, show. The demographic data collected at the beginning of 2017 reveal that 13.1% of the whole population are neither born in Austria nor have the Austrian citizenship. For another 5.8% Austria does not represent their place of birth but they are of Austrian nationality. Vice versa, 2.2% of the inhabitants are born in Austria but are not Austrian citizens. (STATISTIK AUSTRIA 2017) The reasons for these circumstances are manifold but it can be assumed that therefore a high proportion of these people possibly speak an additional language other than German. The Adult Education Survey (AES) undertaken from October 2011 to May 2012 delivers more specific details in relation to multilingualism in Austria. 84.1% of the participants aged 25 to 64 displayed that German is their mother tongue, which in the study was defined as the language used at home during childhood. The remaining 15.9% named mostly Turkish, Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian (BCMS), English, Romanian and Polish as their L1. Concerning foreign languages, which in the AES are specified as any other language besides the mother tongue, 4 out of 5 people questioned are proficient in at least one other language. Roughly half of the participants know one additional language, about a fifth knows two more and 8.8% knows three or more foreign languages. English with 75.1% depicts the largest group for the first foreign language followed by German, French and Italian. (STATISTIK AUSTRIA 2013: 45-48) This distribution can especially be attributed to language policies in schools, where English is most often taught as the first foreign language.

In general, educational institutions in Austria carry great weight in terms of multilingualism. First of all, the foreign languages curricula for Austrian grammar schools² encompass twelve different languages. (BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR BILDUNG 2000; 2004) In reality, however, English occupies a special position as 98% of all students have English as a subject during their education. The remaining languages are only being taught to a rather small number of pupils (French 9.4%, Italian 5.4%, Spanish 4.1%, Russian 0.7% and Others 1.4%). (STATISTIK AUSTRIA 2016) Secondly, linguistic diversity in schools has been constantly increasing in the last years. In 2015-16, the percentage of students whose vernacular is a language other than German accounts for 23.8%, or expressed in figures, 262,777 pupils. In comparison to inquiries of

² The curricula for vocational education are relatively diverse due to the variety in specialisations. Thus, this diploma thesis will not elaborate on them for practical reasons. For further information refer to the Ministry of Education's website.

2006, the number of this group of learners amounted to 15.6%. Examining the situations of each state, Vienna exhibits the highest rate as almost every second student (49.7%) speaks a different vernacular than German, whereas in Carinthia this number totals only 13.3%. The state of Burgenland features also a rather small percentage with 15.3%. However, significant differences can also be observed between different school types. Approximately a third of students in special needs education, pre-vocational schools, new secondary schools or primary schools do not speak German as their L1. In contrast, the figures for grammar schools and vocational schools are 19.4% and 15.0%, respectively. Similar to the overall situation in the country, languages represented most often in Austrian schools besides German are BCMS, Turkish, Albanian and Romanian. Where mother-tongue teaching is concerned, lessons in 27 different languages were offered at schools in 2014-15. (MEDIEN-SERVICESTELLE NEUE ÖSTEREICH/INNEN 2017) In this context, UNESCO highlights the importance of education in the learners' mother tongue by proclaiming an International Mother Language Day. The theme for the current year has been "Towards Sustainable Futures through Multilingual Education". (UNESCO 2017) On that note, this thesis will devote the following section to multilingual education.

2.2 Multilingual education

In a broad definition, multilingual education is the employment of several languages for learning and teaching in an instructional environment. In a narrower definition, multilingual education is considered as the development of literacy and/or the teaching of certain content subjects through the use of more than one languages proceeding in an organised and planned education program. (WAYNE, SOVICHETH & GARCÍA 2015: 1) Notwithstanding, multilingual education constitutes an urgent concern and its importance is uncontested as it occupies the role of safeguarding different languages, linguistic communities and their uniqueness as well as linguistic longevity. (STAVANS & HOFFMANN 2015: 228-229) In the ensuing subchapters, the transition from a monolingual to a holistic view will be approached at first and subsequently, this thesis will elaborate on the objectives of multilingual education in order to underline its benefits.

2.2.1 From the monolingual habitus to a holistic view on multilingual education

One of the most widespread notions adopted in studies on multilingual education constitutes the atomistic view; it concentrates on the scrutiny of specific elements rather than on their relationship and has a clear focus on isolating languages. (CENÓZ 2013a: 10) Foreign language teaching in particular exhibits a long history of linguistic separation. For example, students were split according to their language levels in order to keep input comprehensible. Moreover, the teaching of languages was separated so that the focus on the target language could be retained. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 53) In this regard, LÜDY and PY (2009: 154) state that the majority of language teaching models in the 20th century are based on scholarly work that examine individual languages on their own terms, thus adopting an atomistic view. GARCÍA and LI WEI (2014: 53-54) maintain that during this period, the direct method was favoured for teaching foreign languages. This claim needs to be treated with caution since the scholars do not provide any empirical scrutiny with regard to actual school classrooms. However, they argue that this approach did not allow for any explicit grammar teaching and where students were instructed only in the object language. The aim was to imitate the way in which children learn their first language without interference from the L1 and to obtain native-like competence. Afterwards, the communicative method with a focus on interaction in the target language was introduced. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 53-54) COOK (2001: 404) criticises this approach as for him it seems to ignore the existence of the learners' L1 altogether. However, both methods clearly place their emphasis on keeping the languages separate. Similarly, in second language education programs, the learners' L1 and the dominant language of the nation-state, which is then the object of attention and learning, have been isolated from each other. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 53-54) This convention of separating languages in instruction has been referred to as "the two solitudes assumption" by CUMMINS (2008: 65) or as "parallel monolingualism" by HELLER (1999: 271). Nonetheless, such a philosophy of separation cannot prevent multilingual use in classrooms. Therefore, despite being widespread, atomistic views on multilingual education have been contested and holistic approaches have been promoted instead.

The adoption of the holistic view on multilingual education has been gaining prominence in scholarship over the last few decades. In the late 1980s, GROSJEAN (1985) was one of the first

to propose such an approach by claiming that bilinguals do not have fractional linguistic skills but are competent speaker-hearers who possess an exceptional linguistic profile. Cook (1992) with his development of the term 'multicompetence' also pertains to the holistic view adherents. He suggests that acquiring a second language can have effects on the L1 and thus the competence of multilingual speakers differs from the ones of monolinguals through being characterised as more complex. Thereby, the comparison with the monolingual native speaker cannot be justified any longer, as achieving the level of a monolingual native speaker's communicative competence appears to be unreachable. In multilingual educational settings then, the possibility of acquiring native-like status in all languages being taught seems even more remote (CENÓZ & GORTER 2015: 3). This understanding of multilinguals' competence differing from monolingual speakers has been incorporated into 'Focus on Multilingualism', which constitutes a holistic approach established by CENÓZ and GORTER (2011). This approach to teaching and research in multilingual education investigates means to link how multilinguals use their communicative resources in everyday interaction with the curricula of the different languages in formal education. There is clearly the need to bridge the gap between these two realities by allowing students to employ their full linguistic repertoire in class. The two linguists therefore forward a flexible multilingual pedagogy with permeable boundaries between languages (CENÓZ & GORTER 2011: 367) in order to help learners in "becoming multilingual" (CENÓZ & GORTER 2015: 3).

2.2.2 Aims of multilingual education

An apparent objective of multilingualism in education is that learners become competent in several languages through using these. Therefore, "becoming multilingual" cannot be detached from "being multilingual" as language learners employ all their linguistic resources in the process of expanding their multilingual competence. Studies in language acquisition (becoming multilingual) and language use (being multilingual) have been brought closer together on the one hand through the so called "social turn" (ATKINSON 2011; CANAGARAJAH 2007a; POZA 2016) and on the other hand through the "multilingual turn" (MAY 2014; ORTEGA 2014; POZA 2016). (CENÓZ & GORTER 2015: 3) The former emphasises that acquiring a language is dependent upon and displays the learners' experiences and communicative needs, which is manifested by variability and contextual responsiveness. The latter gives priority to the

knowledge and practices of multilinguals rather than foregrounding monolingual perspectives such as isolating languages. (POZA 2016: 5-6) As is clear from these assumptions, the two dimensions “becoming” and “being” multilingual should not be seen as a dichotomy but are best represented as a continuum. The two ends of this continuum are intertwined in both practice and research, which is particularly embodied in the aforementioned holistic approach Focus on Multilingualism. (CENOS & GORTER 2015: 8) In order to reach the aim that speakers display competence in various languages, a change in attitude towards all languages needs to be undertaken.

Multilingual education aspires to change the perspective on learners’ home languages from problem to resource. In schools, where multilingualism is an educational aim, the pupils’ linguistic repertoire is appreciated and their language competence reinforced. These educational institutions have adopted “an ethos that balances and respects the use of different languages of the pupils and their communities as a way of life rather than a problem to be solved” (STAVANS & HOFFMANN 2015: 231). In these circumstances, the variety of languages is then viewed as a natural resource that leads to cultural, spiritual and educational growth as well as to economic, commercial and political gain. (BAKER 2011: 383) Additionally, learners that have diverse linguistic backgrounds question traditional monolingual school systems and policies. As a consequence, well-established ideologies of language are challenged and teachers are forced to contemplate the issue of diversity. (STAVANS & HOFFMANN 2015: 231) Within the orientation of language as a resource, the assumption prevails that linguistic diversity and national unity are not discordant but rather that there is a possibility of co-existence between these two. (BAKER 2011: 383)

The preservation of linguistic diversity is a significant purpose in the multilingual education agenda. Languages do not only express identity but they can also be seen as repositories of history and further they are an integral part in the sum of present human knowledge. (BAKER 2011: 45-46) SIMONS and FENNIG (2017) list 7,099 recognised languages in around 200 states at the present moment. The distribution of these languages is highly uneven as some countries are relatively homogenous in terms of languages, whereas other states exhibit an opulence of linguistic diversity. (STAVANS & HOFFMANN 2015: 231) Not only is the allocation among the countries disparate, but also the number of speakers of the various languages is

unequally spread resulting in speakers of lesser languages having to communicate in a different language in their daily lives. (CENOS 2013a: 3) The idea of multilingual education is then to improve the current condition of many individuals. However, the challenges of choosing which languages should have a greater hegemonic role in education and which continue to be considered as vehicular languages still remain. (STAVANS & HOFFMANN 2015: 243) GARCÍA (2009: 141) argues that due to the heterogeneity of the student population there might be no other way than to work with specific lingua francae but she admits that appreciating the learners' home languages is essential as well. At any rate, supporting the variety of languages through multilingual education appears to be crucial as it facilitates participation and action in society as well as provides access to new knowledge.

3 Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

One notable approach in multilingual education is Content and Language Integrated Learning. As this diploma thesis analyses CLIL lessons, it is essential to investigate the concept in greater depth in order to gain a comprehensive understanding. The initial chapter is divided in two parts; the first subchapter will explore the definition of CLIL and how CLIL has evolved, whereas the second subchapter will consider variables of its implementation in educational settings. Following, the situation of CLIL in Europe and in Austria will be reviewed, as this study is located in an Austrian context. The last section covers the advantages and the challenges of CLIL in relation to teachers, learners and learning outcomes.

3.1 What is CLIL?

3.1.1 Definition and development of CLIL

Content and Language Integrated Learning – in short CLIL – is a quite complex concept as it is interpreted and used in various ways. One definition that has often been cited describes CLIL as “a dual-focused educational approach in which an **additional language** is used for the learning and teaching of both content *and* language” (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 1, original emphases). Additional language in this context refers to a foreign language or a lingua franca not to a second language. In other words, the language of instruction is predominantly encountered in the classroom, as it is not used on a regular basis in wider society. Even though any language could be utilised for instruction, it is mainly prestigious languages that are employed. English in particular occupies a special position as its prevalence as the medium for instruction in CLIL classes is exceptional. This fact is possibly due to the increasing demand of English literacy skills worldwide. (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 183-184) CLIL with its flexibility and its capability to adapt to various situations fulfils this need. Therefore, the success of this innovative educational approach has led to great transferability both across different types of schools and across various countries. (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 1) However, in certain states similar educational practices, such as immersion education, have been implemented but these cannot be regarded synonymous with CLIL because some fundamental differences exist. (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 1)

The CLIL approach displays certain features that differentiate it from other types of multilingual education. Closely related to the use of a foreign language mentioned before, teachers of CLIL lessons are usually non-native speakers of the target language and for the greatest part are experts on the subject being taught and not language-experts. Furthermore, CLIL programmes are normally implemented after students have developed literacy skills in their L1 and thereby, learners are able to transfer this competence to the target language. Another characteristic is that CLIL classes are mostly scheduled as content-lessons. (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 1-2) This aspect is according to WOLFF (2007: 15-16) attributable to the practice that “classroom content is not so much taken from everyday life or the general content of the target language culture but rather from content subjects, from academic/scientific disciplines or from the professions”. However, CENOZ, GENESEE and CORTER (2014: 244-247) claim that it is not possible to label the core features of CLIL because its scope is not distinct. Furthermore, the researchers argue that the differentiation between CLIL and immersion is confusing and they provide examples of the mentioned characteristics that also hold true for immersion programmes. In a response to this critique, DALTON-PUFFER et al. (2014) acknowledge the need for an overarching concept but still assert that CLIL in its current state enjoys three prototypical features. In addition to two of the characteristics already mentioned – firstly that the languages used are mainly international lingua francae and secondly that CLIL is timetabled as content lessons –, the scholars emphasise that “CLIL does not happen instead of foreign language teaching but alongside it” (DALTON-PUFFER et al. 2014: 215). In other words, schools continue to have the target language as a subject on its own taught by language specialists but also implement into their curricula delivering content in a foreign language.

Although CLIL is justifiably seen as a major educational innovation, being educated in a language that is not one’s L1 has been practiced for centuries already. A prominent example is the long-lasting use of Latin as the medium for instruction (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 3). This kind of operation has been imitated across the world throughout history and can be experienced at the moment through the global uptake of English language learning. Besides immersion education, an example of such educational practice is content-based language teaching. (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 1-2). In this sense, it cannot be argued that CLIL is something completely new but it is claimed to be a synthesis of a number of theories

and approaches (IOANNOU GEORGIU 2012: 496). The usage of the acronym CLIL, though, started at the beginning of the 1990s in Europe (EURYDICE 2006: 7) and in 1995, European Union policymakers officially acknowledged the significance of CLIL in the EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S white paper "Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society". From then onwards, the CLIL approach has been steadily promoted in a high number of policy documents (IOANNOU GEORGIU 2012: 496). This consistent support can be ascribed to the EU's "mother tongue plus 2" goal, previously mentioned in chapter 2.1.1. (LLINARES, MORTON & WHITTAKER 2012: 1) As a result, CLIL has been spreading rapidly all over Europe (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 2; DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 182-183) and has even been implemented in Asia and South America (IOANNOU GEORGIU 2012: 495).

The implementation of CLIL has been fostered on the one hand through high policy-making, as previously mentioned, and on the other hand through grass-roots actions, which embody teachers and parental choices. A high number of parents believe that CLIL can be advantageous for their children with regard to employment as they discern a shift in society and economic life (HÜTTNER, DALTON-PUFFER & SMIT 2013: 270). Both facets are becoming more internationally interwoven with the consequence of requiring well-educated employees who are proficient in several languages, an aspect that is crucial for the job market. Reacting to this perception of change as well, teachers seize the initiative to modify their language practices to teaching in English. (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 184) DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA and SMIT (2010: 4) suppose that these grass-roots activities, which occurred almost simultaneously at myriad locations, are responsible for the appearance and the maintenance of CLIL. High-level political agents gained these insights only later on and consequently introduced different language management activities. In a similar vein, COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 8) attribute the impetus of CLIL programmes to four main proactive forces that in their opinion happened concurrently:

families wanting their children to have some competence in at least one foreign language; governments wanting to improve languages education for socio-economic advantage; at the supranational level, the European Commission wanting to lay the foundation for greater inclusion and economic strength; and finally, at the educational level, language experts seeing the potential of further integrating languages education with that of other subjects.

Deducing from these varying interests, it becomes apparent that one individual model cannot fulfil all these expectations. Thus, numerous variations in CLIL programmes can be detected; these will be examined in the following section more closely.

3.1.2 Variations in CLIL models

CLIL is frequently viewed as an umbrella term (CENOZ, GENESEE & CORTER 2014: 246; DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 2; IOANNOU GEORGIOU 2012: 497) due to the vast range of existing models within this educational approach. The development of these models can be ascribed to the already mentioned rapid adoption of the programme in diverse contexts that entailed specific requirements. In this sense, IOANNOU GEORGIOU (2012: 497) criticises that the CLIL umbrella might be stretching too much. She further argues that features that have made CLIL fashionable in the first place might be lost through its transferability, an aspect which COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 1) have positively reviewed. However, IOANNOU GEORGIOU (2012: 498) demands that each CLIL programme needs to be clearly defined in order to enable communication and sharing of experience in research contexts. COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 14) also stress the importance of a clear description of each individual model with a focus on two major issues, the operating factors and the scale of the CLIL programme. Besides these two aspects, other variables such as the choice and the use of the target language or the content need to be considered when establishing a CLIL programme in a school. All these aspects will be reviewed in greater detail in the following.

First of all, the school context has to be taken into account before developing any particular model. CLIL programmes can be implemented at primary, secondary or tertiary level of education, as they are suitable for different age groups. (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 184; WOLFF & SUDHOFF 2015: 16-19) However, in order to establish this educational approach, it is of vital importance to determine whether sufficient teachers are available. Furthermore, collaboration among the teachers needs to be observed as working individually or in teamwork has an impact on both planning and implementation. (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 14) Another closely related issue is whether teachers themselves have multilingual competences and if they have enjoyed training in multilingual education. (LLINARES, MORTON & WHITTAKER 2012: 5) As was mentioned above, one defining characteristic of CLIL is that

teachers are usually non-native speakers of the target language. Rather than being a disadvantage, the CLIL teachers' linguistic background can contribute to learners' higher engagement with both language and content during the lessons. (NIKULA et al. 2016: 21). However, the problem is rather that only a small number of educators have received instruction in CLIL pedagogy. (LASAGABASTER & SIERRA 2010: 371) Therefore, COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 14) claim that the language level of both teachers and students affect the teacher's input and their role in the classroom. Under these circumstances, using multilingual practices, especially translanguaging, by both teachers and students seems inevitable in order to foster an understanding of the subject and make sense of the world.

The choice and usage of the target language in CLIL settings is another aspect that needs to be reflected upon. The selection of the target language has already been briefly discussed at the beginning of chapter 3.1.1. At this point, it should only be mentioned again that even though EU policies proposed that CLIL classes could be conducted in a foreign, regional or minority language (EURYDICE 2006: 7), researchers (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 183; DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 1) stress that CLIL in reality is about a foreign and not a second language. In terms of language use in CLIL classrooms, WOLFF and SUDHOFF (2015: 20) distinguish three types. Firstly, teaching and learning proceeds in the target language only. For WOLFF and SUDHOFF (2015: 20), this type represents the ideal form of CLIL provision. However, this thesis with its focus on translanguaging argues against this understanding at a different point in this paper (see chapter 7). The second type constitutes the target language as the medium of instruction but with support of the language of education. The practice of using both languages is purposefully planned and aims to overcome communication breakdowns. This view accompanies the recent assumptions on code-switching during lessons, which see code-switching as a beneficial tool rather than an obstacle in learning (GIERLINGER 2015; MACARO 2005; SAMPSON 2012). The third type of language use in CLIL incorporates the target language and the school language complementarily. Thus, the function of the latter is not only being a supportive tool but this type can pave the way for working contrastively. The last type conforms partially to the consideration on translanguaging.

Linked to the two previously reviewed variables school type and language use in CLIL classrooms, the scale of the CLIL programme also plays an essential role in establishing a

model in any educational setting. For DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA and SMIT (2010: 2), the frequency of application appears to be the most fundamental variable in the range of CLIL realisations. The programmes might either be short- or long-term and can range from a sequence of lessons to a whole school career. In this matter, COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 15-16) differentiate between extensive and partial instruction through the vehicular language. In the former category, the additional language is used nearly extensively and the language of education serves only to explain certain linguistic aspects of the subject or vocabulary items. The focus is placed on content, language and cognition. The objectives in the curriculum must be designed in such a way that not only the content is mastered but also linguistic proficiency is promoted. In contrast, with the latter category usually a project-based modular approach is adopted. COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 15-16) believe that in a partial instruction setting probably less than five per cent will be taught through CLIL. However, the scholars do not indicate how they arrive at this number. WOLFF (2005: 15-16) specifies modular CLIL by stating that in this approach some thematic units of a subject are taught in a foreign language over a short period of time. The function of modular CLIL is to help learners understand what significance knowing a foreign language can have in professional life. However, this approach can assist the implementation of extensive CLIL in schools but cannot replace it. Still, there is again a triple focus on language, cognition and content.

The last variation in CLIL models that will be discussed in this thesis relates to content. This aspect is especially important as CLIL in the literature is often deemed to be content-driven (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 2-3; IOANNOU GEORGIU 2012: 498). However, stakeholders often tend to view CLIL as a way to improve foreign language competence and therefore put content into the background (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 6). Still, learning the subject matter language is normally intertwined with learning its content. Vice versa, content teaching also always involves language teaching. (GIERLINGER 2015: 348) The one is just emphasised to a greater extent than the other at a given time (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 1). VOLLMER (2013: 126-127) highlights three dimensions that constitute subject competence, i.e. content knowledge, being able to structure the thinking process successfully and the ability to talk about the content. Nevertheless, the question which subjects are most suitable for implementing a CLIL approach is not answered in the literature (WOLFF & SUDHOFF 2015: 32). COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 27) state that the

22

content in a CLIL context is much more flexible than simply choosing a subject from a traditional school curriculum because what could be appropriate for a CLIL programme depends on the contextual variables discussed above. Put differently, “what exactly is meant by ‘content’ in CLIL will depend on the context of the learning institution” (COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 28).

3.2 CLIL in Europe

As mentioned previously (chapter 3.1.1), CLIL became popular in Europe through extensive promotion on the side of EU institutions. This political union comprises over 510 million people in 28 nation states and features 24 official languages (and in addition a high number of regional and minority languages). As a consequence, the EU has to encourage multilingualism in order to uphold its “unity in diversity principle” (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 1). This necessity has been recognised in the 1990s and thus the goal was formulated that every citizen should be able to speak two foreign languages in addition to their L1 (EUROPEAN COMMISSION 1995). Furthermore, it was stated that “secondary school pupils should study certain subjects in the first foreign language learned” (EUROPEAN COMMISSION 1995: 47) From then onwards, CLIL has occurred in a range of declarations and in 2003, it was explicitly declared that this educational approach contributes remarkably to the Union’s language learning goal (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 184-185). It therefore can be said that CLIL became the “tool to aid in the promotion of increased multilingualism and intercultural competence among the inhabitants of member states” (MOORE & NIKULA 2016: 211).

However, the reality of how CLIL is conducted varies markedly in different countries. The reason for this manifoldness is that precise learning goals are largely missing (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 185). In addition, educational institutions that wish to implement CLIL are not being stipulated the nature and scale of the activities in their CLIL programme (EURYDICE 2006: 27). Another intriguing point in the European situation is that policy declaration and policy implementation diverge heavily: “while general policy lines are formulated at EU-level, it is not ‘Brussels’ that decides on educational legislation and financing but the 27 [note: nowadays 28] national governments” (DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 5). Even though an abundance of practitioners has developed conceptualisations, curricular guidelines and

model materials in accordance with the high-level claims, nearly any national educational system has committed itself to provide guidelines, teacher education or additional funding. Only Spain and the Netherlands have promoted projects and measures for this purpose. (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 185; DALTON-PUFFER, NIKULA & SMIT 2010: 5) As regards the implementation of CLIL in schools, only Luxembourg, Malta and the German-speaking community in Belgium provide CLIL in all schools throughout the whole educational system. However, these regions use two state languages in their CLIL provision, an aspect that does not accord to the characteristics of CLIL (see chapter 3.1.1) in theory. Except for Iceland, Turkey and Greece, where no official documentation of CLIL provision exists, all the other remaining countries offer CLIL provision at least in some schools. The only countries where CLIL is partly compulsory are Italy, Liechtenstein and Austria. (EURYDICE 2012: 39-41) The following chapter will hence direct its focus towards the CLIL situation in Austria.

