



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

„Using the L1 in vocabulary teaching and learning:
Teachers‘ and learners‘ practices and attitudes in the
Austrian EFL classroom“

verfasst von / submitted by

Lukas Kloibhofer

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

Wien, 2019 / Vienna, 2019

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

A 190 344 299

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

Lehramtsstudium UF Englisch UF Psychologie und Philosophie

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Julia Hüttner, MSc

Acknowledgements

I feel the need to express my gratitude to all individuals that supported me during the time of writing and finishing this diploma thesis.

Firstly, the supervisor of my diploma thesis, Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Julia Hüttner, MSc, was very supportive and helped me whenever I had questions or did not exactly know how to continue. Especially the collaborative editing of the final versions of the questionnaire and interview guide need to be highlighted. Furthermore, the administration of meetings and the contact via email were very uncomplicated.

Secondly, I want to thank all the teachers and students who participated in my empirical investigation. They did their job very conscientiously and it would not have been possible to gain significant results without their help. The headmasters of the partaking schools acted as supportive as they could as well.

Lastly, I want to thank my family for their never-ending support and for all imaginable opportunities in my life. I owe you everything! In addition, my girlfriend Kathi needs to be thanked for her selfless patience, enduring encouragement and useful assistance during the planning of the practical study.

Declaration of authenticity

I, Lukas Kloibhofer, confirm that this diploma thesis is my own work, contains my own ideas and thoughts and was written by me. The empirical study was conducted to contribute to the thesis' objectives and the gained data were only used for scientific purposes. All used sources were consulted by myself and are indicated properly within the text as well as in the list of references at the end.

May, 2019

Abstract

The aim of this diploma thesis is to gain insights into the practices and attitudes of Austrian EFL teachers and their learners with its thematic foci on vocabulary teaching and learning, the role of the shared first language (L1), German, and the influence of the learners' language proficiency level on the former issues.

For this purpose, contemporary and relevant literature is reviewed in the theoretical part, focusing on the main didactic approach in Austria, Communicative language teaching (CLT), and the implications of research on the addressed issues. The empirical investigation collects data in the form of in-class observations with audio recordings, questionnaires for all learners and interviews with the teachers. Three teachers of Austrian AHS-schools participated with one 3rd form and one 6th form each. The analyzed data are interpreted, compared and contrasted with the reviewed literature.

The findings suggest that Austrian EFL teachers and learners recognize the role of the L1 in the EFL classroom and ascribe certain functions to it, even though teachers rather aim to adhere to target language use, with differing success. The most common investigated purposes of integrating German into the Austrian EFL classroom are vocabulary teaching and learning and the communication of important organizational issues both by teachers and learners.

Austrian EFL teachers use a wide range of vocabulary teaching strategies, German translations, English explanations and the methodological use of the blackboard being the most frequent ones, the former two being approved by the learners' perceptions. German is an integral part of vocabulary learning for learners of both proficiency levels. In sum, teachers and learners deliberately use more German in lower proficiency level classes in general and for the purpose of vocabulary teaching, unambiguously, which is confirmed by their attitudes. Further, it is suggested that lower-level students require more German vocabulary translations than higher-level students.

Zusammenfassung

Das Ziel der vorliegenden Diplomarbeit ist die Untersuchung konkreter Praktiken und Einstellungen von Englisch-Lehrkräften und deren Lernenden innerhalb der österreichischen Sekundarstufen 1 und 2. Konkret fokussieren sich diese Untersuchungen sowohl auf die Vermittlung von neuen Vokabeln und das generelle Vokabellernen als auch auf die diesbezügliche Bedeutung der Bildungssprache Deutsch und den potentiellen Einfluss eines unterschiedlichen Sprachniveaus auf diese Lehr- und Lernprozesse

Zunächst wird im theoretischen Teil ein Überblick über die aktuell relevante Fachliteratur mit den Schwerpunkten auf den derzeit dominanten didaktischen Ansatz im österreichischen Fremdsprachenlernen, dem „Communicative language teaching“ (CLT), gegeben. In der empirischen Untersuchung werden Daten mithilfe von während Unterrichtsobservationen gefertigten Audioaufnahmen, Fragebögen und Interviews gesammelt und folglich diskutiert beziehungsweise interpretiert.

Die Resultate indizieren, dass österreichische Englischlehrkräfte und deren SchülerInnen die Rolle der Bildungssprache anerkennen und diese in bestimmten Situationen verwenden, auch wenn Lehrkräfte versuchen, größtenteils in der Zielsprache zu bleiben. Am häufigsten findet die deutsche Sprache dabei im Kontext des Vokabellehrens und ebenso Vokabellernens sowie beim Besprechen organisatorischer Angelegenheiten Verwendung.

Die teilnehmenden Lehrpersonen integrieren eine Vielzahl an Strategien für die Vokabelvermittlung, wobei deutsche Übersetzungen, englische Erklärungen und die methodische Verwendung der Tafel die häufigsten sind und die beiden ersten Aspekte parallel dazu auch aus der Perspektive der Lernenden bestätigt werden. Die SchülerInnen beider Sprachniveaus nutzen die Erstsprache als Ressource zum Vokabellernen. Vor allem in Klassen mit niedrigerem Sprachniveau wird in den Klassen, im Allgemeinen und für die Vokabelvermittlung, gezielt ein höheres Ausmaß an Deutsch verwendet. Dies spiegelt sich außerdem aus der Erkenntnis wider, dass SchülerInnen mit niedrigerem Sprachlevel primär deutsche Vokabelübersetzungen von den Lehrkräften verlangen.

List of abbreviations

CLT – Communicative language teaching

EFL – English as a foreign language

ELT – English language teaching

ESL – English as a second language

FL – Foreign language

L1 – First language

L2 – Second language

TL – Target language

T1 – Teacher 1

T2 – Teacher 2

T3 – Teacher 3

S1, S2, ... – Student 1, Student 2 ...