3.3 CLIL in Austria

The implementation of CLIL programmes in Austria has been fostered through national language policies and movements on the local level. In the early 1990s, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education started the 'Fremdsprachenoffensive' [foreign-language offensive], which can be considered the legislative background for the implementation of CLIL in educational settings (GIERLINGER 2015: 348). This venture can be especially attributed to the state's then upcoming accession to the EU in 1995. The offensive incorporated a series of foreign language teaching initiatives: foreign language learning was introduced to grades 1 and 2 of elementary school, fully developed bilingual school programmes were established at specific locations and 'Fremdsprache als Arbeitssprache' [foreign language as a working language] emerged. (DALTON-PUFFER 2007: 46) The last mentioned expression is one of the German equivalents for CLIL (NEZBEDA 2005: 7). Equal to the overall situation in Europe, the introduction of CLIL in schools has been encouraged even more through grass roots actions. Experienced teachers looking for a new adventure integrated CLIL into their teaching, which in turn prompted headmasters and headmistresses to augment their school's profile by embracing this innovative impetus. Interestingly, the formal requirements in terms of the use of a foreign language as the medium of instruction are rather unspecific and do not restrict schools in their choice. (DALTON-PUFFER 2007: 46-47) Additionally, Austrian teachers

are trained for at least two subjects, which allows for a high level of flexibility in CLIL programmes (GIERLINGER 2015: 348). Under these circumstances, individual teachers and schools were not confronted with administrative challenges and for this reason they had the possibility to test one of the many variants of CLIL (DALTON-PUFFER 2007: 47). Hence, the CLIL scene in Austrian schools can be described as “a diverse spectrum of organisational forms ranging from ‘mini-projects’ with just a few lessons to bilingual schooling” (EURYDICE 2005: 5).

Due to these favourable conditions, CLIL practice has been slowly but steadily on the rise in Austrian classrooms. HÜTTNER, DALTON-PUFFER and SMIT (2013: 267-268) argue that, in contrast to other educational innovations, the concept of CLIL has found easy acceptance in the Austrian educational system even amongst pupils who are less motivated in language learning. This positive uptake has resulted in CLIL lessons being conducted in various languages. In Austrian educational settings, CLIL classes are provided mostly in English but also in French, Italian, Romanian and in regional/minority languages with official status (Slovene, Croatian, Hungarian, Czech and Slovak). The extent to which minority languages are used is subject to the location and population. (EURYDICE 2006: 18-19) Remarkable is that even though the Ministry of Education has been forwarding the concept, CLIL across the whole educational system is mentioned only briefly in a general provision for education in languages other than German, indicating a rather laissez-faire approach (DALTON-PUFFER & SMIT 2013: 547-548). Nevertheless, the legal requirement for CLIL provision in technical colleges changed in 2011. Since then, CLIL has been compulsory for this type of school, as 72 CLIL lessons a year per class in the last three years of the learners’ education have to be incorporated into the teaching. In the enactment, though, only English is mentioned as CLIL language. (HTL) In this context, DORNINGER (2013) explains that students attending a technical college have to reach B2 level in English. In order to accomplish this goal, English needs to be taught also in content subjects, as the amount of regular foreign language is insufficient. Up until now, only three studies (DALTON-PUFFER et al. 2008; HÜTTNER, DALTON-PUFFER & SMIT 2013; JEXENFLICKER & DALTON-PUFFER 2010) were undertaken in the context of CLIL at Austrian technical colleges. In general, research on CLIL in Austria is rather scarce, especially regarding the actual scope to which this educational approach is implemented in educational settings. Therefore, a survey into this matter would be much appreciated.

3.4 Advantages and challenges of CLIL

After discussing what the concept of CLIL is, which variables might influence the development of a CLIL model and what the CLIL situation is like in Europe and in Austria, it is of great interest to investigate which advantages and limitations this specific educational approach comprises. For this reason, this section will at first scrutinize benefits and drawbacks of the CLIL approach with regard to teachers and subsequently investigate these on learners. The last section of this chapter is concerned with the learning outcomes in CLIL settings.

3.4.1 Teachers

The realisation of CLIL faces the central problem that there seems to be a lack of teachers capable of teaching this educational approach professionally. As mentioned a few times, CLIL lessons are usually conducted by non-native speakers of the target language who are experts in the subject they are teaching. According to WOLFF (2009: 562), there is a worldwide prevalence of educators who are only qualified in one subject except for German-speaking countries. Thus, additional teacher training in either foreign language or content instruction would be needed for a country that considers implementing CLIL into their educational system. This endeavour might become relatively expensive for the states in question. (WOLFF 2009: 562) IOANNOU GEORGIU (2012: 500) also emphasises that in order to conduct an effective CLIL programme, educators need teacher training in both foreign language and content subjects as well as a proper understanding of the CLIL approach and of relevant methodology. In relation to this issue, MEHISTO, MARSH and FRIGOLS (2008: 22) criticise that educators are not equipped with the expertise to focus on both language and content likewise and therefore tend to foreground one or the other. However, COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 1) believe that it is typical for CLIL that at times the focus is placed more on content than on language and at other times the situation is vice versa. Until now, scholarship has concentrated more on teachers' orientation towards language neglecting their orientation towards content (NIKULA et al. 2016: 15). In this regard, MORTON (2012) and KOOPMAN, SKEET and DE GRAAFF (2014) establish that teachers' approach to language is often not systematic and that language teaching often occurs incidentally without consideration of

theoretical knowledge on language learning. Therefore, offering future teachers training on the appropriate methodology for CLIL seems a necessary action.

Another act that needs to be undertaken by a country implementing CLIL is the adequate provision of suitable teaching material. In recent studies (MOATE 2011; MORTON 2013), a high number of educators report that they encounter the difficulty of finding appropriate materials to complement their teaching. For this reason, teachers themselves often produce an abundance of texts for a single course or script their lessons with the right pronunciation in brackets beforehand. Furthermore, texts in the target language, which are not intended for the classroom, are being used. (BOVELLAN 2014: 63) This, in turn, has an impact on the workload CLIL teachers have to cope with, which might have a negative effect on the attitude towards this educational approach. GIERLINGER (2007: 92-94) notes in his study that the lack of materials forms the greatest discouraging factor of CLIL in teacher's perceptions. In this context, MEHISTO, MARSH and FRIGOLS (2008: 22) reveal that CLIL lessons need more preparation time than regular classes as teachers have to set content, language and learning goals for every lesson. However, this practice is not displeasing as such, in particular as thorough planning should be indispensable, but teachers do not feel rewarded for their additional work. In most cases, this added preparation time is not included in the assigned working hours. Therefore, teachers conducting CLIL lessons can either accept this extra assignment or they opt for a lesser quality of their instruction. To decrease the problem of more workload due to the lack of teaching materials, teacher associations have been established where content teachers using a foreign language co-operate (WOLFF 2009: 562).

Apart from the challenges, a number of advantages for teachers exist if CLIL is implemented in their school. In his research, WIESEMES (2009: 45-16) identified four main benefits for teachers. Firstly, CLIL allows for sharing of ideas across departments and fosters cross-curricular links. For a successful realisation of CLIL, teachers need to start contemplating issues outside of their field, such as learner talk or scaffolding learning. Secondly, foreign language teachers get the possibility of enhancing their lessons with content elements. According to the scholar, learners' achievement and motivation is thereby raised as well. Thirdly, content teachers can develop their language teaching pedagogies in the mother tongue classroom. Lastly, as professional dialogue is constantly evolving teachers are more

motivated. ÇEKREZI (2011: 3823) also highlights that CLIL offers teachers a wider repertoire of teaching methods. The researcher gives the example that whereas in Geography classes maps are used and in language lessons often listening activities are undertaken, CLIL provides the possibility of combining these two activities. As a result, educators are able to reach a higher proportion of students by catering for diverse learner types.

3.4.2 Learners

One major issue that has been reported by many researchers (e.g. COYLE, HOOD & MARSH 2010: 11; DALE & TANNER 2012: 11; MEHISTO, MARSH & FRIGOLS 2008: 21) is that students exhibit a stronger motivation in CLIL settings. DALE and TANNER (2012: 11) assert that learners are more motivated because they not only acquire content knowledge but alongside they develop their language skills in another language. Further, students might see a purpose in using the foreign language (DALTON-PUFFER & SMIT 2007: 8) in an authentic and meaningful context (IOANNOU GEORGIOU 2012: 495). According to DALE and TANNER (2012: 11), students also notice their rapid progress in the additional language, which causes their being more ambitious. Another reason why students tend to be more motivated in CLIL lessons might be that learners' mistakes are not assessed most of the time. Consequently, students feel more comfortable using the foreign language. (WILDHAGE & OTTEN 2009: 18-19) However, COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 11) specify that the learners' overall motivation towards the subject gets only enhanced if they participate voluntarily in the CLIL programme. BRUTON (2013: 591), in turn, argues that students are more motivated in CLIL settings not because they are interested in the subject but rather that the real motivating drives are possibly academic achievement or even the grades for which acquiring the language is necessary. The scholar maintains that the involvement with artistic works might be more fruitful. As a response, HÜTTNER and SMIT (2014: 166) criticise BRUTON'S (2013) lack of evidence for his argument and contend that for some pupils engaging with cultural artefacts might be more appealing, whereas others are more likely to benefit from content that relates to their professional development or to other disciplinary interests. RÜSCHOFF (2015: 359) states that not enough empirical research with regard to motivation exists but he still believes that CLIL might have a positive effect on this factor.

Resembling the motivational aspect, scholarship also does not agree on the effects of CLIL on participants' actual use of the target language in class. On one side, it is argued that CLIL reduces anxiety to speak in a foreign language as the focus in CLIL lessons lies more on conveying the meaning rather than on employing the appropriate form (DALTON-PUFFER & SMIT 2007: 9). As a result, students gain more confidence in contributing something in class, which indicates that their concern about using the language inaccurately is lessened (FRYDRYCHOVA KLIMOVA 2012: 573). Furthermore, students might feel more empowered since in CLIL settings students are on a more equal footing with teachers. The characteristic that educators teaching CLIL classes are usually non-language experts plays a crucial role here. Through the lack of highly advanced linguistic resources, the power differentials between learners and teachers are less palpable and the discourse practices are less teacher-centred. As a consequence, pupils have more space to act as communicative participants. (NIKULA 2010: 119-120) On the other side, a large number of studies (e.g. CROMDAL 2005: 349-350; DALTON-PUFFER 2007: 290) have shown that learners are inclined to use their L1 once they are among themselves. This claim has not been supported by NIKULA's (2007) study, in which has been ascertained that students used the L2 even for social purposes like forwarding greetings from one teacher to another. However, as this thesis analyses translanguaging practices, it has to be stressed that using one's L1 for accomplishing a task should not be seen as a drawback but can help students to process the content more effectively (for further discussion see chapter 4.2.2).

Another essential point in question, especially relevant for this paper, is the suitability of CLIL for learners with a migration background. Many countries of Europe have large groups of migrants whose children speak both their L1 and the vernacular language of the country they live in (WOLFF 2009: 561). As has already been discussed in chapter 2.1.3, Austria also features a high percentage of students with an L1 other than German. Most of the time these children have acquired their mother tongue only orally and besides to some extent display significant problems with the state's official language (WOLFF 2009: 561). Referring to CUMMINS' (1987) distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), it can be maintained that children of the migration population master the BICS in the L2 sufficiently but hardly acquire CALP, which can lead to failure in school. Under these circumstances, one might easily come to the

conclusion that this group of learners would have even greater problems learning content in an additional language. Consequently, parents with a migration background are being advised against enrolling their offspring in these programmes. (WOLFF 2009: 561) This aspect would then pertain to BRUTON'S (2013: 595) view that CLIL is "elitist". HÜTTNER and SMIT (2014: 162), however, claim that in particular the implementation of CLIL in educational settings might offer the possibility to diminish the traditional monolingual habitus of European schools as this educational approach attempts to counteract "the discriminatory potential inherent in national-language teaching for L2 speakers of that language" (HÜTTNER & SMIT 2014: 162). WOLFF (2009: 561-562) also postulates that CLIL has the potential to include pupils with a migration background into the learning environment. For this intention, the scholar proposes to resort to Canadian research on immigrant children. Nonetheless, studies in CLIL that focus on learners with a migration background are urgently needed. Furthermore, the question remains whether CLIL provision negatively affects the learning outcomes of the vernacular language. On this note, this paper will now review the advantages and limitations on general learning outcomes of CLIL.

3.4.3 Learning outcomes

Scepticism is often voiced in terms of CLIL students' learning outcomes in the content subjects. Parents and teachers fear that pupils participating in CLIL programmes will not reach the predetermined competences in the content class as the subject matter is delivered to them in a language in which they are not as proficient as their L1. Scholarship to date has been less concentrating on content related than on language related outcomes because the results of the former seem rather inconclusive. (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 188) Still, various studies have provided contradictory results possibly due to diverse educational and geographical contexts (RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ 2015: 53). MEHISTO, MARSH & FRIGOLS (2008: 20), for example, affirm that "CLIL students perform as well as or even outperform non-CLIL students in terms of learning content". DALTON-PUFFER (2011: 188-189) takes a more critical stance based on her literature review. Whereas certain studies concur with the view that CLIL learners outperform their mainstream educated peers possibly due to a higher tolerance of frustration or deeper semantic processing, other researchers, especially the ones writing in an other language than English, report less student participation during lessons or the usage

of less relevant linguistic expressions in CLIL settings. Further studies claim neither a positive nor a negative effect of CLIL concerning the content dimension. Nonetheless, it has to be emphasised that up until now no universal instrument for measuring the obtained content knowledge through CLIL schooling exists. Still, deducing from these views, it can be stated that CLIL at least does not disadvantage CLIL learners with regard to content knowledge. The question therefore arises how CLIL students arrive at equally good results even though they study the subject matter in a language they only know to some extent.

Since CLIL is often regarded as a means to improve students' foreign language, language-learning outcomes in CLIL settings have been researched extensively. In most of these studies, the comparison with the native-speaker does not apply but students' progress is compared to the language attainment of learners not enrolled in the CLIL programme. An abundance of published surveys (e.g. HÜTTNER & RIEDER-BÜNEMANN 2010; RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ 2010; VILLAREAL OLAIZOLA & DEL PILAR GARCÍA MAYO 2009) clearly indicate that CLIL learners surpass their peers language-wise in different areas of language competence due to the increased temporal involvement with the foreign language. (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 186) The findings, however, show that there is a mismatch between receptive and productive skills. Students benefited particularly in reading, speaking and certain writing competencies such as lexical and morphosyntactic variety, fluency, accuracy and syntactic complexity. (GENÉ-GIL, JUAN-GARAU & SALAZAR-NOGUERA 2015; HÜTTNER & RIEDER-BÜNEMANN 2010; JEXENFLICKER & DALTON-PUFFER 2010; JIMÉNEZ CATALÁN, RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ & CENOZ 2006; RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ 2010; NAVÉS 2011) Other domains that were less affected are listening skills and macro-level categories of writing like cohesion and coherence, register awareness, discourse structuring or genre (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 187; RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ 2011: 135). Furthermore, CLIL students displayed a larger receptive and productive lexicon that features richness and sophistication (CELAYA & RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ 2010; JEXENFLICKER & DALTON-PUFFER 2010; PRIETO-ARRANZ et al. 2015). With regard to speaking, research has shown that CLIL fosters spontaneous L2 speaking skills as CLIL learners demonstrated greater fluency, speaking confidence, flexibility and listener-orientedness (HÜTTNER & RIEDER-BÜNEMANN 2010; MAILLAT 2010). The dimension of pronunciation though seems to be the least affected by CLIL instruction (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 187; RALLO FABRA & JACOB 2015). The outcomes on morphosyntax are rather inconclusive and

thus further research in this field is required (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 187; RUIZ DE ZAROBÉ 2011: 141).

Besides content and foreign language, learning outcomes of CLIL in other areas have also been reported in scholarship. Critics of the CLIL approach argue that through its implementation students' competence in the language of schooling might decrease as the learners would only learn the academic register in the foreign language (MEHISTO, MARSH & FRIGOLS 2008: 20). Interestingly, MEHISTO, MARSH and FRIGOLS (2008: 20) observed that CLIL students even outperformed non-CLIL pupils in writing, reading and listening in the language of education. Moreover, CLIL supporters claim that this educational approach could advance learners' intercultural knowledge and understanding (FRYDRYCHOVA KLIMOVA 2012: 573; DALE & TANNER 2012: 12). WOLFF (2009: 567), however, states that this aspect is only of theoretical nature and that it has not been examined empirically yet. According to the linguist, for this undertaking a new definition of interculturality needs to be provided. Intercultural competence in CLIL helps students comprehend the differing cultural perspectives stemming from scientific approaches in different countries. Nevertheless, one major benefit that the CLIL approach offers is the advancing of students' cognitive development (DALE & TANNER 2012: 11; DALLINGER et al. 2016: 29). COYLE, HOOD and MARSH (2010: 10-11) describe the cognitive flexibility CLIL fosters as follows:

Different thinking horizons and pathways which result from CLIL, and the effective constructivist educational practice it promotes, can also have an impact on conceptualization (literally, how we think), enriching the understanding of concepts, and broadening conceptual mapping resources. This enables better association of different concepts and helps the learner advance towards a more sophisticated level of learning in general.

In other words, through the use of an additional language, learners have the possibility to engage with the content matter to a greater extent and thus a deeper level of learning takes place. Closely related to this aspect is the notion of translanguaging. Through the use of translanguaging practices in classrooms, students activate their whole linguistic repertoire at their disposal in order to achieve a better understanding of the subject. The concept of translanguaging will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent chapter.

4 Translanguaging

The innovative notion of translanguaging has recently entered the fields of multilingualism and education; it clearly represents a new academic approach towards the linguistic performance of multilinguals as it relates to dynamic multilingualism rather than being based on monolingual suppositions. Since the core part of this thesis represents the analysis of translanguaging instances in CLIL lessons, a careful analysis of the concept is required beforehand. The following sections will therefore examine at first the presupposition for the emergence of translanguaging and subsequently describe its development. Thereupon, translanguaging will be demarcated from other similar terms. The last part of this chapter will provide a literature review on the current knowledge of the phenomenon, divided into translanguaging in education in general and translanguaging in content classes.

4.1 Theoretical framework

4.1.1 The 'linguaging' in translanguaging – reflecting on linguistic practices

At present, a paradigm shift in conceptualising language can be experienced in the field of linguistics. Both the Saussurean view that language is a system of signs and the strictly mentalist conception of Chomsky are being challenged (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 6-7; GORT 2015: 1; MAZAK & HERBAS-DONOSO 2015: 699-700; PENNYCOOK 2010). Rather, language is treated as an activity or something language users do. In other words, language is deemed “as a form of action that emerges within particular social and cultural contexts” (PALMER et al. 2014: 758). This emphasis on linguistic practices in scholarship has been indicated through the usage of the term ‘linguaging’ (GORT 2015: 1). Not linguists but the biologists MATURANA and VARELA (1987 [1973]) were the first to use this notion in their theory of ‘autopoiesis’, which postulates that the language users’ biological and social history of actions cannot be isolated from their perception of the world. Thus, “all doing is knowing, and all knowing is doing” (MATURANA & VARELA (1987 [1973]: 26). For the scholars, linguaging is then the tool with which speakers become themselves. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 7-8) In his inquiry into translation, BECKER (1988) also employs the term ‘linguaging’ relatively early on. According to the linguist, linguaging shapes, stores, retrieves and communicates our experience in an on-going process. Due to this perpetuation, language can never be accomplished and is in

constant formation through our linguistic interaction with the world. Through the growth of post-structuralism in the post-modern era, such thoughts have been gaining more recognition in various linguistic disciplines.

Such considerations on languaging have especially been adopted and elaborated on in sociolinguistics. Scholars in this field regard languaging as an on-going process, which shapes and is shaped by language users as they engage in social and cultural activities creating meanings influenced by ideological systems in historical moments. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 9) Thus, language is viewed neither as a system of structures nor as a product situated in the mind of a speaker but languaging is considered “a social process constantly reconstructed in sensitivity to environmental factors” (CANAGARAJAH 2007b: 94). The emphasis on the process is illustrated through the attachment of the present participle (*-ing*) within the term ‘languaging’. This operation reflects a turn towards viewing language as a verb, “an action, contextually situated, jointly constructed and essentially mutable, rather than as a noun” (MOORE & NIKULA 2016: 213) and further denotes the shift away from languages as ‘codes’ (MAZAK & HERBAS-DONOSO 2015: 700). Instead, a central component in the act of communicative meaning making gets highlighted, namely the agency of speakers (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 9). Language users as agents strategically resort to semiotic resources at their disposal in order to interact and act in the world; hence, they enjoy access to a repertoire of linguistic features that might be wider or narrower depending on the domain. (GORT 2015: 1) These characteristics of languaging have been influenced on the one hand by the practice turn in contemporary social theory (PALMER et al. 2014: 758) and on the other hand by the human turn in sociolinguistics (JUFFERMANS 2011). The former trend reframes language as a practice, whereas the latter sees language as a “sociolinguistic system that is constructed and inhabited by people” (JUFFERMANS 2011: 165). Nonetheless, sociolinguistics is not the only discipline interested in the notion of languaging.

Psycholinguistics has been investigating the concept of ‘languaging’ as well. Whereas scholars in the sociolinguistic field examine the cognitive side of linguistic practices, psycholinguists are vice versa exploring the social facet of cognitive engagement. The main difference between these two disciplines is that the focus of sociolinguistics lies on the context of usage of languaging, while psycholinguistics considers languaging as the

individual's property. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 10-11) Appertaining to the psycholinguistic branch, SWAIN (2006: 89) proposes the term 'languaging' in order to describe how learners utilize speaking and writing to mediate activities that are cognitively difficult. Furthermore, she recommends examining moments of languaging in speech so as to capture thinking-in-progress, or put differently, "the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language" (SWAIN 2006: 89). According to SWAIN and DETERS (2007: 821), languaging is then the vehicle through which "learners articulate and transform their thinking into an artifactual form, which becomes a source of further reflection". Expanding these notions, LI WEI (2011a: 1224) refers to languaging as the "process of using language to gain knowledge, to make sense, to articulate one's thought and to communicate about using language". These ideas correspond to COOK's (1992; 2012) concept of 'multicompetence', which emphasises the link between language and cognition. Thus, multicompetence does not only adhere to the linguistic aspects of the mind but also refers to cognitive processes and concepts. As a result, the no-language standpoint that sees language as an artefact of different cognitive processes gets opposed and it is assumed that no barrier between language and other cognitive systems exist. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 10-11) Deriving from this understanding, there also seem to be no boundaries between languages, an aspect that is central to the concept of translanguaging. The rest of this chapter will now devote itself to exploring the theoretical framework of the main issue of this thesis, namely translanguaging.

4.1.2 Origins and development of translanguaging

'Translanguaging' can be regarded as a relatively new notion that is evermore gaining ground in scholarship. The term originated as the Welsh word 'trawsieithu', was later translated into English as 'translinguifying' but then changed to 'translanguaging' (BAKER 2011: 288; LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 643). WILLIAMS (1994; 1996), a well-known Welsh educator, initially coined the term in the 1980s for the "planned and systematic use of two languages for teaching and learning inside the same lesson" (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 643). According to this original use of translanguaging, the input is given in one language and the output is produced in another and this alternation occurs systematically during lessons (BAKER 2011: 288). WILLIAMS (1996: 64) believed that before new information can be used successfully, it first has to be understood to its full extent. Therefore, translanguaging was

essentially established as a measure to foster “dual-language processing” (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 644). An often-mentioned example of such a pedagogic practice would be when students receive a text in Welsh and discuss it in English afterwards (BAKER 2011: 288; BERES 2015: 107; GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 20). Such a method enables learners to internalise new knowledge, process it in greater depth and afterwards make sense of it in another language. Thereby, a series of both receptive and productive cognitive skills are employed resulting in a better understanding of the subject. (BERES 2015: 107) In addition, translanguaging in its original sense is strongly child-centred. However, WILLIAMS (1996) contends that the method of alternating two languages systematically may be more effective with learners who are fluent in both languages rather than with children who are in their initial stages of learning a new language. This claim can be affiliated to the Welsh educational context in those days, which aimed at developing and enhancing a child’s bilingualism and simultaneously deepen the learners’ knowledge in a subject area (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 644-645).

In order to comprehend the emergence of translanguaging in Wales, political and social factors as well as the research background at the time have to be taken into account. Considering the political context of Wales, translanguaging can be seen as a reaction against the separation of Welsh and English, two monolingualisms, which differed in terms of prestige and status. (BERES 2015: 107-108) English dominated over Welsh, which was endangered until the last decades of the 20th century. The change then was motivated by the growing positive attitude towards bilingualism from the 1960s onwards. The beliefs that bilingualism causes mental confusion and that it only incorporates disadvantages were dismissed and were substituted for the understanding that bilingualism has its benefits. Consequently, the view that both Welsh and English are equally advantageous was established. (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 642) This altered perception allowed for the introduction of translanguaging, a first step towards the concurrent use of both languages in the Welsh educational system. (BERES 2015: 107) Furthermore, the state of affairs in research needs to be contemplated. Even though translanguaging was invented by WILLIAMS, as stated above, it is clearly linked to JACOBSON’s (1983) concept of purposeful concomitant usage of two languages in a bilingual lesson and to FALTIS’ (1990) scrutiny of 16 signals for switching the medium of instruction. Still, WILLIAMS (2003) states that his concept of translanguaging

refers to a different kind of usage of the two languages than the ones proposed by JACOBSON and FALTIS. According to the scholar, translanguaging entails that the stronger language helps develop the weaker one and additionally augments the students' understanding of a subject matter. (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 644) WILLIAMS' thoughts on translanguaging became relatively popular in Wales and thus, other scholars seized the concept as well and developed it further.