I – Interviewer

Q1, Q2, ... - Questionnaire item 1, Questionnaire item 2, ...

List of tables

Table 1: What is involved in knowing a word? from: Nation (2013: 49)

Table 2: Instances of German use in the EFL classroom

Table 3: Frequencies of German use: all classes

Table 4: Frequencies of German use: all students

Table 5: Frequencies of German use: all teachers

Table 6: Frequencies of used vocabulary strategies: all classes

Table 7: Frequencies of students' vocabulary learning strategies

Table 8: Descriptive statistic Q7

Table 9: Descriptive statistic Q11

Table 10: Descriptive statistics Q14

Table 11: Descriptive statistic Q8

Table 12: Descriptive statistic Q5

Table 13: Descriptive statistic Q6

Table 14: Descriptive statistic Q3

Table 15: Frequencies of teachers' vocabulary teaching strategies

Table 16: Frequencies of T1's vocabulary teaching strategies

Table 17: Frequencies of T2's vocabulary teaching strategies

Table 18: Frequencies of T3's vocabulary teaching strategies

Table 19: Descriptive statistic Q4 & Q12

Table 20: Descriptive statistic Q4

Table 21: Frequencies of perceived strategies Q15

Table 22: Frequencies of preferred strategies Q24

Table 23: Descriptive statistic Q18

Table 24: Descriptive statistic Q22

Table 25: Descriptive statistic Q21

Table 26: Descriptive statistic Q1

Table 27: Descriptive statistic Q2

Table 28: Descriptive statistic Q16

Table 29: Descriptive statistic Q19

Table 30: Frequencies of German use: third forms

Table 31: Frequencies of German use: sixth forms

Table 32: Frequencies of teachers' German use: third forms

Table 33: Frequencies of teachers' German use: sixth forms

Table 34: Frequencies of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies: third forms

Table 35: Frequencies of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies: sixth forms

Table 36: Frequencies of perceived strategies: third forms

Table 37: Frequencies of perceived strategies: sixth forms

Table 38: Descriptive statistic Q17 & Q23

Table 39: Descriptive statistic Q20

Table of contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Declaration of authenticity.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Zusammenfassung.....	iv
List of abbreviations.....	v
List of tables.....	vi
Table of contents.....	vii
1. Introduction.....	1
Part I: Theoretical background.....	4
2. The role of the L1 in the EFL classroom.....	4
2.1. Communicative language teaching.....	4
2.2. Code-switching.....	9
2.3. Functions of the L1 in the classroom.....	13
3. Strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning.....	16
4. Attitudes of teachers and learners.....	25
4.1. Teachers' attitudes.....	26
4.2. Students' attitudes.....	28
5. Language proficiency level as a factor of influence.....	29
Part II: Empirical investigation.....	33
6. Methodology.....	33
6.1. Purpose of study.....	33
6.2. Participants and setting.....	33
6.3. Research methods: data collection and analysis.....	35
6.3.1. Observation and audio recording.....	35
6.3.2. Questionnaire.....	38
6.3.3. Interview.....	42
7. Results.....	47
7.1. The role of German in the Austrian EFL classroom.....	48

7.2. Strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning.....	58
7.2.1. Learners' strategies.....	60
7.2.2. Teachers' strategies.....	64
7.3. Attitudes of teachers and learners.....	77
7.3.1. Learners' attitudes.....	77
7.3.2. Teachers' attitudes.....	81
7.4. The proficiency level as a factor of influence.....	83
8. Discussion and implications.....	93
9. Potential shortcomings.....	97
10. Conclusion.....	98
11. References.....	99
12. Appendix.....	104

1. Introduction

„Try again in English please!“. This is a phrase that might look familiar to many students who learned or are currently learning English as a foreign or second language. The typical situation starts as follows. A language learner is asked to explain a newly learned word or phrase in the English classroom and decides to provide the translation, because this is the natural reaction when being confronted with a novel vocabulary item in a different language than your native one. As a student, it may seem much more practical and economic to compare a new piece of foreign language with the language(s) they already know. Additionally, providing a suitable translation in the foreign language classroom seems easier and, therefore, takes up less time than finding a synonym, a paraphrase or an explanation in the target language. Nevertheless, teachers often request an answer in English and they obviously do so for a reason.

The main reason for them to encourage students to use English as often as possible is because they are convinced that the target language will be acquired most efficiently by using it and letting students use it frequently or even always. An additional reason might be a multicultural classroom in which not every student may understand the classmates' first languages (L1) so well. The teachers' conviction must either be caused by their own beliefs and experiences or, more likely, by the way they were or have been educated in the course of their tertiary education. Remembering the initially described situation, the teacher's demand for an English explanation makes sense, as the student is required to think and talk in the target language, which might be cognitively more challenging than simply providing a translation. When trying to come up with a synonym or a paraphrase, the learner is allowed to use existing knowledge as well, but it needs to be expressed in the language that is learned.

Thus, from the point of view of the student, simply translating new words from the foreign language to the mother tongue makes, *prima facie*, as much sense as the teacher's standpoint of requiring an English explanation, because it may foster the student's skills in the foreign language. Which strategy, then, is more justifiable and most importantly, how will the student remember the new vocabulary item more effectively? Should teachers accept or even provide translations, rather use and de-

mand a maximum in- and output of English in an English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom or is the right way to find the Aristotelian mean?

The question of how vocabulary teaching per se is done right or wrong can probably not be answered in such a simple way, as different students have different preferences, classes show different dynamics and most importantly, different words and phrases require different strategies of conveyance. For example, some words can be directly translated and have a synonymous meaning in the L1 and other words may have more possible meanings depending on the context. Furthermore, some words may have contradictory meanings in other languages (English-German example: *sensible* = *sinnvoll*, *vernünftig*; *sensitive* = *sensibel*). Some words like *apple* or *house* can be depicted in pictures, while more abstract words, such as *betrayal* or *adore*, and concepts require explanation. Another aspect is the language level of the students to be taught, for one might argue that beginners do not have the resources to provide and understand synonyms or paraphrases if they are only starting to learn the simplest words. Learners with a higher proficiency level may have enough prior knowledge to explain novel words in the target language. However, there are, of course, possible ways to avoid the students' L1 in low proficiency classrooms as well. Teachers can use mime and gestures, images or videos while teaching new vocabulary. For all these reasons, a teacher must be aware about the individual needs of their students and classes and decide in every particular situation which strategy is most suitable for teaching specific vocabulary items.

The stated questions above could lead to the more general issue of classroom language and the situations in which the L1 may be an appropriate and effective resource. Concerning the question of English-only classrooms versus using the first languages of students as a guiding and helping force, controversial views are existent. This complex issue connects to the fundamental question of what language learning is and how it happens. An L1 is learned without the help of other languages from the beginning, even if we may not forget that many children are raised bilingually. However, they have no resources to resort to a language which they are already proficient in. For some, the learning of a second or third language is then seen as a linear process, which means that learners start from the beginning without the help of other languages, as this would be confusing. On the other side of the spectrum, there are scholars who welcome the use of already known languages when learning a new

one, as the comparison between them and the comprehension of similarities and differences might enhance the learning progress. The essence of these questions lies in the issue of vocabulary teaching and learning, as the comprehension of a foreign language begins with being able to understand and produce words and the ways in which these words are conveyed must thus be of high importance for an effective foreign language acquisition.

Therefore, the purpose of this diploma thesis is to outline, compare and contrast existing contemporary views on the issue of using the L1 in an EFL classroom with foci on vocabulary teaching, the students' proficiency level and teachers' as well as students' attitudes towards first language use and vocabulary conveyance and to contribute to this field of study by conducting practical research in Austrian EFL classrooms, in order to learn more about actual practices and attitudes of teachers and students and make suggestions about what the results could imply. The first part of the work is a literature review which sets the theoretical framework for the study to be conducted. More specifically, it will outline the general role of the L1 in the language classroom in relation with the current didactical approach and discuss functions of its use. Then, some vocabulary teaching and learning strategies will be described and the role of the L1 explored in this respect, followed by a review on teachers' and students' attitudes on these issues. The last point will discuss the influence of the learners' proficiency level on the three previous areas of interest. The second part is an empirical study in which, firstly, the methodology of the study, including the formulation of the specific research questions, the setting and used research instruments, will be outlined. Secondly, the process and results of the study will be presented and explained. Thirdly, the results will be discussed and implications drawn. Further, possible weaknesses of the conducted research will be stated and ideas for possible further research suggested. This diploma thesis is set and written in the context of Austrian EFL teaching with its primary didactic approach of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

PART I: Theoretical framework

2. The role of the L1 in the EFL classroom

The relevance of the ongoing debate on the medium of instruction and first language use in foreign language classrooms for future teachers of a foreign language is undeniable as Macaro (2013: 10) states:

Yet, I would argue, the question of whether the first language (L1) should be used in the oral interaction or the written materials of second or foreign language (L2) classrooms is probably the most fundamental question facing second language acquisition (SLA) researchers, language teachers and policy makers in this second decade of the 21st century.

For many decades, theories on foreign language learning suggested a “largely negative influence” of the L1 on L2 learning (Song & Andrews 2009: 1) and proclaimed a maximal input of the target language in the EFL classroom. Ellis (2005: 217), for example, states as a principle of instructed language learning that teachers need to “[m]aximise use of the L2 inside the classroom” and that the target language ideally becomes “the medium as well as the object of instruction”. This view has been challenged lately (Song & Andrews 2009: 1) and it is suggested that “the first language is a valuable resource that can be beneficial for foreign language teaching and learning” (Fussi 2017: 1). For a more concrete discussion of this issue, the most common approach within the Austrian school system, communicative language teaching, needs to be investigated in some detail, as to get an idea of how the L1 is portrayed within it. When discussing the role of the L1, one cannot escape the construct of code-switching and the potential functions that switches to the L1 in a foreign language lesson could serve.

2.1. Communicative language teaching

As a response to former approaches, such as the grammar-translation method or the audio-lingual method, CLT defined the goal of language learning clearly as being

communication, for Byram (2009: 491) summarizes: “The focus of CLT changed the emphasis from almost exclusive attention to grammatical competence by identifying other competences which are crucial in communicating through speech.” According to Walker et al. (2018: 8), “Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emerged as the most influential theory of language teaching, starting from a communicative model of language and language use in the 1970s” and for this reason, this approach has developed to become the basis for foreign language teaching syllabuses, one example would be the Common European Frame of Reference (Council of Europe 2001). Likewise, Austrian curricula resort to CLT, which is the predominantly used approach to foreign language teaching in Austria, the context of the following practical study, which took place in Lower Austrian AHS forms that include lower and higher secondary education. This is why it is noteworthy that, for example in the curriculum for the higher secondary form of AHS in Austria, the ‘Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung’ (https://bildung.bmbwf.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/lp_ahs_os_lebende_fs_11854.pdf: 2) states that communicative competence is the main didactic principle of foreign language teaching:

Dem handlungsorientierten Ansatz gemäß stellt die kommunikative Sprachkompetenz das übergeordnete Lehr- und Lernziel des Fremdsprachenunterrichts dar. Das heißt, fremdsprachliche Teilkompetenzen sind in dem Maße zu vermitteln, wie sie für erfolgreiche mündliche und schriftliche Kommunikation nötig sind.