Through the third edition of *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, the Welsh scholar BAKER (2001) publicised and refined the term 'translanguaging'. A result of the publication of his work was that the term was launched internationally in research. The linguist defines 'translanguaging' therein as "the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, understandings and knowledge through the use of two languages" (BAKER 2011: 288) and proposes four potential advantages in education:

1. Translanguaging may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter.
2. Translanguaging may help learners in developing oral communication and literacy in their weaker language.
3. Translanguaging may assist home-school cooperation.
4. Translanguaging may foster the integration of fluent speakers with early learners.

(BAKER 2011: 289-290)

In terms of the first advantage mentioned, BAKER (2011: 289) refers to the Vygotskian idea of "zone of proximal development", which postulates that further learning rests on stretching pre-existing knowledge, and also to CUMMINS' (2008) understanding of cross-linguistic transfer through interdependence of the two languages. With these two presuppositions given, translanguaging can help build knowledge in the most efficient way. Whereas in monolingual teaching settings students might accomplish a task without full comprehension, it is more difficult to do this with translanguaging as "[t]o read and discuss a topic in one language, and then to write about it in another language, means that the subject matter has to be processed and 'digested'" (BAKER 2011: 289). With regard to the second benefit, BAKER (2011: 290) states that translanguaging aims at enhancing academic language skills in both languages and therefore it might prevent learners from undertaking the main tasks of their work in their stronger language and perform the less challenging parts in their weaker

language. The third advantage addresses particularly students who are not educated in their L1 and whose parents have limited knowledge of the language of instruction. The fourth advantage claims that second language learners can simultaneously develop their language ability and content knowledge if they are in contact with first language speakers. However, the scholar posits as well that translanguaging might not be suitable for language learners at an early stage. (BAKER 2011: 290) What becomes evident in the review of translanguaging is that the concept of translanguaging commenced as a pedagogical theory in Wales, but soon was recognised by a large number of scholars transferring it to global educational contexts and to multilingual research in general. The following section will thus analyse the extension of the translanguaging concept.

4.1.3 Extending the term beyond Wales – a global take on translanguaging

‘Translanguaging’ began in Wales as a local pedagogy but has quite recently been acknowledged by a large number of researchers worldwide. As LEWIS, JONES and BAKER (2012a: 647) notice, “the term has been generalised from school to street, from pedagogical practices to everyday cognitive processing, from classroom lessons to all contexts of a bilingual’s life”. Next to BAKER (2001; 2011), GARCÍA (2009) with her work *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century* has been credited with popularising translanguaging on a global scale as well and with extending the term beyond pedagogy. According to her, translanguaging is not simply a pedagogical practice of input and output but a strategy that multilinguals employ in order to make sense of their multilingual worlds through the usage of more than one language in their daily routine. Thus, translanguaging can be seen as “a powerful mechanism to construct understandings, to include others, and to mediate understandings across language groups” (GARCÍA 2009: 306-307). Additionally, GARCÍA treats translanguaging – “or engaging in bilingual or multilingual discourse practices” (GARCÍA 2009: 44) – as an approach to multilingualism that does not concentrate on languages but on natural communicative practices of multilinguals readily observable. In this context, CANAGARAJAH (2011a: 401) proposes viewing translanguaging as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system”. The emphasis in this definition is placed on the linguistic repertoire that amalgamates a speaker’s languages into one coherent system. However, GARCÍA and KLEYN

(2016: 14) criticise that in this definition languages are still seen as having socially and politically defined boundaries and that certain features are allocated to specific languages.

GARCÍA (2012: 1) summarises her claims in that she asserts that

translanguaging posits that bilinguals have *one linguistic repertoire* from which they select features *strategically* to communicate effectively. That is, translanguaging takes as its starting point the *language practices of bilingual people as the norm*, and not the language of monolinguals, as described by traditional usage books and grammars. (original emphasis)

Apart from researching “Universal Translanguaging” (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012a: 650), GARCÍA (2009) also explores translanguaging in the pedagogical setting. The US scholar agrees with the Welsh stance that translanguaging pertains to the classroom, but she supposes that translanguaging is more flexible and evident than WILLIAMS (1994; 1996) suggests. In her opinion, learners appropriate the use of language in multilingual arrangements even if teachers carefully plan when and how to employ languages, as pupils themselves use their whole linguistic repertoire flexibly. (GARCÍA 2009: 302-304) Further, the researcher advocates that translanguaging is an effective means of learning and that both multilingual teachers and learners need to recognise the importance and value of translanguaging practices. (GARCÍA 2009: 307-308) Thus, if translanguaging is implemented properly into classroom teaching, it could lead to heightening students’ cognitive, linguistic and literacy skills (GARCÍA 2011: 147). In their study of public high schools for immigrant adolescents, GARCÍA and SYLVAN (2011) advance the notion of translanguaging in terms of an effective means of learning. Their proposal is that translanguaging operates best when the following seven principles apply:

- embracing heterogeneity in language
- collaboration among teachers and students
- learner-centred classrooms
- language and content integration
- learners use of inclusive multilingualism
- experiential learning
- localised autonomy and responsibility

All these principles reinforce the use of dynamic multilingualism (see chapter 2.1.2) in class and have the effect of developing learners’ multilingual skills. Consequently, students not

only gain more knowledge and are academically successful, but they also become more confident speakers of the languages at their disposal. (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 398) These contributions to translanguaging by GARCÍA (2009; 2011) and GARCÍA and SYLVAN (2011) have been among the first to extend the term from the classroom to the lives of multilinguals regardless of the context but other scholars have also devoted themselves to investigate the phenomenon.

Numerous studies have examined translanguaging from perspectives that explore academic, cultural, social and identity issues. Among these is the work of HORNBERGER and LINK (2012), which provides a theoretical framework for translanguaging and transnational literacies. The scholars substantiate the notion of translanguaging by drawing on HORNBERGER'S (2003) *Continua of Biliteracy*, which postulate an L1-L2 continuum commenting on the complex relationship between the two languages. As maintained by HORNBERGER and LINK (2012: 268-269), translanguaging offers students the possibility to revert to manifold aspects of these continua. Further, they argue that the concept broadens the research lens via contemplating not only spoken language but also different kinds of communicative modes. Therefore, the researchers demand raising awareness of translanguaging and transnational literacies, which are grounded on funds of cross-national knowledge, identities and social relationships, so that students' resources can be better understood and used to enrich their academic achievement. Additionally, they believe that translanguaging not only concerns learning a language but also having a positive school experience. From a similar ethnographic perspective, CREESE and BLACKLEDGE (2010) analyse translanguaging in complementary schools in England, educational institutions that are highly multilingual. The linguists promote translanguaging as a flexible multilingual approach that "is used by participants for identity performance as well as the business of language learning and teaching" (CREESE & BLACKLEDGE 2010: 112). Moreover, educators employ such multilingual practices as an instructional strategy in order to establish links for learners between the social, cultural, community and linguistic areas of their lives. This pedagogy allows learners to access academic content with the semiotic resources at their disposal while in the process of gaining new ones. (CREESE & BLACKLEDGE 2010: 112-113) Whereas the two studies discussed above operate in an ethnographic framework, different approaches to the study of translanguaging have been taken as well.

LI WEI'S (2011a; 2016) idea on translanguaging stems from the psycholinguistic notion of languaging, discussed in chapter 4.1.1. According to him, translanguaging is both going between various linguistic structures, systems and modalities as well as going beyond them. Hence, translanguaging incorporates a social space for multilingual speakers where different dimensions of people's history, values, identities and abilities are unified into one coordinated and meaningful performance. This translanguaging space has its own transformative power as it is an on-going, lifelong process and it generates new identities, values and practices. The limits of such a space are only inside the minds of the person who creates and occupies it. Furthermore, these spaces are located within wider social spaces where they interact with others. Besides, the idea of translanguaging embraces the two concepts of creativity and criticality. The former is the "ability to choose between following or flouting the rules and norms of behaviour" (LI WEI'S 2011a: 1223), whereas the latter is the ability to use evidence to challenge, problematize or express views. These two notions are linked per se, as "one cannot push or break boundaries without being critical; and the best expression of one's criticality is one's creativity" (LI WEI'S 2011a: 1223). The scholar maintains that multilingualism intrinsically is a rich source of these two concepts. (LI WEI 2011a: 1223-1224) In educational arrangements, translanguaging as a socioeducational process allows learners to establish and constantly alter their sociocultural identities and values through responding to the historical and present conditions critically and creatively. Furthermore, translanguaging enables to challenge the monolingual ideologies of one language only and one language at a time. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 66-67)

CANAGARAJAH (2011b: 1) synthesizes the scholarship on translanguaging by stating the following assumptions: multilinguals possess a linguistic repertoire that is accessed for communicative purposes; languages are not unattached or separated, but rather are integrated into one system; competence in multilingualism arises out of local practices where numerous languages are negotiated for interaction; competence does not involve isolated competencies for each language, but multilinguals have multicompetence functioning for all languages in a person's repertoire; proficiency emphasises building this repertoire rather than achieving total master of each and every language. Nevertheless, as this concept is receiving increasing attention, the theorisation of this practice is occurring under different labels according to the scholar (CANAGARAJAH 2011b: 2). The question arises

though whether this abundance of terms refers to the same concept or whether subtle variations and differences exist. Thus, the following section will try to delineate how translanguaging relates to or differs from other notions.

4.1.4 Delineation of translanguaging to related terms

The contemporary emphasis on language as practice of speakers has led to a plethora of terms to capture this linguistic reality raising the issue what kind of relationship between those notions and translanguaging exists. In particular, translanguaging seems closely connected to code-switching (CS). NIKULA and MOORE (2016: 3) argue that a number of scholars tend to treat translanguaging as plainly a re-branding of CS and therefore stress the importance to distinguish between these two. COOK (2001: 408) sees CS as an activity by highly skilled bilinguals in which the L1 and L2 are employed simultaneously both intra- and intersententially. Moreover, LI WEI (2011b: 374) states that “codeswitching is not simply a combination and mixture of two languages but creative strategies by the language user”. These claims initially seem the same as translanguaging. Nevertheless, GARCÍA and LI WEI (2014: 22-23) highlight the difference between these two concepts. According to the linguists, translanguaging is not a shift or shuttle between two languages but rather “speakers’ construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of language” (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 22). They further try to illustrate their point by referring to the language function on the iPhone. The language-switch function could be said to respond to CS where people are expected to switch languages. In texting, however, multilinguals’ linguistic practices are not restricted to any societal forces and hence multilinguals can choose any features of their entire semiotic repertoire, such as emoticons, photographs or different ‘languages’. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 22-23) LEWIS, JONES and BAKER (2012b: 659) ascribe the difference between these two notions to academic and ideological practices. According to the researchers, the label CS stems from linguistics that analyses the speech of multilinguals and translanguaging is basically sociolinguistic, ecological and situated. Additionally, CS is often associated with language separation while translanguaging appears to celebrate flexibility in language use and permeability of learning through several languages.

In educational settings where learning proceeds in different languages, instances of 'translation' and 'crossing' can often be observed. A teacher might translate words from one language to another so that the learners grasp the content in their stronger language. This practice treats language as separate units and is often employed for scaffolding purposes while translanguaging pertains to the concurrent usage of languages. In multilingual classrooms, however, both approaches are often combined and used simultaneously. Thus, translation might appear in translanguaging activities. Still the difference between these two processes is that translation through isolating languages highlights that one language is favoured academically even if it constitutes the weaker language for a short time. In contrast, translanguaging strives to strengthen all languages used. (LEWIS, JONES & BAKER 2012b: 659-660) Similarly, crossing implies that out-group members use certain linguistic features in order to temporarily generate their identity representation and to oppose their educator's authority. Further, the concept appears to connote going from one autonomous language to the other. (GARCÍA & LI WEI 2014: 37) In this regard, MOORE and NIKULA (2016: 213) summarise that

[t]ranslanguaging is not about languages in contact, it is about discursive practices as enacted by bilinguals [...]; it incorporates code-switching and code-mixing yet goes beyond them to embrace transfer, translation, calques, nonce borrowings, coinages and any multilingual strategy, verbal or non-verbal, which people might employ to convey meaning [...].

Hence, in educational arrangements, various terms are used for linguistic practices but the notion of translanguaging incorporates them all and stresses that it is not the codes that are under scrutiny but the process regarding communication. Nonetheless, the labels discussed usually pertain to educational settings but in scholarship different terms for other contexts have emerged as well that need to be taken into account.

Further models of communicative malleability have surfaced in scholarship such as 'polylinguaging' (JØRGENSEN 2008), 'metrolingualism' (OTSUJI & PENNYCOOK 2010), 'codemeshing' (CANAGARAJAH 2011a) or 'bilanguaging' (MIGNOLO 2000). Polylingualism means the combination of features from different sets especially performed by young people in urban late modern societies. This concept comes close to translanguaging as it admits that it is not reasonable to talk of a language as such but JØRGENSEN (2008) still advocates the idea

of 'language'. Metrolingualism indicates the use of fluid practices in urban contexts by speakers in order to employ and negotiate identities through language. Further, "it does not assume connections between language, culture, ethnicity, nationality or geography, but rather seeks to explore how such relations are produced, resisted, defied or rearranged" (OTSUJI & PENNYCOOK 2010: 246). The main difference to translanguaging is that metrolingualism concentrates on urban areas and does not extend those practices to other contexts. CANAGARAJAH (2011a) coined the term 'codemeshing' to refer to the shuttling between repertoires for certain rhetorical and ideological purposes, particularly used in writing. To the scholar, these practices can be seen as a form of resistance, thus differing from translanguaging, which is regarded as the discursive norm. Moreover, CANAGARAJAH (2011a) asserts that in codemeshing diverse communicative modes and symbol systems are utilized, which to him is a distinctive feature to translanguaging. However, GARCÍA and LI WEI (2014: 40) oppose this assumption, as they believe that translanguaging is also multimodal. Lastly, bilanguaging does not only mean language fluidity in communication but also refers to a political process of social transformation. The term confronts colonial linguistic practices in a border space. (Mignolo 2000: 231) Translanguaging, on the other hand, extends this physical space by focusing on the dynamic of actual multilingual speech.

The terminology discussed in this section shows the abundance of a multiplicity of terms that overlap. As LEWIS, JONES and BAKER (2012b: 656) have rightfully diagnosed "[t]he danger, in breaking new ground, is that we are setting up a maze of terminology". GARCÍA and LI WEI (2014: 36), in this context, submit that the Bakhtinian concept of 'heteroglossia' might serve as an umbrella term to all these models, which would also include translanguaging. Still, the term 'translanguaging' is preferred in this study as it is linked to the educational context since its emergence. The following chapter will present various studies on translanguaging even if competing terms might be used therein. The reason for this is that most of these notions overlap with the concept of translanguaging and their boundaries are not clear-cut.

4.2 Research on translanguaging

Due to the fact that translanguaging has only recently been adopted in scholarship, there has not been much research in this field. In the subsequent chapter, existing studies that

focus on multilingual practices in educational settings will be reviewed more closely. On that note, the research context needs to be taken into account as it makes a difference if the studies are conducted in America near the Mexican border, in Canada that has a high number of immigrants, in South Africa that is a highly multilingual country or in Europe with its focus on establishing multilingualism. Another aspect that has to be considered is at which educational level the investigation concentrates. With regard to research in content classes, it needs to be mentioned that CLIL is not represented in America and Africa since these regions have their own types of multilingual education.

4.2.1 Translanguaging in education

In the United States, a series of studies on students' operation of translanguaging practices were conducted in compulsory education schools. SAYER (2013), for example, investigates how second-grade students use their home language in a transitional bilingual education programme in a Texan school, which features a 97% rate of Latino students. The scholar initially states that he believes that language education should foster learners' linguistic resources and thereby promote linguistic, cultural and social equality. At first, the study examined CS instances but throughout the research this approach proved problematic, as the students did not switch languages for certain functions but were rather unconstrained in the choice from their linguistic repertoire. SAYER (2013) admits that a translanguaging lens is thus more appropriate as it does not focus on language as such but allows analysing how multilinguals make sense of things through language. Furthermore, he states that translanguaging is "not just an issue of comprehension and a means of mediating academic content but also serves an important function for identity performance" (SAYER 2013: 76). Therefore, he demands that educators should endorse the usage of a child's home language through enabling translanguaging in their classroom in order to establish equality. Another study by SOTO HUERTA (2016) analyses the perspective taking of emergent bilinguals in Grade 4 at a Texan school, which again has a high percentage of Hispanic students. In this context, translanguaging served to make the content matter culturally and linguistically relevant to the students. In addition, the scholar claims that translanguaging assisted multilinguals constructing their voice, which they then could share with others, and also learning from and about other students. However, compared to SAYER's (2013) two-year research, the

sample size (six classroom observations) of this study seems rather small to make broad generalisations. Thus, additional research in this matter is needed.

Other American scholars focused on the teacher in their investigation of translanguaging in compulsory schools. MARTIN-BELTRÁN, GUZMAN and CHEN (2017) scrutinize teachers' discourse practices used to cater for diverse students' needs. Their study, which is grounded in sociocultural theory, was undertaken in a culturally and linguistically diverse high school in Washington DC. The results showed that educators often employed translanguaging "to recognise students' multilingual funds of knowledge and to invite students with an array of language expertise to pool efforts to solve linguistic problems" (MARTIN-BELTRÁN, GUZMAN and CHEN 2017: 53). Furthermore, the translanguaging approach was used selectively to intervene in small groups and further helped establishing a collective area of proximal development with learners that have diverse language expertise. The researchers argue that translanguaging as a pedagogy can be used as an instrument with multilingual students in order to differentiate instruction. In a similar vein, PALMER et al. (2014) attend to the dynamic multilingual practices of two teachers in a dual language public school in Texas. It was observed that both of the educators allowed, valued and sometimes even copied their pupils' linguistic choices. Moreover, the researchers postulate four potentially powerful translanguaging pedagogies: "modeling and engaging in dynamic bilingualism, celebrating hybridity and moments of metalinguistic commentary, and positioning children as competent bilinguals" (PALMER et al. 2014: 768). Nonetheless, they highlight that their research is only a minor contribution and that further work has to be done to understand translanguaging pedagogies.

The notion of translanguaging has also been reviewed in Canadian scholarship. VAN VIEGEN STILLE et al. (2016) report on research outcomes in relation to an initiative that engages educators in collaborative inquiry in order to support English language learners in school. Three case studies are presented, in which it is shown how teachers proceeded to include the home languages of learners attending a multilingual classroom. The results showed that teachers recognised the value of translanguaging practices, as they can be of assistance to students in understanding concepts in class better. Moreover, educators realised that it is not the content that might cause problems but rather the language at times. Hence, instead

of reducing the degree of difficulty, teachers tried to help learners overcome language barriers. The scholars conclude that “[u]nderstanding how to scaffold and strengthen multilingual students’ language development, comprehension, and communication of knowledge in the classroom potentially leads to more effective teaching and learning activities” (VAN VIEGEN STILLE et al. 2016: 497). In other words, teachers need to develop instructional strategies so that the learning needs of multilingual students are met. Still, according to the researchers, this should not only be the task of individual teachers, but explicit school- and district-wide policies are needed. In contrast, SUN (2016) explores peer collaboration by Grade 5 students attending a bilingual programme with the help of the translanguaging framework. That is, the practice of making meaning, shaping experiences, and gaining understanding as well as knowledge through the use of more than one language is examined. The linguist could ascertain that the communicative practices among the learners helped build a learning community in which everyone had the chance to practice and scaffold their speech in interaction with other students and in which everyone, in particular newcomer language learners, could gain powerful positions and feel included in their translingual practices.

Researchers in European countries that exhibit high linguistic diversity in their population, such as Sweden and Great Britain, have also demonstrated their growing interest in translanguaging. In her paper, JONSSON (2013) surveys learners’ translanguaging practices by analysing their language diaries and interviewing the students. The sample consisted of six participants who were in their final term at an international school in Sweden. According to JONSSON (2013), all participants employed translanguaging practices on a regular basis, which can be characterised by fluidity and hybridity. At one point, one of the respondents indicated that they are talking in only one single language. Thus, the researcher deduces that the languages of the person are “so intertwined that the boundaries between them are blurred” (JONSSON 2013: 103). This claim seems rather odd as a translanguaging framework assumes that multilinguals have one linguistic repertoire from which they can draw. Hence, the proposition that the language boundaries of only one person interviewed are blurred appears to contradict the translanguaging theory. Nevertheless, JONSSON (2013) further states that translanguaging is part of the learners’ multilingual repertoires but that they are also aware of the double monolingualism practiced at school as the learners differentiate in

what situation they can use which language. As a consequence, it seems necessary to adapt language policies in modern educational settings. The aforementioned study by CREESE and BLACKLEDGE (2010) – see chapter 4.1.3 – has been conducted in two complementary schools in England, in which they detected a series of translanguaging strategies in classroom and school discourse. The two scholars argue that skills and knowledge across languages are not separate but rather interdependent. Furthermore, they believe that multilinguals use their resources as a style resource “for identity performance to peers” (CREESE & BLACKLEDGE 2010: 110). Therefore, it does not seem so important which languages are used but which voices are engaged in identity performance. This work as well insists on further research on classroom language ecology to demonstrate how and why pedagogic multilingual practices are legitimised and accepted by language users.

At the academic level, translanguaging has especially been researched in the South African context. A highly interesting study is the one by MAKALELA (2015), which investigates the effectiveness of a flexible communicative language practice that also includes African languages. The reading and vocabulary achievement test scores of two groups – one that was exposed to translanguaging treatment and one that did not enjoy a translanguaging approach in class – were compared. The results revealed that the translanguaging method fostered vocabulary skills but did not have any effect on reading competence. Further, the study illustrated that the usage of translanguaging has both cognitive and social benefits that are not associated with monolingual lessons. In this regard, the scholar maintains that the findings showed “positive effects of using multilingual resources in the classroom by reinforcing plural identities, bridging linguistic and cultural boundaries and increasing reasoning power through integrated multilingual practices” (MAKALELA 2015: 213). Translanguaging and academic writing skills have been examined by MOTLHAKA and MAKALELA (2016), who focused on how translanguaging techniques can facilitate efficient L2 writing practices. It was ascertained that if learners are aware of their discursive resources, “they might be able to strategically mediate their writing with a multitude of resources, find the true meaning of writing, and gradually develop themselves into better writers” (MOTLHAKA and MAKALELA 2016: 258). Consequently, textual differences should not be considered unconscious errors but outcomes of strategic choices made by multilinguals.

Two studies conducted in the U.S. considered translanguaging at a higher educational level. CANAGARAJAH (2011a) investigates a multilingual student's translanguaging strategies in her writing practice. The researcher acknowledges that translanguaging is a "naturally occurring phenomenon for multilingual students" (CANAGARAJAH 2011a: 402) but he still proposes that translanguaging should be taught, a claim that previous studies have disapproved of. The scholar charges his colleagues with romanticising students' translanguaging practices and proposes a practice-based model to explain multilinguals' competences. Hence, in his opinion, practice is desirable in developing proficiency and competence with translanguaging practices. Further, in order to evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of translanguaging as well as to promote critical assessment and instruction, discourse and rhetorical strategies need to be considered. CANAGARAJAH'S (2011a) proposal to teach translanguaging appears to be contrary to the theoretical ideas on the concept, which regard translanguaging as the discursive norm. Nevertheless, four strategies were detected in the student's writing procedure: recontextualisation, voice, interaction and textuallisation. Reviewing CANAGARAJAH'S (2011a) study, MAZAK and HERBAS-DONOSO (2015: 702) encapsulate his point by stating that his "emphasis on the process of the graduate student exploring the ways in which she can use all of her communicative repertoire as an integrated system shows how translanguaging in texts is strategic". PUJOL-FERRAN et al. (2016), on the other hand, analyse multilingual pedagogies across the college curriculum so that they can find ways to raise the self-esteem of students who speak a language other than English and to encourage them to remain enrolled in college. Four case studies are presented to illustrate how teachers incorporate translanguaging teaching practices while students complete assignments in the classroom. The researchers conclude that multilingual pedagogies have a positive effect as through these a safe and dynamic learning environment is established in which learners can spontaneously engage and interact, which fosters students' reasoning skills as they have the opportunity to think in their dominant language and further, in which their metalinguistic skills are enhanced.