This term traces back to the sociolinguist Hymes (1972: 282, 286), who distinguishes the concepts of knowledge, “systemic possibility” and actual performance but realizes their interrelation:

In sum, the goal of a broad theory of competence can be said to be to show the ways in which the systemically possible, the feasible, and the appropriate are linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behavior.

For CLT, this might imply that communicative competence includes the knowledge of a language, the ability to use it and the actual use in authentic situations. More related to the actual teaching of languages, Savignon (2000: 125) defines communicative competence as “the ability of classroom language learners to interact with other speakers, to make meaning, as distinct from their ability to recite dialogues or perform on discrete-point tests of grammatical knowledge”. She also states that CLT is,

in contrast to a method, “properly viewed as an approach, or theory of intercultural communicative competence to be used in developing materials and methods appropriate to a given context of learning” (Savignon 2007: 213).

Canale and Swain (1980: 28ff) and Canale (1983: 7-11) define which four sub-competences a person who wants to gain communicative competence needs, namely grammatical competence, incorporating “knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology”, sociolinguistic competence, which includes “sociocultural rules and rules of discourse”, discourse competence, enabling the speaker to “combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres” (Canale 1983: 9), and strategic competence, including “verbal and non-verbal communication strategies” a second language learner uses “to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence”. An early advocate of CLT, Brumfit (1984: 110) realized, in general:

We use language to express ourselves, to relate ourselves to our environment, to get things done which we want to get done, to assist others to understand things that we want them to understand, and so on.

As this was one of the first attempts to describe what this approach focuses on pedagogically, this means that learners’ aim is to gain exactly these competences to be able to communicate in their authentic world and teachers should try to convey them with a focus on meaning rather than form.

The use of the L1 in CLT

Because of CLT being the main educational approach in Austrian AHS forms, which are the context of the following research, and language use in EFL classrooms in general and for vocabulary teaching and learning being main interests of this paper, the role of the L1 within this approach needs to be investigated. When being introduced to the communicative approach, the authentic use of the target language in order to be able to establish genuine conversation seems to be emphasized and the possible positive or negative influence of a shared L1 between instructor and learners remains unclear, or seems to be ignored rather. Richards and Rodgers (2001: 172), for example, highlight that one principle of CLT is that “[l]earners learn a language through using it to communicate”. Similarly, when summarizing the topic of

language use in the classroom as suggested by CLT, in general, Byram (2009: 502) states:

Authentic discourse in the target language, both in its oral and written form and in its situational, social and cultural context, becomes not only the object of study, but also a privileged tool in itself since its use within the classroom contributes to increasing learners' communicative competence.

Cook (2001: 404) realizes this omission of mentioning the role of the L1 and thereby advocating the monolingual principle in a foreign language classroom:

Recent methods do not so much forbid the L1 as ignore its existence altogether. Communicative language teaching and task-based learning methods have no necessary relationship with the L1, yet [...] the only times the L1 is mentioned is when advice is given on how to minimize its use. [...] Most descriptions of methods portray the ideal classroom as having as little of the L1 as possible, essentially by omitting reference to it.

Proponents of this monolingual principle claim “that only the target language should be used” in EFL classrooms and some countries even prohibit the use of L1 or at least suggest exclusion of the L1 and only recommend to use it “as a last resort” (Littlewood 2014: 358). Cummins (2009: 317) outlines that the total abandonment of learners' L1 aims at “enabling learners to think in the TL with minimal interference from the L1”. Bruen and Kelly (2017: 369) emphasize that the communicative pedagogy focuses on the meaning of language rather than form and highlights “the importance of authentic communication through the L2 without recourse to the L1”. Thus, the premise of monolingual advocates is to maximize target language input in ESL as well as EFL classrooms (Ellis 2005: 217), the difference being that a second language is non-natively “learnt and used within one country” where it is the official language, ESL teachers and students do typically face a multilingual classroom and, therefore, they do not share their mother tongue while they do in EFL classes, if these are typically monolingual, as a foreign language is “learnt and used with reference to a speech community outside national or territorial boundaries” (Stern 1983: 16). The issue of L1 use in the classroom can be disregarded in multilingual classrooms for this thesis obviously, as the practical part of it is conducted in an Austrian EFL context in which the teachers and students have a shared L1 most of the time, which is why, in these contexts, the role of the L1 needs to be discussed, investigated and reassessed.

Only if one focuses research more clearly on the issue of L1 use in an EFL classroom, will one find that not all CLT scholars would totally abandon a shared L1 from the classroom. Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher (2001: 131 in Turnbull) state that as opposed to earlier references to abandoning L1 usage in foreign language classes, "many scholars are now arguing that the first language can be beneficial as a cognitive tool that aids in second language learning" and argue that the allowance of the first language as a beneficial resource demands "a reconceptualization of the foreign language classroom as a bilingual environment and language learners as aspiring bilinguals". Widdowson (2003: 160) agrees and argues "for a bilingual approach to teaching", as learners of a foreign unknown language can, as has been well entrenched in other fields of research, only acquire it by referring to the familiar and already known first language. He states that when an L2 is learnt, the L1 is always involved, as students naturally resort to their native language and they cannot comprehend "what is foreign in a language without relating to another which is familiar" (Widdowson 2003: 154). Thus, foreign language learning is in fact bilingual language learning, according to Widdowson (2003: 154). He also recognizes that English teachers always work in a certain context "and what they teach is not just a language but a subject on the whole curriculum" (Widdowson 2003: 8). This implies that English needs to be viewed as one part of education within a system, in which a shared L1 is the language of education that can be incorporated into English lessons to foster bilingual language learning. Similarly, Swan (1985: 85) states that individuals would not be able to learn a foreign language without any recourse to their mother tongue and that "translating into and out of [our] own languages" is part of our "common experience". Levine (2011: 9) highlights too, while supporting a multilingual approach, her view that "the L1 has a productive and important role to play in successful L2 learning".