4.2.2 Translanguaging in content classes

Translanguaging in content classes that are not CLIL lessons has been for example researched in South Africa and Germany. CARSTENS (2016) inquires students' perception on

translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy in construction classes at a university in South Africa. In interviews the learners had to answer four questions: whether translanguaging assists them understand the concepts, whether this strategy supports the development of confidence and competence in the weaker language, whether they think that translanguaging can serve as a platform to generate new terms in African languages and whether they intended to use L1 terms in the future. Apart from a small number of students, the findings suggested that translanguaging is perceived as a valuable instrument to perform various pedagogical functions and it may also “contribute towards the intellectualisation of the African languages through creation of new terms as well as through trialling terms created by experts” (CARSTENS 2016: 219). In comparison, PROBYN (2015) explores linguistic practices of eight science teachers in rural and township schools in South Africa. The scholar states that she scrutinizes the concepts of CS, translation and translanguaging. Throughout the paper, though, PROBYN (2015) mostly refers to switches and thus seems to ignore translanguaging. A surprising finding in her study, however, was that hardly any teacher had used their home language to explain science content. Even though only a minority of learners had English as their L1 and most of the learners exhibit poor proficiency in English, it is still the medium of instruction in these schools. Hence being a multilingual setting, one would assume that other languages would emerge. However, her study debunks this supposition. In many African classrooms above primary level, it seems to be the norm to not use the home language. Another recent article on translanguaging in content-matter learning situations has been published by DUARTE (2016). The linguist analyses the role of translanguaging for gaining new knowledge in learners’ task-related speech in German mainstream education. On that account, a sociocultural approach has been opted for examining 10th grade content-matter classes. The results displayed that translanguaging dominated in cognitively challenging speech acts. Moreover, translanguaging practices “seem to reinforce the creative process of knowledge building, by mediating the emergence of high-order thinking” (DUARTE 2016: 13). The researcher also lists functions of translanguaging, which she compartmentalises into making sense of the task at hand and jointly constructing answers. In her study, the former category includes paraphrasing the task, diagnosing and defining available knowledge to solve the task and solving managerial aspects. The latter incorporates producing a certain formulation regarding the content,

hypothesising, rewriting and correcting previous information, negotiating meaning, quoting from sources, showing (dis)agreement, providing objections and discussing appropriate choice of words.

Scholarship in North and Latin America has also devoted itself to investigate the phenomenon of translanguaging in content lessons. POZA (2016) and LANGMAN (2014) both review translanguaging practices in US schools with extremely diverse student populations. Whereas POZA (2016) focuses on the interaction of students in fifth grade, LANGMAN (2014) directs her attention towards teachers' practices. In line with previous research, POZA's (2016) study confirms that "allowing, and indeed valuing and leveraging students' prior knowledge and familiar languaging practices, effectively scaffolds access to content knowledge and skills" (POZA 2016: 15). However, the researcher also considers potential pitfalls when teachers adopt translanguaging pedagogies. He stresses that there is a risk that translanguaging might be reduced to allowances of CS and translation instances, which needs to be avoided. Reasoning from her study, LANGMAN (2014) believes that teachers who adopt a translanguaging approach are representing a behaviour that tries to emphasise connections of knowledge taught in schools to lives outside. Furthermore, she states that teachers who allow multiple varieties in their classrooms keep those linguistically real. At an officially bilingual Columbian university, MAZAK and HERBAS-DONOSO (2015) collected data on a teacher's linguistic practices in a science course. Similar to SAYER (2013), the two academics first analysed CS but then realised that it does not suffice and thus adopted a translanguaging framework. Their findings indicate that most translanguaging sequences in their scrutiny occurred around English texts as key terms were negotiated. Moreover, they claim that translanguaging necessitates the activation of all learners' meaning-making resources. MAZAK and HERBAS-DONOSO (2015) further criticise that English is often used as the language of science and highlight that through a translanguaging approach Spanish might also be valued in the scientific discourse. Ironically though is that their article is also written in English. The reason for their choice might be that the scholars want to reach a greater audience but thereby they undermine their claim.

As CLIL has been increasingly implemented in various educational settings in Asia over the last years, scholarship on translanguaging in these circumstances has also gained ground. A

recent study by LIN and Lo (2017) focuses on classroom discourse and interaction patterns in two secondary schools in Hong Kong. They selected two lessons out of a large corpus in order to conduct a fine-grained analysis. The scholars observed that when teachers exploit learners' daily life experiences and employ several communicative resources in a skilful way in order to connect the target thematic patterns with what students are familiar with, pupils are more likely to "engage in the process of trans/languageing and co-constructing (instead of regurgitating) science thematic patterns in L2" (LIN & Lo 2017: 41). Nevertheless, the comparison of only two lessons might be a good starting point for further analysis but appears rather small in size for broad generalisations. ADAMSON and COULSON (2015) analyse translanguaging in a CLIL English academic writing preparation course at a Japanese university. The sample consists of questionnaire data and final reports of 180 newly enrolled undergraduate students. Conclusions drawn from the data are that translanguaging assists learners to accomplish tasks and that students perceived this approach as a positive experience. Additionally, when students are aware of translanguaging, their written work improved and this, in turn, enhanced authenticity and relevance to local purposes.

Most studies on translanguaging in CLIL settings are undertaken by European scholars. Two studies, one by MOORE (2014) and the other by MÉNDEZ GARCÍA and PAVÓN VÁZQUEZ (2012), were conducted at a university in Catalonia and at primary and secondary schools in Andalusia, respectively. MOORE (2014) explores communicative practices in a CLIL Educational Psychology course, which is delivered in English to both local and international students. The findings indicate that learners still attend to the subject knowledge even if they encounter language barriers. The researcher argues that "[s]uch findings help legitimise the use of a second language for learning academic content, as it seems the latter remains participants' primary concern" (MOORE 2014: 605). MÉNDEZ GARCÍA and PAVÓN VÁZQUEZ (2012) aim to detect whether collaboration among language assistants and content teachers in CLIL lessons, in which two languages are employed, have an effect on the development of strategies that might improve the teaching process, the learning of subject matter and also language skills and language awareness. It was maintained that neither language nor content teachers were trained for using translanguaging in their classrooms and that their teaching process is grounded on their intuitions and previous knowledge. However, the educators report that the target language is employed for formulaic expressions and

classroom management, whereas they revert to their L1 when telling anecdotes or resorting to routine language. Even though both papers briefly discuss translanguaging, they do not engage the concept in their research.

To date, the only academic work explicitly focusing on translanguaging in CLIL classrooms are the publications by NIKULA and MOORE (2016) and MOORE and NIKULA (2016). The latter can be regarded as an extension of the former, as in both studies the data set is derived from the same corpus of secondary CLIL classroom recordings. Therefore, only the latter will be discussed in this paragraph. The aim of the research was to analyse translanguaging practices by exploring what is occurring during the lessons rather than through teacher/learner self-reporting. The scholars declare that they “expect that bi- and multilingual language use is often a typical feature of bilingual classroom interactions and [they] expect language choices to be spontaneously influenced by pedagogical and interactional imperatives” (MOORE & NIKULA 2016: 219). At the beginning of the study, the linguists tried to establish a taxonomy of functions but throughout the analysis it became clear that demarcated functional categories would propose prescriptive orientations. Thus, a more holistic exploratory approach was undertaken by drawing a broad distinction between sequences when the orientation is towards language in content and episodes when the orientation is towards the flow of interaction. The analysis has shown that when ‘orienting towards content learning’ is concerned translanguaging can help to “smoothly deal with questions of language in content avoiding the breakdowns which would likely occur if a strict L2 monolingual protocol were in place” (MOORE & NIKULA 2016: 232). Therefore, translanguaging can be regarded a powerful communicative strategy. In terms of ‘orienting to the flow of interaction’, students demonstrate behaviour that is similar to multilinguals outside the classroom. As a result, CLIL can be perceived to contribute to the development of functioning multilinguals. The method of categorisation seems highly appropriate when analysing instances of translanguaging in the classroom, thus it will be employed in this study as well.

In summary, all these studies have validated that translanguaging can be considered typical linguistic behaviour of multilinguals and that it is a helpful instrument in the classroom. When students are concerned, employing multilingual resources can have benefits on

various levels. Translanguaging can help learners to make sense of things and to scaffold the access to content knowledge by activating all meaning-making resources. In addition, a translanguaging approach can work against the belief that students' content knowledge will suffer if language barriers exist, which is particularly relevant for the implementation of CLIL. It has also been ascertained that by engaging in multilingual practices, the subject matter can be made more relevant to the students. Furthermore, allowing pupils to resort to their full linguistic repertoire in class can establish an environment that allows students to participate in identity performance and that promotes equality among them. With regard to teachers, scholarship has maintained that multilingualism is usually valued in the classroom and that it can have positive effects if multilingual resources get reinforced. However, it is also evident that teachers are not trained to incorporate a translanguaging pedagogy into their teaching. Hence, there is a clear need of instructional strategies that are theoretically underpinned. Taking the entire theory discussed so far into consideration, the second part of this diploma thesis will now resort to the actual empirical study that analysis translanguaging instances in lower secondary CLIL classes.

PART II: EMPIRICAL STUDY

5 Design of the empirical study

As has already been mentioned a number of times, translanguaging is a relatively new notion in scholarship. Thus, the phenomenon has not been examined in lower secondary CLIL lessons in Austria yet. This circumstance can be considered a gap in research that the second part of this diploma thesis attempts to fill. The study focuses on the discourse of two CLIL teachers, a teaching assistant and the students during six lessons that were recorded. More precisely, the aim of this paper is to investigate translanguaging practices in Austrian CLIL classrooms and for what reasons these are employed. Since a translanguaging framework focuses on the speaker's discursive practices as a process, it seems also crucial to examine in how far people resort to their linguistic repertoire fully. At this point, one issue that other scholars have also encountered (e.g. MOORE & NIKULA 2016: 219) needs to be acknowledged. As scholarship in this field has not yet provided the terminology to describe what is occurring in translanguaging moments, traditional terms such as 'language' need to be employed in this work as well. Still, the author of this thesis is aware of the fact that monoglossic conventions, such as of viewing language as separate codes, are under criticism. The remaining parts of this thesis include the description of the research context, the data and the methodology employed as well as the study's analysis and the discussion of the results with the goal to determine whether this study is in accordance with previous research. As a reminder, the main research question and its three sub-questions are:

Do classroom participants practice translanguaging in a CLIL setting at lower secondary schools in Austria?

- Are classroom participants resorting to their full linguistic repertoire, in other words, are they also using other languages in the classroom besides the two official media of instruction?
- For what purposes is translanguaging employed in the classroom?
- Is there a difference in the usage of multilingual resources between CLIL in natural science and in humanities lessons?

5.1 Research context and data

The data used for the analysis of this study derive from two different research projects³ conducted in relatively diverse school settings. By way of illustration, the differences between the two research contexts are summarised in Table 1 at the end of the section. School A is an academic secondary school located in Vienna, which partakes in the so-called 'Dual Language Programme' (DLP). This programme is an initiative of the Vienna Board of Education, in which a CLIL teaching approach is implemented in schools. Pupils attending the school in question enjoy CLIL lessons in two to three subjects per grade where they are instructed by a content teacher with the help of a native-speaker-teaching assistant at times. However, it has to be stressed that the students in the CLIL programme of this institution have chosen this branch on a voluntary basis. Hence, it is supposed that the learners' aptitude and motivation in learning a language are quite high and further that they are likely to receive support from their families. School B is a former General School, which was transformed into a new secondary school in the year of the research project's implementation (2012), located in the region of Burgenland. This school has been the first one to provide learners with CLIL lessons in this specific region since the school year 1995/96. From then onwards, bilingual education has been offered in five subjects (Geography, History, Biology, Musical Education and Art Education). The proportion of English in these classes is enhanced in accordance with the learners' progress in language proficiency. All CLIL teachers of this institution are certified English teachers. However, some of the English teachers occasionally have to teach CLIL lessons in subjects they are not qualified for, a relatively common practice in this type of school. The bilingual education programme in School B is complemented by the attendance of a native speaker who focuses on improving the students' oral communication skills. In this school, the participation in the CLIL syllabus is voluntary as well. Nonetheless, before the change to the new school form, learners wishing to attend the bilingual school programme had to be allocated to the top stream in English. This prerequisite was abandoned with the launch of new secondary schools and thus all students interested can enrol for the CLIL syllabus at this school.

³ For more information on these projects, refer to BAUER-MARSCHALLINGER (2016) and KORNFELD (2012).

The data set of School A consists of three History CLIL lessons taught in 7th grade. The class in focus has 25 learners in total, of which 11 are female and 14 male. At the time of the research project, the students were about 12-13 years old and had already completed at least 2 ½ years of CLIL instruction besides attending regular English lessons. Even though the exact number was not ascertained, quite a few students in this study use a language other than German at home, similar to the statistics on the multilingual situation in Austria, which was discussed in chapter 2.1.3, stating that roughly 50% of Viennese students do not have German as their L1. One of the two weekly History lessons were taught in English and accompanied by a native-speaker-teaching assistant. This native speaker teacher is an American graduate whose main task was to encourage the learners to use the target language. Even though his focus was meant to be on language-related issues, he occasionally provided historical input. The content teacher in School A began her teaching career six years prior to the project. Her second subject is English and she also completed a training course on CLIL and DLP. Despite functioning as a content teacher during CLIL lessons, she also discusses issues regarding language such as vocabulary, pronunciation or spelling. In general, the CLIL lessons of this class are perceived as ‘teaching history in English’. Therefore, in the second weekly History lesson, which is supposed to be taught in German, the teacher also lets students make use of their full linguistic repertoire at times in order to enhance the learning experience. The subject matter belongs to the humanities and the topic in the observed sequence is the Industrial Revolution. At the beginning of the first lesson, the teaching assistant revises the already discussed teaching material on the Industrial Revolution with the students through full class interaction. Afterwards the teacher explains the procedure of the online group project, which is scheduled for the lessons to follow. Thereupon, the students build groups of three and start reading the information provided on the school’s e-learning platform. In Lesson 2, the learners are mainly engaged in producing their product for this project. In Lesson 3, most of the students have already finished their online presentation and are commenting on their colleagues’ works. In all of the classe, the Internet does not function properly and thus the data features a high amount of off-task talk. All three lessons were filmed with a camera and additionally in each lesson five audio recording devices were placed among the students so that their interaction during group work could be documented. This procedure generated a vast amount of data and hence for

the analysis of this study, two out of the five audio recordings were chosen for Lesson 2 and Lesson 3. However, in the first lesson the students often turned off the recorder on purpose which led to a smaller sample size. For this reason, all tapes of Lesson 1 are used so that the length of the audio material approximately accords with the other two lessons.

In School B, three CLIL Biology lessons in an 8th grade were recorded for the purpose of analysis. A total number of 24 students attend this class, of whom 15 are girls and 9 are boys. They were about 13 to 14 years of age at the time of the research project and had three years of experience with being taught through CLIL. Hence, they were already very accustomed to instructions in English and appeared to be relatively independent when they had to fulfil certain tasks. As with School A, no information is explicitly given with regard to the learners' L1. According to the statistics mentioned in chapter 2.1.3, roughly 15% of Burgenland's students speak a language other than German at home. The content teacher of the class is a certified teacher for English and Musical Education. However, as the school lacks qualified English teachers who are able to teach certain CLIL lessons, she also teaches Biology in English. Regarding her experience with bilingual education, the teacher has been involved in the establishment of CLIL in this institution from the very beginning. Besides being the students' Biology and regular English teacher, she was also their form teacher at that time. In the three lessons, the teacher discussed the topic of blood and its constituents. In the first lesson, the teacher introduces this new topic to the students and together they collect information on the content. Afterwards the students receive a worksheet written in English, which the learners have to read silently and then they discuss it in class. While they are reading, the teacher writes a number of important terms onto the blackboard and subsequently asks the students to circle words that belong to one group. At the end of the lesson, the teacher gives instructions for a short physical exercise. In Lesson 2, the teacher distributes another worksheet on blood components, which the classroom participants read out loud and in the meantime the teacher stops them in order to discuss essential terminology. Afterwards, the teacher asks the pupils to create a mindmap with information from the text. At the beginning of the third class, the teacher distributes cards with words on them according to which the students have to form groups. In these formations, the learners are required to compose a text including the vocabulary items from their paper. Following this sequence, the pupils have to read their text in front of the class. After all groups have

58

finished, the students receive another worksheet with gaps in the text that they have to complete. Thereupon, the teacher ensures that all learners get the correct answers by discussing the text in class. The three lessons were not filmed but only audiotaped. Furthermore, students' interaction has not been recorded separately like in School A. Therefore, the data feature mostly teacher-student communication.

Table 1: Differences between the research contexts

	<i>state</i>	<i>school type</i>	<i>grade</i>	<i>subject</i>	<i>teacher</i>	<i>students</i>
School A	Vienna	academic secondary school	7 th grade	History (humanities)	1 content teacher 1 teaching assistant	25 learners 11 female 14 male
School B	Burgenland	new secondary school	8 th grade	Biology (natural sciences)	1 content teacher	24 learners 15 female 9 male

5.2 Methodology

5.2.1 Classroom-based research

The study presented in this diploma thesis pertains to the greater field of classroom-based research. The main goal of this kind of scholarship is to examine and thus to enhance the understanding of the events in the language classroom. This field of investigation can be educationally, psychologically, sociologically or linguistically oriented depending on whether aspects of teaching and learning language, behaviour of students and teachers, social aspects such as group and peer work or linguistic communication among classroom members are scrutinized. (RIAZI 2016: 34) Even though the analysis of the present study also includes students engaging in group work in one of the data sets (see chapter 5.1), this study is linguistically oriented as its main focus is on the interaction between classroom members. In accordance with MOORE and NIKULA (2016: 219), this thesis is also “equally interested in ‘teacher’ and ‘learner’ behaviour” as both parties are conceived as multilinguals and language users in a multilingual setting. Classroom-based inquiries can be conducted quantitatively, qualitatively or as a mixed-method approach that constitutes a combination of the first two mentioned. According to CRESWELL (2014: 3-4), the distinction between

quantitative and qualitative research is often made on the basis of describing that the former uses numbers and close-ended questions, whereas the latter uses words and open-ended questions. However, the researcher highlights that those two should not be regarded as discrete categories but rather represent different ends on a continuum. In the middle of this continuum then, the mixed-method approach can be placed. Quantitative methods in classroom research incorporate surveys, correlations and experiments, whereas qualitative approaches include case studies, discourse analysis, interaction analysis and ethnographies (RIAZI 2016: 34). This study operates qualitatively for the greatest part by approaching the database through classroom discourse analysis, which will be discussed in the subsequent section.

5.2.2 Classroom discourse analysis

Since this thesis performs a discourse analysis on six lessons in a CLIL setting, it is essential to explore this type of methodology more closely. Discourse analysis, as mentioned above, is usually classified as qualitative research and refers to the collection, analysis and exploration of meaning patterns and structure in a text constructed among social groups. Thus, scholars in this field try to disclose content and language employed in a certain context to achieve specific aims. Discourse analysts can follow either an inductive approach, where no a priori coding scheme is used and where hypotheses are generated during the analysis, or a deductive approach, where a coding scheme based on relevant theoretical frameworks is employed and where researchers examine whether the data apply to current theories. (RIAZI 2016: 95) This research project then proceeds deductively as it relies on the coding scheme developed by MOORE and NIKULA (2016). Regarding discourse analysis in educational settings, RYMES (2016: 8) has proposed that classroom discourse analysis should be viewed as

looking at language-in-use in a classroom context (with the understanding that this context is influenced also by multiple social contexts beyond and within the classroom) to understand how context and talk are influencing each other [...] for the purpose of improving future classroom interactions and positively affecting social outcomes in contexts beyond the classroom.

For this research project, the provided working definition seems particularly suitable as this study examines language-in-use in the form of translanguaging practices of two CLIL

teachers, a teaching assistant and their students. Moreover, it is acknowledged that the participants' discursive practices are influenced on the one hand by events happening in the classroom and on the other hand by outside school phenomena such as an increase in multilingualism due to globalisation. Additionally, this thesis attempts to understand for what purposes students engage in translanguaging practices and further hopes to contribute to the amelioration of future classroom conversation by promoting the use of speaker's whole linguistic repertoire in educational settings.

Certain issues need to be taken into consideration with regard to classroom discourse analysis. At first, HOPKINS (2014: 137-138) claims that qualitative methodologies in classroom research have often been criticised in the past "because of unarticulated procedures for analysis" (2014: 137) leading to reduced validity. Therefore, he urges that it is essential to follow a specific procedure in the analysis of classroom data. HOPKINS (2014: 144) maintains that there are four steps in the classroom research process: data collection, validation, interpretation and action. In the context of the present study, these four steps have also been applied. At first, the two data sets for this research project were obtained. Afterwards, one part of the data had to be transcribed, whereas the second part already consisted of full transcript, which only needed to be compared to the audio recordings in order to confirm their validity (step 2). With regard to the first data set, no validation process has been undertaken which might be considered a drawback of this study. The material was subsequently analysed and the results interpreted with regard to the discussed theory on translanguaging (step 3). In a last step, the researcher considered what action might be taken in accordance with the results. However, HOPKINS (2014: 144) highlights that these stages are rather interactive than linear, which is also the case in this research project. Closely connected to the validity problem is the issue of interpretation. KUMARAVADIVELU (1999: 458) observed that classroom discourse analysis might involve a "potential mismatch between intention and interpretation – between the teacher's intention and the learner's interpretation, on the one hand, and between the teacher's and learner's intention and the observer's interpretation, on the other". ROBERTS and COPPING (2008: 93) similarly stress that one limitation of discourse analysis is that the researcher can "'read in' too much to the language used". Consequently, a salient skill of classroom scholars is to have "[t]he ability to step back and critically analyze situations, to recognize and avoid bias, to obtain valid and

reliable data, and to think abstractly” (STRAUSS & CORBIN 1990: 18). This study can also be regarded interpretative and thus subjective as it is grounded on the interpretation of only one researcher. However, the researcher tried to follow STRAUSS and CORBIN’s (1990) description of a competent classroom scholar as effectively as possible in order to reach reliable and meaningful results. In the following subchapter, the research process of arriving at such results will be described in more detail.

5.3 Procedure and transcription process

As stated previously, the data for this study were provided by two colleagues, who agreed on making them available for further analysis. These were SILVIA BAUER-MARSCHALLINGER (data from school A) and the supervisor of this thesis (School B). The three lessons recorded in School B were already transcribed fully (KORNFELD 2012) and so they only needed to be adapted to the transcription conventions used in this diploma thesis, which are based on the ones developed by the VOICE PROJECT (2007) with only slight modifications. The exact transcription conventions used can be found in the appendix of this thesis. In contrast, the recordings of School A were only partly transcribed beforehand. The database of School A consisted at first of four lessons but during the second class the internet was not working and so the group had to switch classrooms in order to continue with the tasks. These circumstances led to redundant material for this inquiry and hence the second lesson was eliminated from the analysis. The remaining three included each a video of the whole lesson and five audio files that contained the learners’ talk during group work. As this procedure of data collection produced a massive data amount, the researcher of the present study decided to select two out of the five tapes for each lesson. All of the group-work recordings of Lesson 2 and 3 were listened to and then two were chosen for transcription. The choice of these, though, did not eventuate on grounds of content but was rather pragmatic. Since decoding audio material of group work proves rather difficult due to the high noise level, the ones where students’ discourse was easily assigned to one group was selected. This *modus operandi* was chosen due to the fact that in a transcript, which features utterances that cannot be properly identified, would not be practicable for the analysis afterwards.

The transcription processes was organised into specific steps. First of all, the discourse occurring in the three videotaped lessons of School A was rendered as precisely as possible. However, all classes contained sequences in which students worked in groups resulting in a high noise level and so the researcher could only discern the talk of certain groups at times. Those extracts often feature unintelligible speech due to the frequent occurrence of overlaps or change in volume, which led to a few transcription gaps in the on-going interactions. Furthermore, the camera had often been moved in the course of every class and so the focus shifted as well to a different group each time. Nonetheless, teacher/teaching assistant-guided talk could be transcribed more comprehensively due to the high volume of their voices and the concomitant low noise level. As a second step, raw transcripts were produced for the audiotapes. At this point, it has to be mentioned that the discourse of both Lesson 3 recordings could not be assigned to one specific group like in the previous two lessons. It seems that the recording devices had all been placed between two groups and so the talk of more than one group was taped simultaneously. As a result, the transcripts of the Lesson 3 audio recordings at times contain the talk of one group and at other times the interaction of another group. Thirdly, after a global examination of the raw audio transcripts the researcher selected passages of interest for the inquiry and refined those parts. Fourthly, the sequences that were featured in both the audio and video recordings were compared and where possible supplemented since the participants' talk could sometimes be understood better in either of the two record types. As a fifth step, discourse in a language other than English was indicated with bold and italics. Furthermore, the participants were anonymised and any information regarding the school was altered in all transcripts. With regard to School B, the audiotapes and the transcripts just had to be compared in order to confirm their validity. After all these steps were performed, the data was ready for analysis.

The investigation conducted in order to answer the research questions was also planned carefully. All the words in the transcripts were counted at first and then all instances in the data where English was not used were flagged and colour-coded, whereby each language was assigned a distinct colour. This technique is needed to address the first research sub-question. Afterwards the sum of the words was separated according to the languages they belong to. The next step was to count the translanguaging instances that occur in the data.

This undertaking proved difficult to some extent, as it is rather complicated to determine where one translanguaging instance begins and where it ends. The researcher decided to proceed in the following way: if one word was uttered in another language in a speaker's discourse, then this remark was counted as one translanguaging instance. However, if a speaker constantly employed their multilingual resources, then the researcher defined the beginning and the end of one translanguaging instance according to the theme of the conversation. For example, if a conversation was about the spelling of an item at first and then the speakers switched to discuss the assignment of group functions and in both conversations they used more than one language, then this was counted as two translanguaging instances. Hence, the reader might not agree on all decisions that were made in this context. Subsequently, the episodes were analysed in greater detail and it was attempted to classify them into the two categories: 'orienting to language in content' or 'orienting to flow of interaction'. Nevertheless, this twofold way of classification proved to be insufficient since a number of instances could not be grouped into either of these. Hence, a third category that contains miscellaneous episodes of translanguaging was created. During the categorisation, the researcher considered what roles and purposes translanguaging could have in each example. Afterwards the results were interpreted and the theoretical framework adduced to give the outcomes meaning. Until this stage, it can be stated that the research process followed the procedure of classroom analysis suggested by HOPKINS (2014). The steps of data collection, validation and interpretation were all taken in an interactive manner. For example, while transcribing, the researcher already interpreted to some extent the instances on translanguaging. However, the last stage that considers 'action' will issue in the conclusion section of this thesis where the researcher suggests possible implications of the results for employing translanguaging in the CLIL classroom. The subsequent chapter will now give a detailed account on the analysis of this study.

6 Analysis

This chapter deals with the conducted analysis of the research project. The first section will briefly present some essential figures that are relevant to the present study. Subsequently, languages that have emerged in the two classroom contexts will be examined more closely. The third section of this chapter will then analyse translanguaging instances. These moments are categorised according to MOORE and NIKULA'S (2016) coding scheme into 'orienting to language in content' and 'orienting to flow of interaction'. However, since these two categories did not suffice for this research project, a third category that includes miscellaneous examples was introduced.

6.1 Translanguaging in numbers

Quantifying translanguaging instances is needed in order to interpret the results of the qualitative analysis correctly. However, this undertaking proves rather difficult because defining the beginning and the end of one translanguaging moment can be quite problematic⁴. As a consequence of this circumstance, it was decided to count all words at first and then allocate them to the language in which they were uttered. The distribution is summarised in Table 2 for School A and in Table 3 for School B. This course of action revealed some interesting outcomes. The overall word count comprises 25,252 tokens for School A and 5,842 tokens for School B. When whole classroom interaction takes place, which is the case for a great part of the first lesson in School A and for all lessons in School B, learners use English for more than 25%. In Lesson 1 of School A, which includes a long sequence where the teaching assistant discusses the content with the whole class, the learners speak English for more than 80% of the time. The other two videotaped lessons, in which the students are engaged mostly in group work, English in the pupils' discourse accounts for roughly 15%. With regard to School B, learners use the target language approximately 27%, 31% and 73% in Lesson 1, Lesson 2 and Lesson 3, respectively. The relatively high use of English in the last lesson compared to the other two classes might be the result of students reading their self-authored texts in front of the class. Analysing the

⁴ Refer to chapter 5.3 for a description of the researcher's approach at solving this problem.

pupils' group work discourse from the audio recordings of School A, it becomes apparent that German is used for more than half of the time. The teachers' use of the target language varies greatly in both school contexts. In the video taped lessons of School A, the teacher's use of English in her speech ranges from roughly 23% to 87%. A noteworthy outcome can be detected in the teacher's audiotaped discourse. The teacher uses English for more than 55% on all devices in Lesson 1 and Lesson 3, whereas she speaks in the target language for around 10% in Lesson 2. This circumstance might result from the fact that the teacher is especially occupied with arranging the technical equipment for all students in this class. The teacher of School B uses the target language for approximately 39% to 60% in her speech. The occurrence of languages other than the two media of instruction is less than 1% in the data of School A and zero in the data of School B.

Table 2: Word count divided into languages used by classroom participants in numbers and percentage – School A

	Teacher		Assistant		Researcher		Students		Total	
Lesson 1 – video tape										
English	1,126	86.82%	444	99.55%	88	100%	151	82.07%	1,809	89.78%
German	171	13.18%	2	00.45%	0	0%	33	17.93%	206	10.22%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	1,297	100%	446	100%	88	0%	184	100%	2,015	100%
Lesson 1 – device a										
English	849	85.67%	485	100%	0	0%	207	10.63%	1,541	44.52%
German	142	14.33%	0	0%	37	100%	1,741	89.37%	1,920	55.48%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	991	100%	485	100%	37	100%	1,948	100%	3,461	100%
Lesson 1 – device c										
English	368	61.85%	21	100%	0	0%	162	22.88%	551	41.62%
German	227	38.15%	0	0%	0	0%	543	76.69%	770	58.16%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	0.42%	3	0.23%
Total	595	100%	21	100%	0	0%	708	100%	1,324	100%
Lesson 1 – device d										
English	212	99.53%	29	100%	2	25%	175	42.58%	418	63.24%
German	1	0.47%	0	0%	6	75%	236	57.42%	243	36.76%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	213	100%	29	100%	8	100%	411	100%	661	100%

Lesson 1 – device e											
English	258	57.46%	35	100%	0	0%	15	6.17%	308	42.37%	
German	191	42.54%	0	0%	0	0%	226	93%	417	57.36%	
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.83%	2	0.28%	
Total	449	100%	35	100%	0	0%	243	100%	727	100%	
Lesson 2 – video tape											
English	209	22.79%	0	0%	0	0%	138	14.38%	347	18.18%	
German	708	77.21%	0	0%	32	100%	822	85.63%	1,562	81.82%	
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
Total	917	100%	0	0%	32	100%	960	100%	1,909	100%	
Lesson 2 – device a											
English	68	10.64%	0	0%	0	0%	1,258	30.02%	1,326	27.46%	
German	571	89.36%	0	0%	0	0%	2,932	69.98%	3,503	72.54%	
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
Total	639	100%	0	0%	0	0%	4,190	100%	4,829	100%	
Lesson 2 – device b											
English	71	8.64%	0	0%	0	0%	614	23.53%	685	19.97%	
German	751	91.36%	0	0%	0	0%	1,995	76.47%	2,746	80.03%	
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
Total	822	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2,609	100%	3,431	100%	
Lesson 3 – video tape											
English	474	71.17%	19	100%	2	5.56%	153	15.95%	680	40.48%	
German	191	28.68%	0	0%	34	94.44%	804	83.84%	997	59.35%	
Other	1	0.15%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.21%	3	0.18%	
Total	666	100%	19	100%	36	100%	959	100%	1,680	100%	
Lesson 3 – device a											
English	196	73.41%	306	100%	0	0%	251	5.7%	753	15.13%	
German	71	26.59%	0	0%	0	0%	4,152	94.3%	4,223	84.87%	
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
Total	267	100%	306	100%	0	0%	4,403	100%	4,976	100%	
Lesson 3 – device d											
English	272	79.3%	202	100%	0	0%	733	27.21%	1,207	37.26%	
German	71	20.7%	0	0%	0	0%	1,960	72.76%	2,031	62.70%	
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0.03%	1	0.04%	
Total	343	100%	202	100%	0	0%	2,694	100%	3,239	100%	
Total word count										28,252	

Table 3: Word count divided into languages used by classroom participants in numbers and percentage – School B

	<i>Teacher</i>		<i>Students</i>		<i>Total</i>	
Lesson 1						
<i>English</i>	733	38.87%	82	26.62%	815	37.15%
<i>German</i>	1,153	61.13%	226	73.38%	1,379	62.85%
<i>Total</i>	1,886	100%	308	100%	2,194	100%
Lesson 2						
<i>English</i>	876	52.21%	85	30.58%	961	49.13%
<i>German</i>	802	47.79%	193	69.42%	995	50.87%
<i>Total</i>	1,678	100%	278	100%	1,956	100%
Lesson 3						
<i>English</i>	763	59.52%	298	72.68%	1,061	62.71%
<i>German</i>	519	40.48%	112	27.32%	631	37.29%
<i>Total</i>	1,282	100%	410	100%	1,692	100%
Total word count						5,842

Even though the number of classroom participants using languages other than the two media of schooling in the CLIL lesson is relatively negligible in numbers; their occurrence in the data is of great significance for the research questions of this study. These instances will be examined by means of classroom discourse analysis in the subsequent section. At this point, Table 4 serves as an overview of the languages detected in the database of School A.

Table 4: Languages detected in the database of School A

	<i>English</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>BCMS</i>	<i>Italian</i>	<i>Unidentifiable</i>
<i>Lesson 1 – video tape</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 1 – device a</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 1 – device c</i>	x	x	x		x x
<i>Lesson 1 – device d</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 1 – device e</i>	x	x	x		
<i>Lesson 2 – video tape</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 2 – device a</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 2 – device b</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 3 – video tape</i>	x	x		x	
<i>Lesson 3 – device a</i>	x	x			
<i>Lesson 3 – device d</i>	x	x			x

Unsurprisingly, in all recordings English and German are employed since those two are the two official languages for instruction in this CLIL context. BCMS occurs in two out of the eleven recordings (Lesson 1 device c and device e) and Italian is used in Lesson 3. Two further languages were detected in the recording of Lesson 1 – device c. It is assumed that one of these two belongs to one of the Asian language families. With regard to the other language, no information can be given since it is not possible to determine which language the speaker is using at that moment. This circumstance is definitely one limitation to this research project. No table has been created for School B because no languages other than English and German appear in the dataset. After having reviewed which languages are employed and to what extent they are used, it seems essential to consider the amount of translanguageing instances.

The number of translanguageing moments in the datasets of both research contexts is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Number of translanguageing instances in School A and School B including both teachers and students

	<i>Teacher</i>	<i>Students</i>	<i>Total</i>
School A			
<i>Lesson 1 – video tape</i>	9	5	13
<i>Lesson 1 – device a</i>	3	10	13
<i>Lesson 1 – device c</i>	6	24	30
<i>Lesson 1 – device d</i>	1	8	9
<i>Lesson 1 – device e</i>	4	5	9
<i>Lesson 2 – video tape</i>	10	17	27
<i>Lesson 2 – device a</i>	5	32	37
<i>Lesson 2 – device b</i>	6	28	34
<i>Lesson 3 – video tape</i>	8	23	31
<i>Lesson 3 – device a</i>	2	25	27
<i>Lesson 3 – device d</i>	3	33	36
Total School A			266
School B			
<i>Lesson 1</i>	17	11	28
<i>Lesson 2</i>	24	12	36
<i>Lesson 3</i>	14	11	25
Total School B			89
Grand Total			355

In total, 355 translanguaging instances were ascertained in the entire database, whereof 266 occurrences belong to the data set of School A and 89 to the data set of School B. This difference in amount is due to the larger sample size of the former research context. The teaching assistant of School A also employed translanguaging once in his discourse, which is not embodied in Table 5 for reasons of comparability. On the one hand, his translanguaging is not statistically significant and on the other hand, by excluding him each of the dataset features then only one teacher and a cohort of students, which makes it easier to compare. However, the translanguaging moment of the teaching assistant will be discussed in section 6.2. Comparing the three videotapes of School A and all three lessons of School B, on average the teacher of the former translanguaged nine times and the students 15 times per lesson. In contrast, the educator of School B employed a translanguaging technique 18 times and her students eleven times on average in each of the three recorded classes. These results correlate with the word tokens displayed in Table 2 and Table 3. The teacher of School A spoke 2,880 words in the video taped lessons, whereas the students' discourse feature 2,103 words. In contrast, 3,850 words can be ascribed to the educator of School B and 1,992 tokens to the learners. Put differently, the indicators for translanguaging moments per 100 words are 0.93 and 2.62 for the teacher and the students in School A and 1.43 and 1.71 for the educator and the learners of School B, respectively. With regard to the audio recordings of School A, the indicators are 0.69 for the teacher and 0.96 for the pupils.

All the translanguaging instances were then categorised according to the coding scheme developed by MOORE and NIKULA (2016). The allocation of this categorisation is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Number of translanguaging instances separated into the three analytical categories for both teachers and students

	<i>Orienting to language in content</i>	<i>Orienting to flow of interaction</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>
School A			
<i>Teacher</i>	8	39	10
<i>Students</i>	70	111	29
School B			
<i>Teacher</i>	30	20	5
<i>Students</i>	22	11	1

Interestingly, the teacher in School A used translanguaging as a strategy almost five times more often for organising the flow of interaction than to orienting to language in content. This circumstance might be due to the fact that the teacher functioned as a media specialist most of the time during the three lessons. She constantly made sure that all learners had Internet access. With regard to the students in this research context, they also used their multilingual resources to a greater extent to organise their communicative flow. The explanation for this might be that the students might have been accustomed to use their multilingual resources to continue their interaction and so could focus on the content rather than facing communicative breakdowns. In contrast, the educator and the learners of School B translanguaged more often when orienting to language in content, showing a ratio of 3:2 for the teacher and 2:1 for the pupils. These results might stem from the teacher's pedagogy since she used and demanded translation of key terminology in a high number of cases. In total, 45 instances were marked under miscellaneous with 39 occurrences belonging to School A and 6 moments pertaining to the dataset of School B. The remaining part of this chapter will now explore selected passages more thoroughly by means of discourse analysis.

6.2 Languages in the classroom

For the purpose of answering the first research sub-question of this diploma thesis, it is essential to investigate the languages that have emerged in the classroom. An overview of these can be found in Table 4 given in chapter 6.1. As already mentioned at the beginning of the thesis' empirical part (see chapter 5), it needs to be emphasised that this study supports the theory that speakers in general have recourse to one linguistic repertoire, from which they strategically draw their linguistic resources (meaning various languages and varieties) in order to communicate. This assumption is supported by the data at hand and will be discussed in chapter 7. However, as scholarship has not yet provided suitable terminology to describe what is happening, traditional terms that see languages as separate entities will be employed. Unsurprisingly, English and German are used for the greatest part during the lessons in the datasets of School A and School B. Teachers as well as students resort to both languages in the classroom, which indicates that all participants perceive the classroom as a multilingual setting and act accordingly. However, the teacher's perception of learners using their whole linguistic repertoire differs in the two research contexts as can be seen in Extract

1 and Extract 2. In Extract 1, the educator of School A is explaining to the students in English that they are being recorded for a research project that focuses on multilingual education.

Extract 1: School A – Lesson 1 (videotape)

-
- T: <3> so the background of this: </3> idea project is for a master (.) thesis so if you are going to study some time soon in a few years time. you have to write thesis <LQde> **Diplomarbeit Masterarbeit** {diploma thesis master thesis} </LQde> erm (.) and you have to do different (.) <hand gesture> mEthods to get some results and THIS is about students your age <pointing to various students> (.) learning two different languages basically at the same time. working with TWO different languages English German (.) at the same time (.) so think about this CLIL DLP BBS. you know that? yes.
- TA: <4> you guys are aware </4>
- T: <LQde> <4> **ihr wisst** </4> **dass ihr zwei sprachen habt im unterricht** {you know that you have two languages in class}
- SS: **ja**: {yes} </LQde>
- T: jUst checking. if they are aware of the fact.
-

She stresses the fact that they are working with English and German simultaneously during the lessons. Interestingly, the teacher reinforces this point by asking the pupils in German whether they are aware of this circumstance. It appears that the educator is appreciative of the learners' linguistic resources and that she is furthermore promoting the usage of their entire linguistic system in class. The teacher does not regulate when the pupils should employ which language but allows them to make use of their full linguistic competence as they please. Additionally, the teacher acts as a role model in this passage as she herself uses both English and German for her explanation.

In contrast, the educator in Extract 2 attempts to control the learners' language use for distinct activities.

Extract 2: School B – Lesson 3

-
- {SS build groups}
- SX-m: [SX] <LQde> **du muasst zu uns** {you have to come to us} </LQde>
- T: don't speak german only english is allowed
[...]
- T: the red cells get trapped <LQde> **ja? die werden also dort** (.) **setzen sich dort fest ja** {yeah? there they get (.) get trapped there yeah} </LQde>
-

While students are arranging themselves into groups for the following task, the teacher hears one student make an utterance in German and immediately establishes that the

learners are required to perform the activity in English only. This kind of separation practice might be ascribed to the educator's teaching background since she is a certified English language teacher with no additional training in CLIL. Thus, she might be inclined to focus more on improving students' English language competence due to her teaching experience. In the course of this task, the teacher tries to maintain this English-only attitude by predominantly using the target language but at times she resorts to German, which is also represented in the chosen passage. Hence, there is a discrepancy between the teacher's stance and her actions, of which she might be unaware. It can be maintained that despite attempting to isolate the languages for different uses, the educator still employs all of her linguistic resources in her discourse.

Occurrences where the teaching staff of School A draws from their entire language repertoire in their talk can be detected in the data as well. In Extract 3, the main teacher walks around in order to check whether all students are connected to the Internet.

Extract 3: School A – Lesson 3 (videotape)

T: <LQde> **so hier noch einmal** {so here once again} xxx </LQde>
 {teacher goes from one desk to another}
 T: <LQit> **attenzione** {attention} </LQit> one second
 SS: xxx
 SX-m: {singing} <LQit> **attenzione attenzione** {attention attention} </LQit>

After she has finished with one group, she goes to another desk at the front and in order to indicate her approaching the students she says *attenzione*, the Italian cognate for 'attention', followed by an English utterance. One of the students has noticed her usage of Italian and after a few minutes imitates the teacher by singing this Italian word. This passage might denote that the educator is also competent in Italian besides English and German. However, it might also imply that the speaker has encountered this expression at some point in her life and accepted it into her linguistic repertoire without speaking the language to its full extent. The teacher demonstrates though that she has the knowledge in what context it is appropriate to use this word either because of her Italian language knowledge skills or due to the word's similarity to the English cognate. As the educator could also have used the English equivalent in this circumstance, the purpose of her choice was possibly to place greater emphasis on her utterance so that the learners she was approaching would notice

her. The effect she creates is that another pupil seizes this expression and transforms it into a melody. His action can be interpreted as satirising the teachers' conduct since his colleagues around him start laughing. Again, it cannot be determined whether this particular student is competent in Italian or whether he has absorbed this word in the course of his linguistic biography. In this instance, it is relatively likely that the learner has acquired the expression from the teacher at that moment and might be testing its usage in a playful manner. For both cases, it can be claimed that the speakers freely take advantage of their linguistic resources in order to reach a specific aim. The teacher uses her translanguaging ability in order to draw the learners' attention to her approaching them. In contrast, the student uses his multilingualism for humorous purposes.

In a similar vein, the discourse of the teaching assistant of School A supports the claim that speakers have recourse to one integrated language system, from which they freely choose their linguistic resources, as can be seen in Extract 4.

Extract 4: School A – Lesson 1 (videotape)

TA: yeah. okay. but something I'm not (track) to (.) right. your <LQde> ***frau professor*** {professor} </LQde> says that comes later (.) what else is something that's HAppening during this time that has to do with machines factories (.) people losing their jobs because?

In Lesson 1, the teaching assistant is revising the Industrial Revolution content, which the students have been taught the week before. One of the students mentions automated guns and the main teacher explains that this invention emerges later in history. As a reaction to the pupil's contribution, the teaching assistant confirms the teacher's comment and refers to her in his talk as *frau professor*. Through this utterance, it appears that the teaching assistant has adopted the way the learners of this class address their content teacher, which is a phrase in Austrian German. Since he has only recently moved from America to Vienna, it appears that the teaching assistant has not yet understood the pragmatic meaning of the phrase as it is rather unusual for a colleague to approach a teacher in this manner. If the teaching assistant had been living in Austria for a longer period of time, he probably would have known that this form of address is reserved for pupils. It can be assumed that due to the multilingual setting of his new profession, the teaching assistant has accommodated himself to this new environment by incorporating the expression into his linguistic

repertoire. Furthermore, by applying similar linguistic practices as the learners, the teaching assistant might be attempting to establish a relationship with the students who are constantly translanguaging during the lessons, as will be illustrated by Extract 5 and Extract 6.

The data set of School A features a high number of instances where learners engage in multilingual practices in the classroom, as was discussed in chapter 6.1. Two out of these 210 translanguaging moments – Extract 5 and Extract 6 – will be examined more closely in the following. The two students of Extract 5 are occupied with reading the information on ‘Children at schools in the Industrial Revolution’ for their presentation.

Extract 5: School A – Lesson 1 (recording device c)

-
- S1: <LQde> **was schrElbst du (2) nicht translat- nicht gOOgle oh mein gott bist du dumm?** {what are you writing (2) not translat- not google oh my god are you stupid}
- S2: @@@
- S1: **das ist so dummdidumm xxx keiner weiß was das ist** {that’s so stupid xxx nobody knows what it is}
- S2: **nEin (.) warte** {no (.) wait}
- S1: **das IST schon deutsch** {that’s already German}
- S2: **ich weiß ich such** {I know I’m searching for}
- S1: **aso du willst serbisch** {I see you want Serbian}
- S2: **ja okay also (.) ahSO: @@** {yeah okay so (.) I see}
- S1: **das ist was anderes** {that is something else}
- S2: **es ist wenn du=** {it’s when you}
- S1: **=du weißt es selber nicht (4) xxx abgerissen** {you don’t know yourself (4) xxx torn off}
- S2: xxx **wie kannst du keine ahnung haben** {how is it possible you don’t know}
- S1: **es ist so ein dummes wort das** {it’s such a stupid word this} </LQde> <LQxx> (halumte) </LQxx> (.) <LQde> **es ist so wie** {it is like} </LQde>
-

During this activity they encounter the expression *ragged schools*, which is unfamiliar to them, and so S2 decides to consult an online dictionary. On grounds of their discussion, it can be ascertained that S2 is not using an English-German translation but that she wants to know what *ragged* means in Serbian indicating that this language might be her L1. Even though the learner does not use this language explicitly in talk, she still resorts to her language system to understand the concept better. After the student determines the sense of the adjective, she tries to explain it to her colleague in German but S1 hinders her by accusing S2 of not knowing the right meaning. It seems that thereafter the two pupils

change the language in the online translation tool in order to discover the meaning of another word in the L1 of S1. It cannot be discerned though what the learners are talking about because on the one hand their speech is unintelligible and on the other hand S1 is using a word in a language that is unknown to the researcher. However, this passage is an excellent example of students profiting from their entire linguistic repertoire since their practice produces an enhanced learning situation. The two students are gaining their information in English, discussing their proceedings and the material in German and additionally examining new vocabulary in each of their L1 for the purpose of acquiring a deeper understanding of the content.

Another example that learners make use of their multilingualism during lessons is given in Extract 6.

Extract 6: School A – Lesson 1 (recording device c)

SX-f: <LQxx> xxx </LQxx> i don't know why <LQxx> xxx </LQxx>

In this short sequence, a female student speaks in a language that probably belongs to one of the Asian language families. Unfortunately, the researcher does not have any competence in this language and therefore it is not possible to analyse the content and purpose of the utterances. Still relatively interesting in this sample is the discourse structure of the student's talk. During her speech in the said language, she inserts an English phrase and then continues communicating in the language that is probably her and her interlocutor's L1. Due to her pace, it seems natural to her that the student translanguages in her everyday talk. Nevertheless, the important aspect for this thesis is that the extract demonstrates that other languages beside German and English are employed in this classroom setting. The data of School B in turn does not include any instances of such multilingual practices. The following section will examine translanguaging instances occurring in the two data sets and the purposes of translanguaging more closely by grouping them into the three categories: orienting to language in content, orienting to flow of interaction and miscellaneous.

6.3 Translanguaging practices

In the following, translanguaging instances that were selected for the analysis will be discussed more thoroughly. For this endeavour, most of the samples were classified into the

two categories ‘orienting to language in content’, which includes moments where translanguaging is used to facilitate content learning, and ‘orienting to flow of interaction’, which features translanguaging instances that are unmarked in the unfolding talk, established by MOORE and NIKULA (2016). Since a small amount of translanguaging instances could not be grouped into either of these two, a third category containing miscellaneous translanguaging moments was added.

6.3.1 Orienting to language in content

An essential aspect of constructing knowledge in the content class is that classroom participants have the appropriate lexis at their disposal. Hence, a large proportion of the translanguaging instances detected in the database are concerned with key lexis. An example of translanguaging for vocabulary enrichment in a natural science class is given in Extract 7. In this sequence of the Biology lesson, the teacher is reviewing a worksheet on blood components with the learners.