Drawing from these discussions, quite a number of CLT theorists and scholars view it as one of the approach's tenets that the L1 is not taboo in the classroom, even though there seem to exist quite contradictory views and no real consent, but rather a continuum of notions within the whole concept. Therefore, a frequently discussed issue of using more than one language within a conversation or even within a whole sentence or word will be reviewed in the following section.

2.2. Code-switching

We have seen that the L1 has been considered a valuable resource in the foreign language classroom but the rationale of gaining communicative competence in the TL remains, which means that, alongside L1 input, a large proportion of TL input is without doubt included into the lessons. Thus, two languages occur within the same lesson, the same conversation, or even the same utterance or sentence, which makes the concept of code-switching relevant to our investigated issues. With reference to Widdowson's view of a foreign language classroom being a bilingual setting, there seems to be consent that "code-switching is a characteristic feature of bilingual talk rather than a deficiency in one or the other of the language" (Awan & Sipra 2015: 19).

Auer (1998: 1) writes that the "usual definition" of code-switching is the "alternating use of two or more 'codes' within one conversational episode". Milroy and Muysken (1995: 7) agree with this definition to a high degree and MacSwan (2012: 323) explain that "two (or more) languages" are alternately used "within the same utterance". The question arises whether a code is the same as a language, or rather includes dialects or even different styles or registers. Myers-Scotton (1997: 218) makes the point that a code does not necessarily refer to merely standard languages but can also happen between dialects and different modes of style and register. Within this thesis, code-switching is used as the alternate usage of two different languages. Cook (1991: 63) emphasizes the important aspect that a requirement for code-switching is the sharing of the used languages between the speakers involved, as she views code-switching as "going from one language to the other in midspeech when both speakers know the same languages". This point is seen as a presupposition for this thesis, as, in the following study, the concept of code-switching will be regarded as the alternate use of a shared common language, German, and the taught language, English within EFL lessons in Austrian classrooms.

Different types of code-switching, which need to be outlined briefly, can be identified. Poplack (1980: 615) defined as the outcome of her study the types of inter-sentential code-switching, intra-sentential code-switching and tag-switching. When a switch occurs within a sentence boundary, this is called intra-sentential code-switching, whereas the alternate use of two codes "occurs at a clause or sentence boundary,

where each clause or sentence is in one language or another” (Jingxia 2010: 11). A tag-switch occurs when “a tag or a short fixed phrase” in one code is inserted into a sentence that is uttered in the other code or language, entirely (Qian et al. 2009: 720).

The definitions above describe code-switching in general, however, Macaro (2013: 19f) asks the question whether general, “naturalistic code-switching” can be equated with code-switching in the classroom and indicates that random everyday code-switching happens for the purpose of continuing interaction, which can also be the case in an EFL classroom. However, the main difference is the presupposition that the students in an EFL classroom have the clear goal of learning and improving their foreign language and teachers are supposed to teach the target language. This suggests that code-switching in the EFL classroom must be treated as a special case, as the rationale in the classroom is language learning, but also the establishment of communicative competence. Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher (2009: 132) state, in this respect, that “[i]n the context of a communicative approach to language learning” learners as well as instructors need to have awareness that “codeswitching is a normal part of bilingual linguistic behaviour”.

Quite a few studies confirm the valuable function of in-class code-switching regarding language classrooms. In the study of Rezvani and Rasekh (2011: 18) in primary EFL classrooms in Iran, they conclude that language teachers switch to their L1 frequently as a skillful strategy and argue that a limited use can improve the teaching quality. They identify that teachers use mainly inter-sentential switches as a “methodological and a social strategy”, thus for the teaching process in order to instruct, translate and correct but also for social matters to discipline and praise students (Rezvani and Rasekh 2011: 21f). Furthermore, they state that teachers use code-switching only for specific didactic and communicative reasons, which can improve the interaction between teachers and students. Hence, their results (Rezvani & Rasekh 2011: 23) show that

foreign language teachers tend to use the learners’ L1 more frequently to serve a certain number of pedagogic and social functions such as translation, explanation, praise, etc., which could all contribute to better teacher-student classroom interaction.

Equally, Qian et al. (2009: 719) conclude that code-switching serves as a discourse strategy for improving “classroom interaction and ensuring efficient classroom man-

agement". The teachers, similarly to the findings in Rezvani and Rasekh (2011) use much more inter-sentential switches than the other types (Qian et al. 2009: 723). Further, they call for a controlled use of switching to the L1 and a "suitable quantity" that can help "cultivate and reinforce good habits of learning and foster a close student-teacher relationship" and highlight that the level of the language learners must be regarded, to be further discussed in section 5 (Qian et al. 2009: 719).

In South Korea's elementary EFL classrooms, team teaching is very common. Park and Manning (2012: 105) study the teachers' use of L1 and compare native English teachers with Korean EFL teachers who share the language with their students. Unsurprisingly, the L1 is almost totally excluded in lessons taught by English natives, while 28% of utterances in an EFL lesson conducted by Korean teachers are expressed in the L1. This study confirms that EFL teachers seem to be convinced that a certain amount of language use in the classroom should be conducted in a shared L1 if possible. Nevertheless, the authors claim that this amount could have been reduced, as most of the utterances could have been expressed in English quite unproblematically. They propose a maximal use of English in EFL classes, even at an elementary stage of learning (Park & Manning 2012: 105). As can be seen, the rationales and objectives of such studies always seem to depend on the subjective views of the authors, as some regard code-switching as a helpful tool in the foreign language classroom while others wonder how it could be minimized instead of analyzing its potential. It can be reported and summarized that teachers tend to use code-switching in a foreign language environment and therefore the potential fostering functions of it need to be explored (next section 2.3), as the findings rather seem to agree with Poplack's (1980: 615) appraisal that "code-switching is a verbal skill requiring a large degree of linguistic competence in more than one language, rather than a defect arising from insufficient knowledge of one or the other". Being compatible with the analyzed and chosen terminology so far, this paper will work with the suggested definition of code-switching in the EFL classroom by Jingxia (2010: 10):

To be brief, code-switching is the shift from one language to another within a conversation or utterance. In the context of foreign language classroom, it refers to the alternate use of the first language and the target language, a means of communication by language teachers when the need arises.