Extract 7: School B – Lesson 1

-
- T: erm capillaries yes okay (.) erm what is INside an artery (.) what can you find inside an artery (.) what is it made of (.) [SX-f]
- SX-f: elastic fibres
- T: fibres (.) elastic fibres (.) what are elastic fibres? <LQde> **wie is so eine arterie beschaffen** xxx **die innenseite** (.) **also DEHNbare also** {how is such an artery designed xxx the inside (.) so elastic so} </LQde> (.) what are fibres (.) <LQde> **wie könnt ma des auf deutsch bezeichnen** {how could you label it in German}
- SX-m: **fasern** {fibres}
- T: **ja genau fasern fasernstoffe fasern richtig** {yeah right fibres fibrous material fibres right} </LQde> (.) elastic fibres in its wall okay (.) erm what is high pressure
- SX-m: <LQde> **hoher druck** {high pressure}
- T: **hoher druck ja** {high pressure yeah} </LQde> er (.) and what do the elastic fibres DO? when there is high pressure (.) what do they do [SX]
- SX-m: stretch them
- T: stretch means
- SX-m: <LQde> **dehnen** {stretch}
- T: **sie dehnen sich aus** (.) **ja okay** {they stretch (.) yeah okay} </LQde>
-

At the outset, she is asking for the meaning of the term *elastic fibres* without demanding an explanation in English or a translation in German from the students. So it appears that the educator gives them the freedom of choice at first. This assumption can be made on the basis of the teacher’s linguistic behaviour since she herself translanguages in her speech in

order to clarify the concept. Once the educator realises that the pupils do not respond to her question, she offers them to provide an answer in German. In the remainder of this activity, the teacher constantly asks for the translation of the terminology as for *high pressure* or *stretch*. This approach might be a result of the previous situation where students did not reply and so the teacher tries to ensure that all participants understand the content and are equipped with the specific terminology. Another explanation could be that the educator attempts to provide students with key terms in both languages. This extract of the School B data set illustrates only one instance where translanguaging happens due to consideration of key lexis but can be regarded representative for the numerous remaining occurrences.

In contrast, the data of School A includes only a few translanguaging instances that revolve around content-specific terminology. One of those (Extract 5) has already been discussed in chapter 6.1. Extract 8 happens a short time after Extract 5, in which the students have started discussing the term *ragged*. After a private conversation, the two girls begin examining the meaning of the word again, which is illustrated in Extract 8. S1 provides a lexical item that she believes to be a synonym of *ragged*.

Extract 8: School A – Lesson 1 (recording device c)

S2: okay er (.) rAgged (.) school?
 S1: <LQde> **das heißt so (.) einfach** {it means (.) simply} </LQde> like (hardish)
 S2: <LQde> **das ist dasselbe** {that's the same} </LQde>
 S1: no not outside (.) no i think they're inside how they teach children is like ragg-ed {teacher comes to their table}
 T: what have you picked children at school? uh ha
 S2: <LQde> **aber wir wissen wir wissen nicht was** {but we don't know we don't know what} <LQde> ragged <LQde> **heißen soll weil** {means because} </LQde> ragged school <LQde> **hier also (.) in überschrift** {so here in the heading} </LQde>
 T: raGGed schools? erm that's kind of like erm public schools but they are run by social institutions (.) so they're not public like our schools nowadays (.) they are institutions erm er like the church they say okay we are trying to teach the kids how to write how to do mathematics yeah

Interestingly, she starts her utterance in German and then proceeds with her talk in English. So it can be maintained that her metalinguistic comments are in German but when she discusses the subject matter the learner uses English. The student might be adopting this strategy in order to emphasise the different parts of her speech. Subsequently, the teacher approaches their table and asks them about their topic. S2 seizes the opportunity and

inquires about the meaning of this term in German. In her answer, the educator adheres to talking in English. This piece of discourse indicates that a rather relaxed atmosphere exists in these History lessons where language choice is concerned, especially when compared to School B where the teacher insists on the use of one language as shown in Extract 2. In other words, it appears that the classroom participants follow implicit rules, which include the possibility of translanguaging in their discourse, and no explicit rules are enforced in the interaction. Neither the teacher nor the students seem to influence one another in their language selection in this passage, as they do not adopt each other's language preference. The classroom participants rather employ a translanguaging technique that helps them convey their message.

A situation similar to translanguaging for terminological reasons arises when participants translanguage in order to determine the correct spelling of a word. In the third lesson of School B, the pupils have to fill in the missing words of a text and afterwards the right answers are discussed in class.

Extract 9: School B – Lesson 3

T: what is <LQde> **rückenmark** {bone marrow} </LQde> in english
 SX-f: bone marrow
 T: yes bone marrow
 SX-m: <LQde> **wia** {how}
 SX-f: <spel> **m** <1> **a** </spel> </1> </LQde>
 T: <1> <spel> m </1> a r r o w </spel>
 SX-f: <LQde> **mit zwa r schreibt mas** {you write it with double r} </LQde>
 T: yes that's right

In Extract 9, the teacher wants to know the English translation for *G Knochenmark* (E *bone marrow*). One male student does not understand the utterance provided by a female colleague and asks for clarification. He makes his utterance in German contrasting the previous discourse that occurs in English, probably in order to highlight his unfamiliarity with the term. Both female student and teacher therefore start spelling the term with the difference that the learner uses German and the educator English. Probably due to authority reasons, the female student stops after the second letter since the teacher is responding to the male learner's request. However, the female student subsequently emphasises in German that the term incorporates the letter <r> twice. Thereby, the female student

supports her colleague in learning the correct orthography. A possible explanation for her linguistic behaviour might be that the female student knows that her male classmate is less proficient in English and tries to help him in the L1. This assistance is then rewarded with the teacher's confirmation of the comment being accurate.

Extract 10 also comprises uses of translanguaging strategies in order to arrive at the correct spelling.

Extract 10: School A – Lesson 2 (recording device a)

S1: the parliament
 S2: <LQde> **schreibst du gerade den haargenauen satz ab** {are you copying the exact same sentence}
 S1: **nein** {no}
 S3: **der** {the} </LQde> parliament par-LI-ament
 S2: okay
 S3: par-LI-ament
 S1: oops
 S2: <pvc> (parLIarliment) </pvc> <LQde> @@ **das ist** {that's} </LQde> parLIament
 <LQde> **ehrlich** {seriously} </LQde> xxx
 S3: <pvc> (parliarliment) </pvc> @@
 S2: eh [S1] <LQde> **besserst du das aus** (.) **aso das schreibt man so** {can you correct that (.) I see you write it like that}
 S1: **ja eh** {yeah anyway}
 S3: **mit einem d** {with one d} </LQde>
 S2: forbi- @ forbid <LQde> **schreibt man mit einem d mann** {you write it with one d only dude} </LQde>
 S3: <pvc> (hildren) </pvc>
 S2: and <pvc> (hildren) </pvc> @@ <LQde> **und** {and} </LQde> hillary clinton

The learners are reading information on a website and then have to compile a presentation. In the course of fulfilling the task, S1 is responsible for typing the text and has difficulties in writing *parliament* accurately. By stressing the syllable in his talk, S3 tries to draw his colleague's attention to the fact that the English term contains the letter <i> as compared to the German equivalent. S1 does not immediately comprehend where to put the vowel correctly, which results in what MOORE and NIKULA (2016: 225) have termed "intra-lexeme translanguaging" also known as inventions, lexical coinages or heteroglossic forms. Through his colleagues' laughter and comments, S1 then realises that *parliarliment* is also wrong and corrects it. However, S2 still believes that the lexical item is spelled incorrectly and urges S1 to rectify the mistake but soon realises that he is in the wrong. Subsequently, they read

through the English text collectively but comment on S1's spelling mistakes in German. The extract clearly demonstrates how students employ two languages in the process of acquiring new linguistic knowledge. Furthermore, the two sequences reviewed in this paragraph show that translanguaging is not only used to focus on meaning but can also be employed to clarify the correct form of a lexical item.

When orienting to language in content, translanguaging is not only employed to focus on the meaning or spelling of lexical items but it is also used to reflect upon the structure of language. An example of this type of translanguaging is presented in Extract 11. Two students of School A are uncertain whether they need a definite article in one of the sentences in their text. So when the teacher approaches them in order to check if they have Internet access, they enquire about the correct grammar for their text.

Extract 11: School A – Lesson 3 (videotape)

T:	<LQde> geht das internet:t {is the internet working}
S6:	ja {yes}
S4:	ja aber wir haben ein nächstes problem {yes but we have an additional problem}
S6:	wir haben das internet (wir brauchens aber nicht) (4) ah ja und da {we have internet connection (but we don't need it)} </LQde> rules for many games
T:	aha
S4:	xxx ma- make rules for the many games
T:	<LQde> ihr könnt auch beides sagen {you can say it both ways} </LQde> (.) make the rules for many games (.) make rules for many games <LQde> ja wahrscheinlich eher {yeah probably rather} </LQde> for many games

A noteworthy remark is made by S4 when she proposes to place the article before the quantifier *many*. This suggestion might stem from her linguistic knowledge of German, in which this kind of construction is possible. Her utterance might indicate that the student is resorting to her linguistic repertoire, in which also numerous constructions are likely located, and is creatively merging her resources on hand, English lexis and German structure, for the purpose of producing a statement. The teacher ignores the learner's proposal, as it seems that she herself is contemplating the right structural form. In her response, the teacher employs a translanguaging technique since she is using German for the comments on the material, probably because the students posed their question in German as well, but resorts to English when she tries out different options in order to determine the appropriate construction.

A similar situation is proceeding in Extract 12, in which three male learners are pondering about the suitable collocation for *wages*.

Extract 12: School A – Lesson 2 (recording device a)

-
- S1: for a lots of money
 S2: for a lots of money (3) <LQde> **na warte** {no wait} </LQde> xxx (2) so erm
 S3: <LQde> **was später noch** {what later on} </LQde>
 S2: erm but <LQde> **wart warte mal** {wait wait a second} </LQde> the lan(.)dlords could sell the coal from their lands (.) for a lot of money (.) but the MIners (.) only (.) got a few
 S1: low wages
 S2: a few (.) a few low wages? <LQde> **kann man das schreiben** {can you write it like that} </LQde> a few er
 S1: so mine owners were very rich but they paid miners low wages <LQde> **ja** </LQde>
 S3: <LQde> **was sind** {what are} </LQde> wages?
 S1: they only got small wages
 S3: <LQde> **was sind** {what are} </LQde> wages
 S1: wages <LQde> **sind einfach gehalt** {are simply wages}
 S3: **aso** {I see} </LQde>
 S1: low wages
 S2: wages (3) <LQde> **warte stimmt der satz jetzt** {wait is the sentence correct now} </LQde> (.) the landlords could sell the coal from their land (.) for a a lot of money but the miners only got (2) a few bucks <LQde> **würd ich schreiben oder** {I would write or} </LQde>
 S1: bucks er <LQde> {sarcastic} **ganz sicher** {sure}
 S2: **ja aber aber nicht das es genauso klingt wie da** (.) **ja ich weiß auch nicht** {yeah but but not that it is the same like there (.) yeah I don't know myself} </LQde> (.) a few
-

The students have composed the first part of their sentence on landlords but they also want to formulate a subordinate clause about the situation of miners. S1 suggests using the quantifier *a few* to describe that people in this profession received small salaries. Thereat, S2 proposes to write the phrase *low wages* instead, which S1 does not comprehend immediately and believes that S2 wants to merge the quantifier with the phrase. He then voices his scepticism in German, which S1 counters by repeating the whole sentence in English to illustrate its accuracy. Later on, he even takes into consideration whether *wages* would collocate with the adjective *small*. Subsequently, the focus shifts from discussing the structure to meaning negotiation. S3 asks what the term *wages* means, which is explained to him by S1 in German. Towards the end of the sequence, S2 examines the whole sentence

again and advances to use *a few bucks* because he is concerned that their text resembles the source material too much. This suggestion is met with sarcasm by S1. Resembling Extract 11, translanguaging in this passage is often used to distinguish between comments on the content and the material referred to. A result of such a procedure might be that both the learning of content and the learner's linguistic knowledge might be enhanced since the discussion of these two aspects in a language that is not the speaker's L1 demands higher cognitive processing. Hence, translanguaging can be regarded a supportive device that assists the teaching and learning of content.

6.3.2 Orienting to flow of interaction

After examining translanguaging instances where the focus is on language, the analysis will now address moments of translanguaging that orient towards the flow of interaction. In this context, translanguaging instances often occur to support task management as can be seen in Extract 13 and Extract 14. The former is taken from the third History lesson in School A, in which the students have to comment online on their peers' virtual presentation.

Extract 13: School A – Lesson 3 (videotape)

-
- <S12 comes to the front>
 S12: <to T> **sollen wir in deutsch oder englisch kommentieren** {should we comment in German or Englisch} </LQde> </to T>
 T: <to S12> in English of course (.) i mean try: (.) as much as possible (.) and you if you have any problems you can also switch to german but try english fIRst </to S12>
 T: <to R> <LQde> **so ich schreib immer arbeitsaufträge für die die schon schneller san** {so I always write down additional exercises for those who are quicker} </to R>
 R: **jaja** {yeah yeah} </LQde>
-

One student approaches the teacher to ask in what language they should write their comments. For his question, the learner uses German but receives an answer in English by the teacher. She states that for the task English is preferred but that German can also be employed as a last resort. Since her reaction is given in the language that would be favoured for the task, the teacher's translanguaging can be regarded exemplary. Furthermore, she tries to encourage the pupils' usage of the target language and thereby enhance their linguistic competence. However, the educator also appreciates it if the students resort to their L1 and in this way broaden their knowledge on the content. Remarkably, she then uses German when explaining her teaching methods to the researcher. Hence, it appears that the

teacher tries to signal alignment through her language choice. She opts for English when talking to the student, which indicates the bilingual setting of the educational programme. With her language choice, she tries to help the student orienting to this context. In contrast, in the interaction with the researchers she uses German and thus aligns to an informal conversation, in which no explicit language rules are prescribed.

Another translanguaging example that focuses on task management is given in Extract 14. In this lesson, the classroom participants are reading out loud an English text on the subject matter and in between the teacher further elucidates on certain aspects in German.

Extract 14: School B – Lesson 2

T: yeah <LQde> ***hämoglobin ist der rote farbstoff*** {haemoglobin is the red pigment} </LQde> (.) what are you looking for? (.) [SX-f]

SX-f: for erm

T: is your text in front of you

SX-f: xxx

T: pardon?

SX-f: I have my text xxx <LQde> ***i hab mein text net do*** xxx ***also*** {I don't have my text with me xxx I mean} </LQde> forgotten

T: aha so you might want to look at [SX-m]'s text then (.) or no i got one here (.) okay <LQde> ***so hämoglobin der rote farbstoff*** (.) ***ham ma gsagt*** {so haemoglobin is the red pigment that's what we have said} </LQde>

At one point during her explanations, the educator notices that a student is searching for something and enquires in English about the problem. The answer provided by the learner is relatively noteworthy since she starts her justification in English, probably because her teacher uses this language as well, but the word *forgotten* cannot come to her mind so she draws resources from her linguistic repertoire and proceeds with her answer in German. In the meantime, the student has been able to access this linguistic item and hence resorts back to English. Interestingly, while attempting to solve the issue the teacher employs English but when continuing with the activity she returns to talking in German. It can be maintained that in this extract, translanguaging helps to distinguish when the speakers refer to task management and when they discuss the content.

Translanguaging instances that aid classroom management can be detected in the data as well. Extract 15 taken from the second History lesson is a salient example in this case.

Extract 15: School A – Lesson 2 (videotape)

S11: <LQde> *frau professo:r* {professor}
T: *ja?* {yeah} </LQde>
S11: can you come back to me:
T: <LQde> {with an English accent} *wos los* {what's up}
S11: *auf jedem computer den wir nehmen gibt's kein word* {on every computer we take we don't have Word} </LQde>

One student sitting in the back of the classroom addresses the teacher in German and receives a response in the same language. Interestingly though, S11 proceeds by posing his question in English. Reviewing the other recordings of this lesson, it was noticed that the group the learner is part of has been attempting to get the teacher's attention for a considerable time. Hence, when she finally registers their call, S11 translanguages probably in order to retain the teacher's attention and thereby creates a humorous effect since one can recognise his alleged despair. As a reaction, the teacher answers in German but pretends to have an English accent, which also results in a comical situation. The learner then aligns with the teacher's language choice and continues his talk in German. Since the conversation happens between an authoritative figure and a student, the language choice of the teacher might be influencing the continuation of the interaction. Nevertheless, translanguaging in this example functions particularly as a strategy to attract the educator's attention in order to be able to proceed with and organise the subsequent classroom activities.

Another translanguaging instance that pertains to classroom management is shown in Extract 16. Towards the end of the lesson, the teacher intends at first to discuss a text but realises that the learners are too exhausted and therefore incorporates a short movement activity into her class.

Extract 16: School B – Lesson 1

T: are you very tired?
SS: yes
T: stand up please (.) come on stand up (4) I EAve the pAper on the desk yeah (.) stand up (.) so stretch your body come on stretch stretch right arm left arm come on stretch it (.) try to touch the ceiling
SS: <LQde> *jo genau* {yeah right} </LQde> @@

- T: stand on tips of your (2) toes ye:s shut your mouth please (.) xxx stretch come on stretch (.) yes circle your right shoulder (2) five times (.) this is not your shoulder this is your shoulder circle it (.) <LQde> **I weiß net** {I don't know} </LQde> [SX-m] (.) circle your left shoulder come on [SX-f] (.) it's a very healthy exercise <LQde> **des is a ganz a gesunde Übung** {it's a very healthy exercise} </LQde> (.) circle once the right then the left and the right and the left come on [SX] <LQde> **NUR Fußball spielen is ah net gut xxx gö** {just playing football is also not good xxx right} </LQde> so and now from xxx (.) <LQde> **rechte linke manche von euch können die Schulter überhaupt ned gscheit bewegen** {right left some of you can't even move their shoulders properly} </LQde> (.) okay so bend your knees stop talking bend your knees and stand straight (.) and bend them again ten times please (.) come on (.) <LQde> **nur immer so a stückal ansonsten ist es ungesund ja genau** {just a bit otherwise it is unhealthy} </LQde> (.) now turn around turn around other direction (.) other direction {bell ringing} okay xxx <LQde> **so die** [SX-f] **läuft jetzt die ganze Pause durch und die** [SX-f] **die haben schon vorher Schluss gemacht** (.) **die dürfen jetzt die ganze Pause jetzt auf dem Platz laufen** {so [SX-f] will run the whole break and [SX-f] as well they ended the class beforehand (.) they have to run all over the place the whole break}
- SX-f: whole break}
- T: **jo genau** {yeah right} </LQde>
thank you very much girls
-

The instructions are given in English for the greatest part, but in between the teacher also utters German remarks. Most of these statements are comments on the physical exercise the learners are doing. For example, the educator tells a student that playing football is not the only way to stay healthy. Afterwards, she continues her instructions in the target language. However, this is not the case for her entire speech. It rather seems that the teacher is resorting to her linguistic repertoire freely in order to keep the interaction flow going. With regard to the pupils, they always use German in their relatively short answers although their teacher employs English. This practice might be due to the fact that the teacher usually insists on using the target language, as was discussed in chapter 6.1, in particular when the class is devoted to content material, and this activity is proceeding in a fairly relaxed atmosphere without any language constraints.

One factor that influences translanguaging practices unquestionably is emotional charge. In the present data, such instances do not occur in full class interaction but can rather be found in communication that happens during group work or between individual students and the teacher. Due to this fact, the two sequences chosen to illustrate the point in question are gathered from the audio recordings of School A. Extract 17 shows such a translanguaging moment, in which a student complains in German about the Internet not working properly.

Extract 17: School A – Lesson 3 (recording device d)

-
- SX-m: <LQde> **das internet ist so lahm** {the Internet is so slow} </LQde>
T: i know and i am very sorry for that (.) but i have nOt the power nOr the money to change it
SX: <LQde> **was denn** {what}
S1: **das internet** {the internet} @@
T: **aber ihr dürft gern (.) einen brief an den stadtschulrat schreiben dass wir (.) er nicht** [org1] **haben wollen als anbieter sondern eins das schneller ist** {but you could write a letter to the Vienna Board of Education that we don't want [org1] as a provider but one that is faster} </LQde>
-

In general, the participants of School A often discuss the malfunctioning of the Internet provided at that school. When the educator hears the learner's complaint, she gives him a response in English explaining why she cannot change the circumstances. Her answer in another language appears to be the opposite of alignment, which might stem from her own dissatisfaction and helplessness about the situation. When another student asks what the issue is, the teacher proposes in German that the pupils could write a letter to the school board. This translanguaging practice could imply that the educator would welcome this kind of action and possibly even support them in their doing. In this short passage, translanguaging is employed as a strategy in order to achieve an aim that goes even beyond the classroom.

A further example of translanguaging due to emotional charge is presented in Extract 18. Three students are working on their virtual presentation on the laptop and have previously reallocated the roles in their group. S2 is now responsible for typing the text, whereas the other two students assist him in formulating the sentences.

Extract 18: School A – Lesson 2 (recording device a)

-
- S3: they had to work everyday in extremely badly (.) BAD <LQde> **nicht** {not} </LQde> badly
S2: <LQde> **das hast DU geschrieben (.) hast du schon** {that's what you wrote (.) yes you did} xxx
S3: **hab ich nicht** {no I didn't} <LQde>
S1: {singing} <pvc> (baddy baddy) </pvc> conditions
S3: <LQde> **ich hab bis DOrt geschrieben** {I wrote until there}
S2: {sarcastic} **ja sicher** {yeah right} </LQde> (2) in coal mines
-

While reading, S3 notices that an adverb has been used instead of an adjective in one sentence and expresses his observation. For the purpose of emphasising the mistake, S3 utters the negation particle *nicht* 'not' in German but states the rest in English. S2 takes offence by this remark and immediately blames S3 for the error. Presumably, S2 resorts to the L1 at this moment because he is more proficient in it and can defend himself better. The third student attempts to end this controversy by making a song out of the words in English but to no effect. Subsequently, S3 intends to show his colleague the point where he stopped typing but only receives a sarcastic answer from his classmate. In order to continue with the task, S2 starts a new utterance in English that concerns the content. The purpose of the multilingual practices in this sequence is on the one hand to mark the beginning and the end of the debate between the two students and on the other hand the attempt to resolve the problem by their unbiased colleague.

6.3.3 Miscellaneous

Categorising translanguaging instances according to MOORE and NIKULA's (2016) approach into multilingual practices that either orient to language in content or to flow of interaction has proven suitable for the greatest part of this study. However, a small number of translanguaging moments could not be clearly grouped into either of these two categories and so those were classified under 'miscellaneous'. These instances will be examined more closely in this section of the thesis. An example thereof is shown in Extract 19, which is taken from the second History lesson of School A. One female student asks a classmate for help in English and afterwards makes an utterance that is unfortunately unintelligible. Furthermore, it cannot be ascertained whether the student translanguages in this part or whether she continues to use English. However, on the basis of her colleague's reaction it becomes apparent that the female learner has uttered something humorous since S11 accuses her in German of using his jokes. The female student then negates this by stating that her remark is actually a fact, which amuses another classmate. Remarkably, this student interposes an English idiomatic expression reaching the climax of this comical situation. S11 is upset about this comment and therefore imitates his female colleague.

Extract 19: School A – Lesson 2 (videotape)

SX-f: you'll have to help me xxx
S11: </LQde> **das ist mein witz** {that's my joke}
SX-f: **das ist kein witz das ist ne tatsache** {it's not a joke it's a fact} </LQde> @@@
SX-m: @@@ she got you: the:re
S11: {mocking} <LQde> **das ist eine tatsache** {it's a fact} </LQde>

In this sample, the students engage in multilingual practices neither for referring to language in content nor orienting towards the interaction flow but rather employ translanguaging for humorous purposes.

A further case in point where learners use their multilingual resources for amusement is illustrated in Extract 20. Three students of School A are studying an English text on their topic and one student then has the idea to read it out aloud in an imitated Russian accent, which he announces to his student in German.

Extract 20: School A – Lesson 2 (recording device a)

S2: <LQde> **lesen wir das jetzt** (.) **also** {let's read this now (.) so} </LQde> we found some very interesting information about kids in coal mines in the 19th century
<LQde> **warte ich lese gerne wie ein russe** {wait I like reading like a Russian} </LQde>
S3: in the 19th and 20th century <LQde> **oder** {or} </LQde>
S2: {with Russian accent} no let's start off with with the question
S3: <LQde> **eine frage jetzt 19. und 20. jahrhundert oder** {one question is it now the 19th and 20th century or} </LQde>
S2: {with Russian accent} xxx still some kids work in coal mines sadly yes
S1: @@
S2: {with Russian accent} in some parts of the world kids have to work in mines
S1: {with Russian accent} in some part of the worlds
S2: {with Russian accent} the only difference is diffe- <LQde> **ja hey das sieht aus wie ein** <spel> **o l e** </spel> **aber es ist ein** <spel> **c l e** </spel> {yeah hey this looks like it is spelled ole but it is actually cle} </LQde>
S1: okay
S2: <1> xxx </1>
S1: {with Russian accent} <1> but there are </1> more terrifying facts about kids in vodka @@
S2: {with Russian accent} kids in vodka @@

His colleague tries to ignore him at first and poses a question about the content initially in English and then again in German. The purpose of his translanguaging procedure probably lies in his effort to proceed with the task but S3 continues with his humorous action. As a

result, their classmate participates in S2's comical activity, which is only shortly interrupted when S2 detects a mistake in the text. Afterwards, the two students continue with their amusement but then even start changing the text and incorporate jokes into it. Similar to the previously discussed example, the students in this passage neither discuss linguistic matters nor use translanguaging for communicative purposes, but rather resort to their linguistic repertoire to create humorous effects and thereby enjoy their multilingual ability to playfully employ various languages at the same time.

Translanguaging instances where students start singing in another language have been categorised as miscellaneous. Such moments usually do not happen when the teacher is present, which means that recordings of the whole classroom do not include this kind of translanguaging. Therefore, the two sequences chosen for illustration are taken from the audio recordings of School A only. Extract 21 features three female students who are working together in a group. They are at the final stages of completing their virtual presentation. One student, however, is not contributing much to the completion of the task and during the whole lesson often makes side comments. This is the case in Extract 21, where S1 states in German that they are growing mature since they are already in seventh grade. Her colleagues ignore her comment as they are committed to the task and discuss the following steps they want to take. Possibly due to their disregard towards S1 and because the thought has triggered something in the student's mind, she starts singing a song in English that addresses the topic of eternal youth.

Extract 21: School A – Lesson 3 (recording device a)

S1:	<LQde> wir sind jetzt in der dritten wä:h wir werden alt {we are in seventh grade now oh we are growing old}
S2:	okay fertig jetzt gehen wir auf andere {okay ready let's go to other} </LQde>
S1:	{singing} forever young i wanna be forever young (.) i don't want to be a princess
SS:	@ @ @
S3:	[S2] <LQde> wie können wir jetzt auf unsere {how can we now ours}
S1:	xxx eine prinzeßin okay {a princess okay}
S2:	okay [S1] tut mir leid (.) warum {okay [S1] I'm sorry (.) why} </LQde>

Subsequently, she tells a joke that makes her two classmates laugh for a short time but they again return to the assignment. As a consequence, S1 emphasises her statement in German and only then S2 responds to her remark, which seems to satisfy S1 as she does not

interrupt their work in the following. Translanguaging in this episode particularly serves S1 to direct the attention towards her and to distract the other students from working. The most absorbing aspect in this context is that the thought of ageing activates the student's multilingual resources and that she thereafter associates a song with this situation. Furthermore, it is also interesting that the learner remains using English in her talk and that she only translanguages after she cannot realise her intentions.

Another situation, in which pupils begin singing in a different language, is shown in Extract 22.

Extract 22: School A – Lesson 1 (recording device d)

S1: <LQde> **das ist ur leicht** {that's really easy}
 S2: **wir haben zwei bis drei stunden** {we've got two to three lessons} </LQde>
 S1: also don't {singing} do do do do don't
 S2: {singing} saturday night <1> jackson mississippi </1>
 S1: {singing} <1> jackson mississippi </1>
 T: very important if you already started a DOcument (.) <2> or a POWerpoint </2> presentation you have to SAVE it somewhere <LQde> **ja?** {yeah} </LQde> <3> so otherwise it will </3> get lost and then its bad (.) WHERE to save it? probably on your own datastorage (.) have you already started something
 S1: <2> a document </2> <LQde> **aso wart wir müssen** <4> **DEIN account** </4> {wait we have to <3> your account </3>}
 S2: **oh scheiße abgestürzt** {oh shit it crashed}
 S1: **wart das ist falsch** {wait that's wrong}
 S2: **aso stimmt das kann man sperren** {oh right you can lock that} </LQde>
 S1: {singing} saturday night saturday night jackson mississippi xxxx

The two students of this passage have just read through the instructions for the virtual presentation. It appears that while reading the students encounter the word *don't*, which seems to be the trigger for them starting to sing a song in English. This activity gets interrupted by the teacher giving instructions to the class, which results in the students resorting to German in order to discuss their course of action for the task. Thereafter, it seems that their computer is down and so the learners cannot proceed discussing the task. This disturbance results in the learners having time off that they use to continue singing their song. In this example, translanguaging is simply used for entertainment purposes. Having reviewed all the results of this thesis' analysis, it needs to be determined whether the data applies to current theories on translanguaging, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

7 Discussion

The analysis of the data in the previous section has yielded some valuable results that need to be discussed in greater detail with reference to the theory that has been presented in the first part of this work. By means of this endeavour, it is intended to answer the research questions posed in this thesis. In general, it can be maintained that all classroom participants – regardless of their role in class – adopted translanguaging practices in their discourse. At times, the use of multilingual resources seemed intentional, for example when the teacher attempted to enlarge the students' vocabulary on a certain topic in Extract 7, but the majority of translanguaging instances display ordinary multilingual behaviour. This linguistic behaviour implies that both learners and teachers perceive the CLIL lessons as a multilingual space, which supports their “becoming multilingual” (CENOZ & GORTER 2015: 3) through “being multilingual” (CENOZ & GORTER 2015: 3). However, the investigation also revealed that one teacher rather endorsed the atomistic view on multilingualism, discussed in chapter 2.1.1, since she tried to isolate the usage of German and English for different activities. In contrast, the other teacher welcomed translanguaging practices in the classroom by offering her pupils the possibility of completing the task in either language. Considering students' language performance in the light of these attitudes, it is assumed that learners who were allowed to make use of their full linguistic repertoire had more opportunities to take risks in the target language and thereby improve their language competence, as demonstrated in Extract 12. It seems that learners in this learning situation did not fear to experiment with language in order to arrive not only on the accurate form but also on the correct meaning of their communicative intentions. This claim is also supported by the quantitative analysis of this study, which yielded the results that pupils in School A used translanguaging to a greater extent to orient to the flow of interaction. Thereby, they were able to continue with their interaction without great communicative disruptions. In contrast, students whose teacher constrained them in their language choice faced communicative breakdowns more often, like in Extract 14. This observation resembles the one by VAN VIEGEN STILLE et al. (2016: 497) that it is not the content that might cause problems at times but rather the language. Therefore, WOLFF and SUDHOFF'S (2015: 20) proposition that using the target language only constitutes the ideal form of CLIL provision is not supported by the material analysed in this

thesis. Rather the outcomes of this study support BAKER'S (2011: 290) suggestion that translanguaging may assist the development of the learners' oral communication and literacy skills in their weaker language and are in accordance with GARCÍA and SYLVAN'S (2011: 398) claim that allowing translanguaging in instruction can help students become "more confident users of academic English". In this context, it appears that a positive atmosphere in CLIL lessons, where multilingualism is permitted or even embraced, tolerates learners experimenting with language. As a result, students have greater courage to make formal mistakes while being engaged with the content and which provides them with more opportunities to improve both their content and language knowledge.

Regarding the enhancement of linguistic knowledge in content learning, translanguaging in the data of this study is used for the greatest part to orient to meaning. Similar to MOORE and NIKULA'S (2016) investigation, a large number of translanguaging instances revolve around key terminology. Particularly in the database of School B, the teacher often insists on providing specific terms in either the L1 or L2. As MOORE and NIKULA (2016: 220) have already stated, "content teachers often believe that one of their principle tasks in CLIL lies in making sure the learners are equipped with L2 content-specific terminology". In this case, it must be added that the educator of School B also strives to accomplish that students learn the terms in their L1 as well, which is indeed an important learning goal in the context of CLIL. The method she follows for that undertaking is translation most of the time, as can be seen in Extract 7. Compared to the History lessons, this strategy is used more frequently in the Natural science classes than in lessons that pertain to the Humanities. From these results, it is inferred that the lexis of 'hard' science lessons features more key terminology that has to be taught to the students, while social science classes can focus more on developing communication skills. This assumption is also mirrored in the quantitative analysis conducted. As has been shown in Table 6, both teachers and learners in School B employed translanguaging to a higher extent to orient to language in content compared to the number they used translanguaging for organising their flow of interaction. Further research is definitely needed though in order to make broad generalisations on that issue. However, it can be maintained that allowing translanguaging in the classroom can work against the belief that CLIL means that students are less proficient in the language of schooling; since, in this data at least, the teacher of School B attempts to equip the learners with the

terminology in both languages. In addition, translanguaging in CLIL classes can lessen the common concern of “reduced subject competence as a result of either imperfect understanding or the fact that teachers preempt this problem and simplify content” (DALTON-PUFFER 2011: 188) as both teachers in this study clearly make an effort that all students understand the content without reducing the degree of difficulty by on the one hand providing the translation for important terms (particularly employed by the teacher of School B) and on the other hand explaining complex content through the use of both languages of schooling (especially noticeable in the teaching fashion of educator in School A). Thus, translanguaging can be viewed as a helpful tool in that it scaffolds the negotiation of meaning and the teaching and learning of content.

In this study, translanguaging instances do not only focus on meaning but multilingual practices are also used for discussing the form of language. This insight contradicts the hypothesis proposed by MOORE and NIKULA (2016: 226) who maintain that translanguaging moments centre around lexis rather than on form. The analysis of this thesis revealed that students employ translanguaging on the one hand to determine the correct spelling of a word, as shown in Extract 9 and Extract 10, and on the other hand to reflect upon the structure of language, like in Extract 11 and Extract 12. It needs to be mentioned that in all four samples, the learners were occupied with either completing or composing a text. This circumstance might be the reason for the difference in outcomes between this study and the one conducted by MOORE and NIKULA (2016), which did not include translanguaging moments that focus on writing. In contrast to writing episodes, oral classroom communication in CLIL contexts rather revolves around understanding the meaning than centering around the discussion of accuracy, as has been observed by DALTON-PUFFER and SMIT (2007: 9). However, employing a translanguaging technique in their writing activities led students to a “conscious and critical appropriation” (MOTLHAKA & MAKALELA 2016: 258) of their texts, which can be especially seen in Extract 12. Furthermore, in this passage LI WEI’S (2011a: 1223) concepts of creativity and criticality can be detected in the students’ translingual practices. In their talk, the students discuss whether they should use informal language in their formal writing, which would constitute creativity according to the scholar’s definition. This possible choice is frowned upon by one learner, which would then depict criticality. These two concepts can also be found in Extract 11, where the students are critical of the grammatical construction

produced by them and where one student creatively merges English lexis and German structure. The speaker's utterance supports the proposition postulated by CREESE and BLACKLEDGE (2010) that skills and knowledge across languages are not separate but rather interdependent. In this context, they further assert that "[i]t is the combination of both languages that keeps the task moving forward" (110), which can be witnessed in Extract 11 as well. The learner in the chosen extract seems to have used strategically any signs and forms she had at her disposal to contribute to the task at hand in order to create a meaningful and accurate sentence. These cited examples provide a fairly realistic portrait of translanguaging in CLIL when the focus is on the language itself, but multilingual practices are further used to organise the flow of interaction.

Translanguaging instances that do not focus on negotiation of matters of subject content are often used to support task or classroom management as well as to express emotional charge. While trying to make sense of the task at hand, classroom participants in this study employ translanguaging techniques for – what DUARTE (2016: 13) has described as – “solving managerial aspects”. Regarding the learners, these aspects basically incorporate checking for instructions, as MOORE and NIKULA (2016) have already noted, which is also the case in Extract 13. Furthermore, translanguaging in the data served to distinguish between discourse on the task and discourse on the content, as demonstrated in Extract 14. This practice is possibly related to the teacher's attitude towards multilingualism since she also separates languages for different activities. However, it is not clear whether her procedure happens intentionally or instinctively. Translanguaging occurrences that appertain to classroom management were defined by GIERLINGER (2015: 353) as “any majority language intervention by the teacher that supported the setting up of the learning environment”, which specifically includes giving instruction or making announcements. These two factors can be ascertained in Extract 16, where the teacher translanguages while performing a physical activity with the students and at the end of the lessons announces that two of the learners have to continue with the task. The other example of using multilingual practices for aiding classroom management involves student's translanguaging as a means to gain the teacher's attention. This attention-getting strategy also includes humorous sequences to give the action more prominence. Multilingual practices in the classroom can also be used to express emotion regarding a certain topic, which is illustrated in Extract 17 and Extract 18. Translanguaging in the former

example serves also a broader function outside the classroom. The teacher employs this strategy to signal alignment since through her usage of English she distances herself from taking any action regarding the Internet issue of the school at first. Then, however, she implicitly expresses her support if the learners decide to take steps by adopting the language the students use at that moment, which is German. As CANAGARAJAH (2011a: 406) has already remarked “[s]uch strategies help in realigning relationships between interlocutors [...] setting aside their status differences, biases, and inhibitions”. Thus, translanguaging in this example lessens the teacher’s power-distance and assists in establishing a solidary relationship with the students. It can be claimed that the teacher thereby creates a “space in which students’ voices are validated and valorized” (HORNBERGER & LINK 2012: 270). As a consequence, such a positive environment encourages and promotes the usage of one’s full linguistic repertoire.

The analysis conducted in this thesis has furthermore revealed that classroom participants indeed resort to their entire language repertoire during content lessons. Besides the two official languages of instruction in these lessons, English and German, the data also features Italian, BCMS and three other languages that cannot be determined. However, it has to be noted that these mentioned languages can only be detected in the data set of School A. This circumstance might be due to the fact that the database of this research site consists of both video recordings of the whole class and of group work audio recordings. The data set of School B only comprises audio recordings of the whole classroom interaction. Hence, the amount of data is much larger in School A than in School B (the word count of the former is five times higher than the one of the latter) allowing for more linguistic phenomena to occur. Another possible explanation of this condition, which is more likely, is that the percentage of linguistic diversity in the area of these schools differs. As was described in chapter 2.1.3, Vienna exhibits a higher rate of multilingual students than Burgenland. Nevertheless, the outcomes of the study clearly indicate that “students frequently pull resources from their entire linguistic repertoire to assist them in the construction of meaning” (POZA 2016: 3), which can be observed particularly in Extract 5. Even though the examined CLIL lessons are conceptualised as using English and German in class, students as well as teachers in this study disregard these bilingual arrangements and resort to other languages in order “to make sense and perform [multi]lingually in the myriad ways of the

96

classroom” (GARCÍA & SYLVAN 2011: 389). In Extract 5, the pupils assumingly resort to their L1 in order to comprehend the content of the task at hand and to deepen their knowledge on the topic.

Another interesting result of the analysis is the linguistic behaviour of the teaching assistant in School A, which illustrates the point that “language users have access to features from a wide range of different sets of features [...] and that this repertoire of language features might be wider or narrower across different domains” (GORT 2015: 1). The American native speaker, who had moved to Austria only shortly prior to the research project, used a few German phrases in his speech even though he was instructed to adhere to talking exclusively in English. Thus, the teaching assistant has adapted his linguistic performance to this multilingual environment or, in other words, his performance of multilingualism has been the result of “local practices where numerous languages are negotiated for interaction” (CANAGARAJAH 2011b: 1). These samples illustrate that CLIL lessons can be perceived as highly multilingual settings despite being designed as bilingual education.

Since the classroom is a multilingual context, classroom participants do not only behave multilingually when referring to educational matters but also engage in multilingual practices in their daily routine. It seems that due to globalisation and the development of technology, students have greater access to artefacts in a language other than their L1. This claim is deduced from the pupils’ absorption of English songs into their speech, as demonstrated in Extract 21 and Extract 22. In general, the audio recordings of School A often displayed sequences in which students started singing. Furthermore, the data shows that learners employed translanguageing in personal discussions too, mostly for humorous purposes, as for example in Extract 19 or in Extract 20. The students playfully draw on their linguistic repertoire and thereby enjoy their ability of expressing themselves in various languages. These sequences can mostly be found in off-task discourse when learners try to bridge technological problems or when one pupil tries to disturb the others in their work. However, it can be argued that as students are adding resources of a new language – which is English most of the time – to their repertoire, they increasingly behave multilingually in their everyday life situations as well. Taking all these points into consideration, it could be argued that “[t]ranslanguageing is not only a way to ‘scaffold’ instruction, to make sense of

learning and language; rather, translanguaging is part of the metadiscursive regimes that students in the twenty-first century must perform” (GARCÍA 2011: 147) and already perform to a great extent.

8 Conclusion

The aim of the diploma thesis at hand has been to shed light on multilingual practices of classroom participants in CLIL settings. Thereby, it was aimed to contribute to the on-going academic discussion concerning multilingualism, more specifically to scholarship on translanguaging. Research in this field proposes the concept of dynamic multilingualism and suggests that speakers draw their linguistic resources from one repertoire for communicative purposes. As a consequence, engaging in multilingual practices seems to be the norm rather than the exception. With regard to education, this theory then implies that translanguaging can be considered an essential tool in the classroom since it supports learners to make sense of the content matter by activating all meaning-making resources. Moreover, using one's multilingual resources can enhance cognitive, language and literacy abilities. On that note, translanguaging contradicts the entrenched belief that allowing linguistic diversity in the classroom has negative effects on students' learning. Hence, this point also reinforces the implementation of CLIL programmes in schools, which is often accompanied with scepticism regarding the learning outcomes. Studies on translanguaging have shown that in such settings students still focus on content even though they encounter language barriers at times.

The study conducted attempted to answer one main research question and three additional sub-questions. First of all, the analysis of the transcripts revealed that all classroom participants engaged in translanguaging practices. In this context, it was determined that learners attending lessons where linguistic diversity is overtly welcomed and the use of multilingual resources is promoted improved their language and content knowledge to a greater extent than students whose teacher tried to compartmentalise activities according to the usage of a certain language. Secondly, languages that were not the official medium of language in these settings also appeared in the data. This result indicates that speakers resort to their full linguistic repertoire even though the language choice in the classroom is regulated by school policy; this implies that curricular arrangements where one language is used at a certain time or in a certain subject or by a certain teacher need to be reconsidered in order to respond to learners' complex multilingualisms. Thirdly, the study showed that translanguaging was strategically employed in the classroom participants' discourse. In

agreement with other studies, translanguaging instances revolve around lexis for the greatest part. However, an outcome that has not yet been observed by other scholars is that learners also use translanguaging strategies to refer to the form of language. For example, pupils employed multilingual practices to discuss the spelling of a word or to determine the correct construction of a sentence. When the focus was not on language in content, translanguaging was used for task and classroom management as well as to express emotions towards aspects regarding the educational environment. Moreover, as students have been developing their multilingual competence through language education, they also behaved like multilinguals in sequences that were classified as off-task sections. Lastly, no clear results could be obtained with regard to the difference between CLIL in science classes and CLIL in a Humanities subject. It has only been assumed that the former context required translanguaging in order to translate essential key terminology, whereas students enjoying CLIL History lessons had the possibility to enhance their communicative competence through translanguaging. However, these claims need to be substantiated by additional scholarship on this topic.

Due to the limitations of this study, further research into this topic is needed. For the analysis of multilingual practices, six classroom lessons were used, which constitutes a rather small sample size. Therefore, this thesis could serve as a starting point for a large-scale study that investigates the phenomenon in Austrian CLIL classes. Furthermore, the data featured relatively loud background noise, which resulted in long sequences that could not be transcribed thoroughly. Closely related, the teachers displayed a clear and loud voice so that their discourse could be rendered more precisely. These two aspects might have had an impact on the outcomes of this scrutiny. Hence, future research could take these issues into account by giving the position of the recording devices more thought. One major issue in this diploma thesis is that the researcher has not been proficient in all languages that occurred in classroom interaction. This circumstance might have resulted in crucial evidence being neglected. Moreover, the researcher could not determine what students were discussing at one point in the data and so was not able to examine the purpose of the learners' translanguaging. In the future, students' language portrait should be collected before the investigation and if needed experts in languages that occur in translanguaging moments should be consulted. Moreover, there is a clear need for action concerning theoretical

100

underpinnings for instructional strategies and teacher education. These operations are of great importance as translanguaging has the potential of creating more democratic classroom environments – particularly those that are highly heterogeneous – and through this greater learning opportunities can be created.

In conclusion, this diploma thesis provides additional evidence that translanguaging in educational settings is a useful instrument and should be highly valued. If no action is taken towards establishing an educational environment that allows students to embrace their multilingualism, it would deprive them of precious learning moments and thereby their multilingual competence might get simply *lost in translanguaging*.

9 References

- Adamson, John; Coulson, David. 2015. "Translanguaging in English academic writing preparation". *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning* 10(1), 24-37.
- Atkinson, Dwight (ed.). 2011. *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Baker, Colin. 2001. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. (3rd edition). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, Colin. 2011. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. (5th edition). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bauer-Marschallinger, Silvia. 2016. "Acquisition of historical competences in the CLIL history classroom". Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.
- Becker, Alton. 1988. "Language in particular: a lecture". In Tannen, Deborah (ed.). *Linguistics in context*. Norwood: Ablex, 17-35.
- Beres, Anna. 2015. "An overview of translanguaging: 20 years of 'giving voice to those who do not speak'". *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts* 1(1), 103-118.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Bovellan, Eveliina. 2014. *Teachers' beliefs about learning and language as reflected in their views of teaching materials for content and language integrated learning (CLIL)*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Printing House.
- Braun, Maximilian. 1937. "Beobachtungen zur Frage der Mehrsprachigkeit". *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 4, 115-130.
- Bruton, Anthony. 2013. "CLIL: some of the reasons why ... and why not". *System* 41(3), 587-597.
- Bundesministerium für Bildung (BMB). 2000. "Lehrplan AHS Unterstufe: Lebende Fremdsprachen (Erste, Zweite)". https://www.bmb.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/ahs8_782.pdf?5te5g1 (March 6 2017).
- Bundesministerium für Bildung (BMB). 2004. "Lehrplan AHS Oberstufe: Lebende Fremdsprachen (Erste, Zweite)". https://www.bmb.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/lp_ahs_os_lebende_fs_11854.pdf?5te975 (March 6 2017).
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2007a. "Lingua franca English, multilingual communities and language acquisition". *The Modern Language Journal* 91(5), 923-939.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2007b. "The ecology of global English". *International Multilingual Research Journal* 1(2), 89-100.

- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011a. "Codemeshing in academic writing: identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging". *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 401-417.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2011b. "Translanguaging in the classroom: emerging issues for research and pedagogy". In Li Wei (ed.) *Applied linguistics review. Volume 2*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1-27.
- Carstens, Adelia. 2016. "Translanguaging as a vehicle for L2 acquisition and L1 development: students' perceptions". *Language Matters* 47(2), 203-222.
- Çekrezi, Rozeta. 2011. "CLIL and teacher training". *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15, 3821-3825.
- Celaya, Maria; Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda. 2010. "First languages and age in CLIL and non-CLIL contexts". *International CLIL Research Journal* 1(3), 60-66.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Genesee, Fred; Gorter, Durk. 2014. "Critical analysis of CLIL: taking stock and looking forward". *Applied Linguistics* 35(3), 243-262.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk. 2010. "The diversity of multilingualism in education". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 205, 37-53.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk. 2011. "Focus on multilingualism: a study of trilingual writing". *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 356-369.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk. 2015. "Towards a holistic approach in the study of multilingual education". In Cenoz, Jasone; Gorter, Durk (eds.). *Multilingual education: between language learning and translanguaging*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-15.
- Cenoz, Jasone; Jessner, Ulrike. 2009. "The study of multilingualism in educational contexts". In Aronin, Larissa; Hufeisen, Britta (eds.). *The exploration of multilingualism: development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 121-138.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2000. "Research on multilingual acquisition". In Cenoz, Jasone; Jessner, Ulrike (eds.). *The acquisition of a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 39-53.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2013a. "Defining multilingualism". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33, 3-18.
- Cenoz, Jasone. 2013b. "Multilingualism". In Chapelle, Carol (ed.). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 1-8.
- Cook, Vivian. 1992. "Evidence for multicompetence". *Language Learning* 42(4), 557-591.
- Cook, Vivian. 2001. "Using the first language in the classroom". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(3), 402-423.
- Cook, Vivian. 2012. "Multi-Competence". In Chapelle, Carol (ed.). *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1-6.