In addition to this definition, the use of code-switching as a communicative strategy by language students, not only teachers, must not be forgotten, as they are the pro-

tagonists in a foreign language classroom. As regards Jingxia's definition, the study to follow assumes German as the shared L1 and English as the TL in the Austrian EFL classroom.

An interesting concept in relation with code-switching is translanguaging, defined as "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire which does not in any way correspond to the socially and politically found boundaries of named languages" (Garcia & Kleyn 2016: 14). Thus, this includes the use of all first and foreign languages a speaker knows and their interrelations within a given communication. The term presupposes bilingualism or multilingualism "as the norm" and is seen as a "pedagogical stance" by Mazak (2017: 5f), where teachers and learners may include all of their linguistic and semiotic resources to learn languages as well as content, and languages are not viewed as distinct systems. Translanguaging, thereby includes code-switching, but is not limited to it, as it "rather seeks to include any practices that draw on an individual's linguistic and semiotic repertoires" (Mazak 2017: 5). Otwinowska (2017: 304) argues in favor of an acceptance of the advantages that a teachers' knowledge of more than one language might have for language learners and encourages teachers to have awareness of the possibility to include elements of several languages they know into their lessons. The examples she gives are drawing students' attention to "lexical similarities between their native language (L1) and the target language (L2)" or contrasting features of grammar that are divergent across the languages" (Otwinowska 2017: 304f). Awan and Sipra (2015: 16) also postulate, as an implication of a conducted study, that a limited and judicious incorporation of L1 into foreign language classrooms can be performed without doubt, even if the amount of the use is described as "highly context-dependent". Many scholars and researchers suggest a judicious use of the L1 in the language classroom, which means that neither teachers nor students should overuse code-switching in their lessons, but rather should they know when and how to use it. For example, Cook (2001: 418) is convinced that it is time to overcome the view of the L1 "creeping in as a guilt-making necessity" and states that the first language "can be deliberately and systematically used in the classroom". In conclusion, the potential benefits of a principled inclusion of learners' L1 into the EFL classroom need to be recognized and this principled usage more closely investigated. Therefore, a set of functions and situations in which code-switching is efficiently used will be reviewed and the works of selected authors cited.

2.3. Functions of the L1 in the EFL classroom

Recent research and studies on the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms propose a judicious, limited or principled use of the L1 in a foreign language classroom (Awan & Sipra 2015, Bruen & Kelly 2017, Myuk 2014, Shabir 2017, Song & Andrews 2009). Generally, these researchers suggest that such a limited and judicious use of L1 “plays a positive role in the process of teaching and learning” a foreign language (Jingxia 2010). As straightforward as these postulations may sound, the questions on when, how, how long and how often a language teacher is supposed to use the L1 of the learners in order to be able to state that they used it judiciously remain. Hence, a definition for these adjectives like judicious, principled and limited must be formulated. Levine (2009: 145) does so for “principled use” and describes that “the speaker gains awareness of the functions of first language use as an integral part of second-language interaction and learning.” Macaro (2009: 38) defines an “optimal use” of L1 in the foreign language classroom as situations in which “codeswitching in broadly communicative classrooms can enhance second language acquisition and/or proficiency better than second language exclusivity”. This emphasis on a limited use is noteworthy, as proponents of a strategic L1 use repeatedly highlight that the argument for a principled incorporation of the L1 into the FL teaching does not aim to reduce the time for L2 input. Butzkamm (2003: 38), for example, argues that, “when used properly”, the L1 does not only barely diminish the time for L2 but rather “helps to establish it as the general means of communication in the classroom” and the lesson can still be conducted and organized in the target language mainly.

The mentioned functions and their elaboration are essential in defining what this judicious and principled use means, as it is of high importance that teachers know in which situations the shared L1 can facilitate processes in the classroom and foster foreign language learning. In this respect, Cook (2001: 413ff) proposes how the L1 can be positively incorporated into the classroom and mentions that the value of certain uses of L1 depend on the factors of “efficiency”, “learning”, “naturalness” and “external relevance”, by posing four useful questions, in this regard, namely, “Can something be done more effectively through the L1?”, “Will L2 learning be helped by using the L1 alongside the L2?”, “Do the participants feel more comfortable about some functions or topics in the first language rather than the second, as studies in

code-switching have shown?” and “Will use of both languages help the students to master specific L2 uses that they may need in the world beyond the classroom?”. These may be helpful questions for language teachers when considering an effective incorporation of the learners’ L1 into their lessons.

Quite a few authors focus on the different functions of the use of the first language in an L2 classroom and in which situations the first language is used effectively by teachers and learners. Macaro (2006: 69), for instance, defines five areas of frequent code-switching by teachers in the classroom, based on teacher reports:

1. building personal relationship with learners (the pastoral role that teachers take on requires high levels of discourse sophistication);
2. giving complex procedural instructions for carrying out an activity;
3. controlling pupils' behaviour;
4. translating and checking understanding in order to speed things up because of time pressures (e.g. exams);
5. teaching grammar explicitly.

In an additional study, Macaro (2006: 69) found that teachers use the L1 for “giving feedback to students”, which could be added as the sixth area of code-switching to the L1. Likewise, Rezvani and Rasekh (2011: 21f) identify giving instruction, using code-switching as an efficient time saver, translating, correcting, praising, disciplining and explaining as functions of teacher code-switching in the EFL classroom and differentiate methodological for the first four functions and social functions being the latter three. Jingxia (2010: 21) recognizes as “functional uses” of L1 in EFL classrooms the translation of vocabulary, explanation of grammar, classroom management, building relationships with learners, “quoting others’ words” and highlighting points. Liu et al. (2004: 616-622) investigate the L1 functions of thirteen South Korean EFL teachers and conclude that the most frequent functions are vocabulary and grammar explanation as well as providing background information. Minor functions of their study are instructional comments, comprehension questions, disciplining students, praise and humor.