- Coyle, Do; Hood, Philip; Marsh, David. 2010. *CLIL: content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creese, Angela; Blackledge, Adrian. 2010. "Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: a pedagogy for learning and teaching?". *The Modern Language Journal* 94(1), 103-115.
- Creswell, John. 2014. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. (4th edition). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Cromdal, Jakob. 2005. "Bilingual order in collaborative word processing: on creating an English text in Swedish". *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(3), 329-353.
- Cummins, Jim. 1979. "Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question, and some other matters". *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 19, 121-129.
- Cummins, Jim. 1987. "Bilingualism, language proficiency and metalinguistic development". In Homel, Peter; Palij, Michael; Aaronson, Doris (eds.). *Childhood bilingualism: aspects of linguistic, cognitive and social development*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum, 57-73.
- Cummins, Jim. 2008. "Teaching for transfer: challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education". In Cummins, Jim; Hornberger, Nancy (eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education: volume 5: bilingual education*. (2nd edition). New York: Springer, 65-75.
- Dale, Liz; Tanner, Rosie. 2012. *CLIL activities: a resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dallinger, Sara; Jonkmann, Kathrin; Hollm, Jan; Fiege, Christiane. 2016. "The effect of content and language integrated learning on students' English and history competences: killing two birds with one stone?". *Learning and Instruction* 41, 23-31.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Hüttner, Julia; Jexenflicker, Silvia; Schindlegger, Veronika; Smit, Ute. 2008. *CLIL an österreichischen HTLs: Projektbericht*. Vienna: Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Llinares, Ana; Lorenzo, Francisco; Nikula, Tarja. 2014. "'You can stand under my umbrella': immersion, CLIL and bilingual education. A response to Cenoz, Genesee & Gorter (2013)". *Applied Linguistics* 35(2), 213-218.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute. 2010. "Charting policies, premises and research on content and language integrated learning". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 1-22.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Smit, Ute (eds.). 2007. *Empirical perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2007. *Discourse in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2011. "Content-and-language integrated learning: from practice to principles?". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31, 182-204.
- Dorninger, Christian. 2013. Vorwort. In: BMUKK. *CLIL Content and Language Integrated Learning. Leitfaden zur Umsetzung an HTLs*.
https://www.cebs.at/fileadmin/user_upload/service/CLIL/clil_austria_HTL_Leitfaden_ab.pdf
 (March 29 2017).
- Duarte, Joana. 2016. "Translanguaging in mainstream education: a sociocultural approach". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15.
- European Commission. 1995. *Teaching and learning: towards the learning society: white paper on education and training*. Brussels.
http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf (March 5 2017).
- European Commission. 2007. *Final report: high level group on multilingualism*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Eurydice, the information network on education in Europe. 2005. *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe – Austria: national description 2004/05*. Brussels: Eurydice Unit.
- Eurydice, the information network on education in Europe. 2006. *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice Unit.
- Eurydice, the information network on education in Europe. 2012. *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe – 2012*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Cultural Executive Agency.
- Faltis, Christian. 1990. "New directions in bilingual research design: the study of interactive decisions making". In Jacobson, Rodolfo; Faltis, Christian (eds.). *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 71-96.
- Franceschini, Rita. 2011. "Multilingualism and multicompetence: a conceptual view". *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 344-355.
- Frydrychova Klimova, Blanka. 2012. "CLIL and the teaching of foreign languages". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 47, 572-576.
- García, Ofelia; Kleyn, Tatyana. 2016. "Translanguaging theory in education". In García, Ofelia; Kleyn, Tatyana (eds.). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: learning from classroom moments*. New York: Routledge, 9-33.
- García, Ofelia; Li Wei. 2014. *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García, Ofelia; Sylvan, Claire. 2011. "Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: singularities in pluralities". *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 385-400.
- García, Ofelia. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- García, Ofelia. 2011. "Educating New York's bilingual children: constructing a future from the past". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14(2), 133-153.
- García, Ofelia. 2012. "Theorizing translanguaging for educators". In Celic, Christina; Seltzer, Kate (eds.). *Translanguaging: a CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. New York: CUNY-NYSIEB The Graduate Center, 1-6.
- Gené-Gil, Maria; Juan-Garau, Maria; Salazar-Noguera, Joana. 2015. "Development of EFL writing over three years in secondary education: CLIL and non-CLIL settings". *The Language Learning Journal* 43(3), 286-303.
- Gierlinger, Erwin. 2007. "Modular CLIL in lower secondary education: some insights from a research project in Austria". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Empirical perspectives on CLIL classroom discourse*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 79-118.
- Gierlinger, Erwin. 2015. "'You can speak German, sir': on the complexity of teachers' L1 use in CLIL". *Language and Education* 29(4), 347-368.
- Gort, Mileidis. 2015. "Transforming literacy learning and teaching through translanguaging and other typical practices associated with 'doing bilingual'". *International Multilingual Research Journal* 9, 1-6.
- Graddol, David. 2004. "The future of language". *Science Magazine* 303(5663), 1329-1331.
- Grosjean, François. 1982. *Life with two languages: an introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, François. 1985. "The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6(6), 467-477.
- Heller, Monica. 1999. *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, Monica. 2007. "Bilingualism as ideology and practice". In Heller, Monica (ed.). *Bilingualism: a social approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-22.
- Hopkins, David. 2014. *A teacher's guide to classroom research*. (5th edition). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hornberger, Nancy; Link, Holly. 2012. "Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15(3), 261-178.
- Hornberger, Nancy. 2003. "Continua of biliteracy". In Hornberger, Nancy (ed.). *Continua of biliteracy: an ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 3-34.
- HTL, Bildung mit Zukunft. *CLIL: Verankerung im Lehrplan*.
<http://www.htl.at/htlat/schwerpunktportale/clil-content-and-language-integrated-learning/wie-ist-clil-rechtlich-verankert.html> (March 29 2017).

- Hufeisen, Britta. 2005. "Gesamtsprachencurriculum: Einflussfaktoren und Bedingungsgefüge". In Hufeisen, Britta; Lutjeharms, Madeline (eds.). *Gesamtsprachencurriculum. Integrierte Sprachendidaktik. Common Curriculum: theoretische Überlegungen und Beispiele der Umsetzung*. Tübingen: Narr, 9-18.
- Hüttner, Julia; Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Smit, Ute. 2013. "The power of beliefs: lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16(3), 267-284.
- Hüttner, Julia; Rieder-Bünemann, Angelika. 2010. "A cross-sectional analysis of oral narratives by children with CLIL and non-CLIL instruction". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 61-79.
- Ioannou Georgiou, Sophie. 2012. "Reviewing the puzzle of CLIL". In *ELT Journal* 66(4), 495-504.
- Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1983. "Can two languages be acquired concurrently? Recent developments in bilingual methodology". In Altman, Howard; McClure, Malcom (eds.). *Dimensions: language '82*. Louisville: University of Louisville Press, 110-131.
- Jessner, Ulrike. 2008. "Teaching third languages: findings, trends and challenges". *Language Teaching* 41(1), 15-56.
- Jexenflicker, Silvia; Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2010. "The CLIL differential: comparing the writing of CLIL and non-CLIL student in higher colleges of technology". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 169-190.
- Jiménez Catalán, Rosa; Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda; Cenoz, Jasone. 2006. "Vocabulary profiles of English Foreign Language learners in English as a subject and as a vehicular language". *VIEWZ Vienna English Working Papers* 15(3), 23-27.
- Jonsson, Carla. 2013. "Translanguaging and multilingual literacies: diary-based case studies of adolescents in an international school". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 224, 85-117.
- Jørgensen, Jens. 2008. "Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3), 161-176.
- Juffermans, Kasper. 2011. "The old man and the letter: repertoires of literacy and languaging in a modern multiethnic Gambian village". *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 41(2), 165-179.
- Kemp, Charlotte. 2009. "Defining multilingualism". In Aronin, Larissa; Hufeisen, Britta (eds.). *The exploration of multilingualism: development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 11-26.
- Koopman, Gerrit; Skeet, Jason; de Graaff, Rick. 2014. "Exploring content teachers' knowledge of language pedagogy: a report on a small-scale research project in a Dutch CLIL context". *The Language Learning Journal* 42(2), 123-136.

- Kornfeld, Maria. 2012. "L1 in EFL & CLIL classrooms". Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.
- Krumm, Hans-Jürgen. 2005. "Von der additiven zur curricularen Mehrsprachigkeit: über die Notwendigkeit der Einbeziehung von Minderheiten-, Migranten- und Nachbarsprachen". In Hufeisen, Britta; Lutjeharms, Madeline (eds.). *Gesamtsprachencurriculum. Integrierte Sprachendidaktik. Common Curriculum: theoretische Überlegungen und Beispiele der Umsetzung*. Tübingen: Narr, 27-36.
- Kumaravadivelu, Balasubramanian. 1999. "Critical classroom discourse analysis". *TESOL Quarterly* 33(3), 453-484.
- Langman, Juliet. 2014. "Translanguaging, identity, and learning: science teachers as engaged language planners". *Lang Policy* 13, 183-200.
- Lasagabaster, David; Sierra, Juan. 2010. "Immersion and CLIL in English: more differences than similarities". *ELT Journal* 64(4), 367-375.
- Lewis, Gwyn; Jones, Bryn; Baker, Colin. 2012a. "Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond". *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18(7), 641-654.
- Li Wei. 2008. "Research perspectives on bilingualism and multilingualism". In Li Wei; Moyer, Melissa (eds.). *The Blackwell guide to research methods in bilingualism and multilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 3-17.
- Li Wei. 2011a. "Moment analysis and translanguaging space: discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 1222-1235.
- Li Wei. 2011b. "Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: code- and modeswitching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools". *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 370-384.
- Li Wei. 2016. "New Chinglish and the post-multilingualism challenge: translanguaging ELF in China". *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 5(1), 1-25.
- Lin, Angel; Lo, Yuen Yi. 2017. "Trans/language and the triadic dialogue in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) classrooms". *Language and Education* 31(1), 26-45.
- Llinares, Ana; Morton, Tom; Whittaker, Rachel. 2012. *The roles of language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lüdi, Georges; Py, Bernard. 2009. "To be or not to be ... a plurilingual speaker". *International Journal of Multilingualism* 6(2), 154-167.
- Macaro, Ernesto. 2005. "Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy". In Llurda, Enric (ed.). *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. New York: Springer, 63-84.
- Maillat, Didier. 2010. "The pragmatics of L2 in CLIL". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 39-58.

- Makalela, Leketi. 2015. "Moving out of linguistic boxes: the effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms". *Language and Education* 29(3), 200-217.
- Martin-Beltrán, Melinda; Guzman, Natalia; Chen, Pei-Jie. 2017. "'Let's think about it together:' how teachers differentiate discourse to mediate collaboration among linguistically diverse students". *Language Awareness* 26(1), 41-58.
- Maturana, Humberto; Varela, Francisco. 1987 [1973]. *The tree of knowledge: the biological roots of human understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.
- May, Stephen (ed.). 2014. *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge.
- Mazak, Catherine; Herbas-Donoso, Claudia. 2015. "Translanguaging practices at a bilingual university: a case study of a science classroom". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18(6), 698-714.
- Medien-Servicestelle Neue Österreicher/innen. 2017. "Mehrsprachigkeit in Bildungseinrichtungen nimmt zu". http://medienservicestelle.at/migration_bewegt/2017/02/21/mehrsprachigkeit-in-bildungseinrichtungen-nimmt-zu/ (March 6 2017).
- Mehisto, Peeter; Marsh, David; Frigols, Maria. 2008. *Uncovering CLIL: content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Méndez García, María del Carmen; Pavón Vázquez, Victor. 2012. "Investigating the coexistence of the mother tongue and the foreign language through teacher collaboration in CLIL contexts: perceptions and practice of the teachers involved in the plurilingual programme in Andalusia". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15(5), 573-592.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2000. *Local histories/global designs: coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moate, Josephine. 2011. "The impact of foreign language mediated teaching on teachers' sense of professional integrity in the CLIL classroom". *European Journal of Teacher Education* 34(3), 333-346.
- Moore, Emilee. 2014. "Constructing content and language knowledge in plurilingual student teamwork: situated and longitudinal perspectives". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17(5), 586-609.
- Moore, Pat; Nikula, Tarja. 2016. "Translanguaging in CLIL classrooms". In Nikula, Tarja; Dafouz, Emma; Moore, Pat; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 211-234.
- Morton, Tom. 2012. "Teachers' knowledge about language and classroom interaction in content and language integrated learning". PhD dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Morton, Tom. 2013. "Critically evaluating materials for CLIL: practitioners' practices and perspectives". In Grey, John (ed.). *Critical perspectives on language teaching materials*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 111-136.

- Motlhaka, Hlavisio; Makalela, Leketi. 2016. "Translanguaging in an academic writing class: implications for a dialogic pedagogy". *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 34(3), 251-260.
- Navés, Teresa. 2011. "How promising are the results of integrating content and language for EFL writing and overall EFL proficiency?". In Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda; Sierra, Juan; Gallardo del Puerto, Francisco (eds.). *Content and foreign language integrated learning: contributions to multilingualism in European contexts*. Bern: Peter Lang, 155-186.
- Nezbeda, Margarete. 2005. *Überblicksdaten und Wissenswertes zu Fremdsprache als Arbeitssprache*. Graz: Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum.
- Nikula, Tarja; Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Llinares, Ana; Lorenzo, Francisco. 2016. "More than content and language: the complexity of integration in CLIL and bilingual education". In Nikula, Tarja; Dafouz, Emma; Moore, Pat; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Conceptualising integration in CLIL and multilingual education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1-25.
- Nikula, Tarja; Moore, Pat. 2016. "Exploring translanguaging in CLIL". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-13.
- Nikula, Tarja. 2007. "Speaking English in Finnish content-based classrooms". *World Englishes* 26(2), 206-223.
- Nikula, Tarja. 2010. "Effects of CLIL on a teacher's classroom language use". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 105-124.
- Ortega, Lourdes. 2014. "Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA". In May, Stephen (ed.). *The multilingual turn: implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge, 32-53.
- Otsuji, Emi; Pennycook, Alastair. 2011. "Social inclusion and metrolingual practices". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14(4), 413-426.
- Palmer, Deborah; Mateus, Suzanne; Martínez, Ramón Antontio; Henderson, Kathryn. 2014. "Reframing the debate on language separation: toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom". *The Modern Language Journal* 98(3), 757-772.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2010. *Language as a local practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Poza, Luis. 2016. "The language of ciencia: translanguaging and learning in a bilingual science classroom". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-19.
- Prieto-Arranz, José; Rallo Fabra, Lucrecia; Calafat-Ripoll, Caterina; Catrain-González, Magdalena. 2015. "Testing progress on receptive skills in CLIL and non-CLIL contexts". In Juan-Garau, Maria; Salazar-Noguera, Joana (eds.). *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments*. Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing, 123-137.

- Pujol-Ferran, Mercè; DiSanto, Jacqueline; Núñez Rodríguez, Nelson; Morales, Angel. 2016. "Exploring plurilingual pedagogies across the college curriculum". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 72(4), 530-549.
- Rallo Fabra, Lucrecia; Jacob, Karen. 2015. "Does CLIL enhance oral skills? Fluency and pronunciation errors by Spanish-Catalan learners of English". In Juan-Garau, Maria; Salazar-Noguera, Joana (eds.). *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments*. Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing, 163-178.
- Riazi, Mehdi. 2016. *The Routledge encyclopedia of research methods in applied linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Roberts, Deborah; Copping, Adrian. 2008. "Doing research in the classroom". In Elton-Chalcraft, Sally; Hansen, Alice; Twiselton, Samantha (eds.). *Doing classroom research: a step-by-step guide for student teachers*. Maidenhill: McGraw-Hill Education, 85-98.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda. 2010. "Written production and CLIL: an empirical study". In Dalton-Puffer, Christiane; Nikula, Tarja; Smit, Ute (eds.). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 191-212.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda. 2011. "Which language competencies benefit from CLIL?" In Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda; Sierra, Juan; Gallardo del Puerto, Francisco (eds.). *Content and foreign language integrated learning: contributions to multilingualism in European contexts*. Bern: Peter Lang, 129-153.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Yolanda. 2015. "The effects of implementing CLIL in education". In Juan-Garau, Maria; Salazar-Noguera, Joana (eds.). *Content-based language learning in multilingual educational environments*. Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing, 51-68.
- Rüschhoff, Bernd. 2015. "CLIL revisited: eine Synthese". In Rüschhoff, Bernd; Sudhoff, Julian; Wolff, Dieter (eds.). *CLIL Revisited: eine kritische Analyse zum gegenwärtigen Stand des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Verlag, 353-378.
- Rymes, Betsy. 2016. *Classroom discourse analysis: a tool for critical reflection*. New York: Routledge.
- Sampson, Andrew. 2012. "Learner code-switching versus English only". *ELT Journal* 66(3), 293-303.
- Sayer, Peter. 2013. "Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular". *TESOL Quarterly* 47(1), 63-88.
- Simons, Gary; Fennig, Charles. 2017. *Ethnologue: languages of the world*. (20th edition). Dallas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>. (13 March 2017)
- Soto Huerta, Mary. 2016. "Transformative pedagogy: emergent bilinguals and perspective taking". *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1-11.
- Statistik Austria. 2013. *Erwachsenenbildung: Ergebnisse des Adult Education Survey (AES)*. Wien: Verlag Österreich GmbH.

- Statistik Austria. 2016. *Schulstatistik: Fremdsprachenunterricht der Schülerinnen und Schüler im Schuljahr 2014/15*.
- Statistik Austria. 2017. "Bevölkerung seit 2001 nach Staatsangehörigkeit und Geburtsland". http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/menschen_und_gesellschaft/bevoelkerung/bevoelkerungsstruktur/bevoelkerung_nach_staatsangehoerigkeit_geburtsland/031396.html (March 5 2017).
- Stavans, Anat; Hoffmann, Charlotte. 2015. *Multilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, Anselm; Corbin, Juliet. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.
- Sun, Miao. 2016. "Peer collaboration in an English/Chinese bilingual program in Western Canada". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 72(4), 423-453.
- Swain, Merrill; Deters, Ping. 2007. "'New' mainstream SLA theory: expanded and enriched". *Modern Language Journal* 91(1), 820-836.
- Swain, Merrill. 2006. "Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language learning". In Byrnes, Heidi (ed.). *Advanced language learning: the contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*. London: Continuum, 95-108.
- UNESCO. 2017. *International Mother Language Day: towards sustainable futures through multilingual education*. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/international-mother-language-day/> (March 6 2017).
- Valdés, Guadalupe. 2005. "Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: opportunities lost or seized?" *Modern Language Journal* 89(3), 410-426.
- Van Viegen Stille, Saskia; Bethke, Robin; Bradley-Brown, Jackie; Giberson, Janet; Hall, Gillian. 2016. "Broadening educational practice to include translanguaging: an outcome of educator inquiry into multilingual students' learning needs". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 72(4), 480-503.
- Vildomec, Věroboj. 1963. *Multilingualism*. Leyden: A.W. Sythoff.
- Villareal Olaizola, Izaskun; del Pilar García Mayo. 2009. "Tense and agreement morphology in the interlanguage of Basque/Spanish bilinguals: CLIL versus non-CLIL". In Ruiz de Yarobe, Yolanda; Jiménez Catalán, Rosa (eds.). *Content and language integrated learning: evidence from research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 157-175.
- VOICE Project. 2007. *VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1]*. http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/documents/VOICE_mark-up_conventions_v2-1.pdf (7 April 2017).
- Wiesemes, Rolf. 2009. "Developing theories of practices in CLIL: CLIL as post-method pedagogies?" In Ruiz de Yarobe, Yolanda; Jiménez Catalán, Rosa (eds.). *Content and language integrated learning: evidence from research in Europe*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 41-59.

- Wildhage, Manfred; Otten, Edgar (eds.). 2009. *Praxis des bilingualen Unterrichts*. (3rd edition). Berlin: Cornelsen Verlag.
- Williams, Cen. 1994. *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]*. PhD thesis, University of Wales.
- Williams, Cen. 1996. "Secondary education: teaching in the bilingual situation". In Williams, Cen; Lewis, Gwyn; Baker, Colin (eds.). *The language policy: taking stock*. Llangefni: CAI, 39-78.
- Williams, Cen. 2003. "Defnyddio trawsieithu i ddatblygu llythrennedd deuol [Using translanguaging to develop dual literacy]". In Roberts, Gareth; Williams, Cen (eds.). *Addysg Gymraeg – Addysg Gymreig*. Bangor: School of Education, 288-312.
- Wolff, Dieter; Sudhoff, Julian. 2015. "Zur Definition des Bilingual Lehrens und Lernens". In Rüschoff, Bernd; Sudhoff, Julian; Wolff, Dieter (eds.). *CLIL Revisited: eine kritische Analyse zum gegenwärtigen Stand des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Verlag, 9-42.
- Wolff, Dieter. 2005. "Approaching CLIL". In: Marsh, David (ed.). *Project D3-CLILmatrix: the CLIL quality matrix. Central workshop report 6/2005*. Graz: European Centre for Modern Language. Council of Europe, 10-15.
- Wolff, Dieter. 2007. "CLIL: bridging the gap between school and working life". In Marsh, David; Wolff, Dieter (eds.). *Diverse contexts – converging goals: CLIL in Europe*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Verlag, 15-25.
- Wolff, Dieter. 2009. "Content and language integrated learning". In Knapp, Karlfried; Seidlhofer, Barbara (eds.); in cooperation with Widdowson, Henry. *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 545-572.
- Wright, Wayne; Sovicheth, Boun; García, Ofelia. 2015. "Introduction: key concepts and issues in bilingual and multilingual education". In Wright, Wayne; Sovicheth, Boun; García, Ofelia (eds.). *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 1-16.

10 Appendix

10.1 Abstract

The notion of translanguaging is gaining growing recognition in educational multilingual research at the present moment. This concept that relates to dynamic multilingualism rejects the idea that languages are isolated entities and rather proposes the presence of one linguistic repertoire from which speakers strategically select their communicative resources. Research into CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), which constitutes one form of multilingual education, has so far mostly adopted a monolingual orientation and thereby promoted the view of languages as separate codes. This diploma thesis attempts to contribute to the dynamic perspective on multilingualism with a focus on speakers' linguistic activity by exploring translanguaging instances in Austrian CLIL classrooms at lower secondary level. A classroom-based discourse analysis has been conducted on six CLIL lessons, of which three are History and the other three Biology classes. The investigation examines whether classroom participants resort to their full linguistic repertoire, meaning if other languages occur in the data besides the two official media of language, what purposes translanguaging serves in the classroom and whether there is a difference between the two subjects. The findings show that both teachers and learners employ translanguaging strategies in both educational and private interactions. Besides the two languages of schooling, English and German, speakers in these contexts also use other language resources in their speech to enhance both their linguistic and content knowledge. In general, this study reinforces the usefulness of translanguaging as an educational instrument and emphasises the value of resorting a speaker's entire linguistic repertoire in CLIL contexts.

10.2 Zusammenfassung

Das Konzept des „Translanguaging“ gewinnt immer mehr an Bedeutung in der Mehrsprachigkeitsforschung, vor allem im Bereich der Sprachendidaktik. Dieser innovative Ansatz, welcher in enger Verbindung mit dem dynamischen Modell der Mehrsprachigkeit steht, widerspricht der Ansicht, dass Sprachen isoliert voneinander bestehen und separat im Gehirn gespeichert sind. Es wird viel eher davon ausgegangen, dass Sprecherinnen und Sprecher ein Sprachenrepertoire besitzen, welches die Gesamtheit des sprachlichen Materials einer Person beinhaltet. Während einer Interaktion greifen Sprecherinnen und Sprecher auf dieses Komplex zurück und wählen strategisch aus den ihnen zur Verfügung stehenden Ressourcen aus, um zu kommunizieren. Bis dato wurde CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), welches eine Form mehrsprachigen Unterrichts darstellt, hauptsächlich aus einer monolingualen Perspektive beleuchtet und dadurch wurde die Auffassung von Sprache als ein separater Code bestärkt. Diese Diplomarbeit versucht dazu beizutragen, Sprache als einen dynamischen Prozess mit Fokus auf die Aktivitäten von Sprecherinnen und Sprechern zu betrachten, indem Translanguaging in österreichischen Unterstufenklassen, welche CLIL in ihren Unterricht implementiert haben, untersucht wird. Für dieses Vorhaben wurde eine Diskursanalyse von sechs Unterrichtsstunden, welche aus je drei Stunden in den Fächern Geschichte und Biologie besteht, durchgeführt. Es soll eruiert werden, ob sowohl LehrerInnen als auch SchülerInnen auf ihr gesamtes Sprachenrepertoire im Klassenzimmer zurückgreifen beziehungsweise ob zusätzlich zu den zwei offiziellen Unterrichtssprachen Deutsch und Englisch weitere Sprachen verwendet werden. Des Weiteren wird erforscht, zu welchem Zweck Translanguaging eingesetzt wird und ob ein Unterschied in dieser Hinsicht zwischen den beiden ausgewählten Fächern besteht. Die Studie zeigt, dass alle Beteiligten im Unterricht Translanguaging sowohl im schulischen Diskurs als auch in privaten Konversationen anwenden. Darüber hinaus können neben den beiden Unterrichtssprachen weitere Sprachen im Datensatz vorgefunden werden. Im Allgemeinen bekräftigt diese Diplomarbeit die Nützlichkeit von Translanguaging im schulischen Kontext und betont den Nutzen dieses methodischen Hilfsmittels besonders in CLIL-Unterrichtsstunden.

10.3 Transcription conventions

The following transcription conventions are based on the ones developed by VOICE (2007). They have been slightly modified for the purpose of this study.

Speakers:

T	teacher
TA	teaching assistant
S1, S2	identified student
SS	collective speaker group
SX	unidentifiable student
SX-f	female unidentifiable student
SX-m	male unidentifiable student
R	researcher

Speech:

xxx	uncomprehensible speech
<1> </1>	beginning and end of overlap marked with numbered tags
<>	contextual information
<LQde>, <LQbcms>	Non-English speech in a language recognisable
<LQxx> </LQxx>	Non-English speech in a language not recognisable
{ }	translation into English
?	raising intonation
.	falling intonation
(.)	brief pause
(1)	longer pauses with number of seconds in parentheses
=	other-continuation
@@@	laughter