Sampson (2012: 296) identifies six functions of adult student code-switching in a conducted study, namely equivalence, metalanguage, floor-holding, reiteration, socializing and L2 avoidance. The first means the translation of a word or phrase, when using metalanguage students discuss about activities or “other procedural concerns” in their L1 (Sampson 2012: 297) and floor-holding is L1 usage which indicates that a learner wants to continue talking without a pause or interruption by another learner or

the teacher. Reiteration is the repetition of expressions that were already uttered in the L2 for emphasis or clarification. Socializing is used for internal humor or “group solidarity” and L2 avoidance describes the laziness of students as they would be able to express something in the TL, but avoid to do so (Sampson 2012: 299f). However, this function was only realized once in each of the two groups. Sampson’s (2012: 296) findings suggest that there is no influence by the learners’ proficiency level on “the number of switches: switching appears to derive from communicative objectives common at all levels, rather than linguistic deficit”. Likewise, Eldridge (1996: 307) finds exactly the same functions in Turkish learners’ code-switching, with the rare additions of “conflict control” and “alignment and disalignment” when students are asked to perform roles. In his analysis, he also argues that the level of proficiency and the frequency of student code-switches do not influence each other (Eldridge 1996: 304).

Analyzing both teachers’ and students’ code-switching functions, Iyitoglu (2016: 257) found that teachers employ code-switching for these functions: fostering the comprehension of grammar and new vocabulary, disciplining learners, praising and motivating them, repeating what has not been understood and for the sake of keeping up fluent interaction. Students use their L1 in order to keep the communication going, to express their attitudes and for the clarification of grammar and novel vocabulary. Again, both groups seem to view the inclusion of the L1 in a foreign language classroom for the specific purpose of facilitating vocabulary knowledge as an effective means in the learning and teaching process. Similarly, Cook (2001: 213) summarizes teachers’ and students’ functions of L1 use in the classroom in reflection of several studies and thereby “building on existing classroom practice”. Teachers use the L1 to translate words and sentences and thus, convey their meanings. By doing so, the teachers realize “that the two languages are closely linked in the mind” (Cook 2001: 414). Grammar is explained as well as exercises and activities to be done, which is referred to as “organizing tasks” (Cook 2001: 415). Moreover, the teachers use the L1 to maintain learner discipline and Cook (2001: 416) describes in this regard that there are two reasons, “partly efficiency of comprehension, partly to show the threat is real rather than pretend”. Teachers aim to gain personal contact with learners by using their L1, the reason being that treating them as who they really are “rather than dealing with assumed L2 personas” feels more natural and, lastly, they use the L1 in tests (Cook 2001: 416). The reviewed students use their L1 for translation and in

group work activities in which “they may explain the task to each other, negotiate roles they are going to take, or check their understanding or production of language against their peers” (Cook 2001: 418). Other possibilities described by Cook (2001: 418) are the use of bilingual dictionaries, “dual language texts on facing pages” and “L2 films with L1 subtitles”.

Every study mentioned in this section approves that both teachers and students use the L1 for the purpose of translating unknown words, thus for vocabulary teaching and learning. As vocabulary knowledge is viewed as a prerequisite for the learning of a language, the topic deserves particularly close attention. Of course, the awareness is given, that language proficiency is composed of many more components like grammatical knowledge and the reviewed competences. However, it could be argued, that mastery in no single competence could be achieved without the necessary knowledge of words in a language. Therefore, the following section focuses on vocabulary teaching and learning in the foreign language classroom and, again, the role of the L1 is tried to be explored.

3. Strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning

Carter (1998: 186) defines that the main rationale of vocabulary acquisition in a classroom is “to put students in the position where they are capable of deriving and producing meanings from lexical items both for themselves and out of the classroom”. With reference to Aristotle, Milton and Fitzpatrick (2014: 1f) outline that the spoken form needs to be distinguished from the written form of a word and the form needs to be distinguished from its meaning. Thus, knowing a word includes the knowledge of its written and spoken form as well as its meaning(s). However, how the term ‘word’ is defined is not as straightforward as it may seem. Milton (2009: 8-12) differentiates tokens, which are the total “number of words in a text or corpus”, types referring to the “number of different words”, hence repeated words are not counted, lemmas, that are headwords with their “most frequent inflections” such as the verb *know* and the forms *knew*, *known* and *knowing*, and word families, which include even more inflections such as different word classes derived from the verb *know* like *knowledge* or *knowingly*. Further, as regards word knowledge, “receptive

and productive knowledge, also sometimes called passive and active vocabulary knowledge" is distinguished, the former defining the ability "to recognize a word when it is encountered with the support of other words for context" and the latter being the ability "to call the word to mind spontaneously for production" (Milton & Fitzpatrick 2014: 2f). Vocabulary knowledge should therefore not be considered as what a learner knows or does not know, but rather a continuum or "a scale running from recognition of a word at one end to automatic production at the other" than a binary opposition (Hedge 2000: 116). Obviously, we would conclude that learners of a language have a more extensive repertoire of receptive vocabulary knowledge than of productive (cf. Milton 2009:13).

Carter (1998: 8) draws a fundamental distinction between function words, or "grammatical words" and content words, or "lexical words", the former including pronouns, articles, prepositions, auxiliary verbs and conjunctions and the latter including nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. Content words have a "higher information content and [...] are syntactically structured by the grammatical words" (Carter 1998: 8). Nation (2013: 16ff) distinguishes high-, mid- and low-frequency words, the high-frequency vocabulary contain the 2,000 most commonly used words, including many function words, and the low-frequency words of about 50,000 words only make about one percent of the coverage of usage (cf. Nation 2013: 23). This is relevant for teaching, because, quite foreseeable, learners need to know the high-frequency words of a language, as these are the "most important group of words" and "very common words that we need every day that we use English" (Nation 2008: 7f). These words are of such importance that "anything that teachers and learners can do to make sure they are learned is worth doing" (Nation 2013: 25). Nation (2013: 49) provides the latest and very demonstrative overview of what vocabulary or word knowledge includes (see Table 1).

Table 1: What is involved in knowing a word? from: Nation (2013: 49)

Table 2.1 What is involved in knowing a word			
Form	spoken	R	What does the word sound like?
		P	How is the word pronounced?
	written	R	What does the word look like?
		P	How is the word written and spelled?
	word parts	R	What parts are recognisable in this word?
		P	What word parts are needed to express the meaning?
Meaning	form and meaning	R	What meaning does this word form signal?
		P	What word form can be used to express this meaning?
	concept and referents	R	What is included in the concept?
		P	What items can the concept refer to?
	associations	R	What other words does this make us think of?
		P	What other words could we use instead of this one?
Use	grammatical functions	R	In what patterns does the word occur?
		P	In what patterns must we use this word?
	collocations	R	What words or types of words occur with this one?
		P	What words or types of words must we use with this one?
	constraints on use (register, frequency ...)	R	Where, when, and how often would we expect to meet this word?
		P	Where, when, and how often can we use this word?

Note: R = receptive knowledge, P = productive knowledge

Teaching strategies

Nation (2008: 1) defines the teachers' jobs as regards vocabulary teaching in four categories, namely "planning, strategy training, testing and teaching vocabulary". Further, Nation (2008: 98) distinguishes the teachers' task between drawing attention to the meaning, the form and the use of a vocabulary item. Already in the introduction, he mentions that among the many options of conveying vocabulary meanings that, when possible "the first-language translation should be given" (Nation 2008: 5). He lists various ways by which the meaning of a word can be quickly outlined (Nation 2008: 98):

1. Use an L1 translation.
2. Use a known L2 synonym or a simple definition in the L2.
3. Show an object or picture.
4. Give a quick demonstration.
5. Draw a simple picture or diagram.
6. Break the word into parts and give the meaning of the parts and the whole word (the word part strategy).
7. Give several example sentences with the word in context to show the meaning.
8. Comment on the underlying meaning of the word and other referents.

Ways of giving attention to the form of an unknown word are writing it on the board, providing the stress pattern, spelling and pronunciation and let students repeat, give possible prefixes, suffixes, and the stem and highlighting "spelling irregularities in the word" (Nation 2008: 98). The use of a word can be emphasized by providing grammatical patterns, collocates and well-known words that define the "lexical set it fits

into”, and explaining restrictions in terms politeness, register, frequency or specified local usage (Nation 2008: 98). It is noteworthy that Nation (2008: 97) views these ways of directly communicating vocabulary meaning as important, but states that they form only a small part of vocabulary teaching and are less effective than learning words through listening, speaking, intensive and extensive reading, and writing activities.

Similarly, in a handbook for language teachers Hedge (2000: 126) summarizes a range of techniques for teachers to convey the meaning of new vocabulary including giving a “physical demonstration”, hence using gestures or mime, giving “verbal explanation” and providing synonyms. Among other options are the use of translation, “visual aids” like pictures or drawings, antonyms and dictionary use (Hedge 2000: 126). Later, she emphasizes the importance of teachers’ continual work on semantic relations, word formation, “collocations and idioms” and connotations (Hedge 2000: 134). It is suggested that it is useful to include a variety of indirect as well as direct vocabulary learning activities (Hedge 2000: 133f).

Learning strategies

According to Oxford (2011: 167) “L2 learning strategies are the learner’s goal-directed actions for improving language proficiency or achievement, completing a task, or making learning more efficient, more effective, and easier”. The aforementioned teachers’ job of strategy training is further outlined and Nation (2008: 3) argues that the learning strategies of “guessing from context, learning to use word cards, using word parts, and dictionary use” are the ones the teachers should mediate to learners. Nation’s (2013) taxonomy of the different kinds of vocabulary learning strategies offers a general overview. More specifically, he outlines a range of possibly effective learning strategies including the focus on word parts, hence analyzing prefixes, stems and suffixes, guessing from context via the use of “background knowledge and linguistic cues”, incorporating reference sources such as dictionaries, lists or glossary, but also teachers, native speakers or other students, and drawing parallels between languages, most prominently the learner’s L1 (2013: 330f). Ways of processing word knowledge are taking notes in notebooks, lists or word cards, retrieval and “creative use”, which can, for instance, be “word analysis, semantic mapping”, “creating contexts, collocations and sentences containing the word”, “the key-

word technique” (cf. Nation 2008: 123) and, of course, using and recognizing the vocabulary item in the four receptive and productive skills (Nation 2013: 331f). Nation (2013: 329) highlights that the most successful learners use a large variety of vocabulary learning strategies and, most relevantly, know when certain strategies are appropriate. Concerning dictionary use, Nation (2008: 114) mentions that learners need a certain repertoire of known words in order to be able to use monolingual dictionaries and, therefore, argues that primary and intermediate students of English should be advised to use bilingual dictionaries. Hence, teachers must be aware of the language level and vocabulary knowledge of their learners as regards the recommendations and instructions for dictionary use.

Hedge (2000: 117) gives examples of “making associations, learning words in groups, and exploring range of meaning” as well as the keyword method in which a word from the L1 that sounds like the new vocabulary to be learnt is used to create a bridge between the two in order to retain the foreign language word. Creating word cards or lists, using learnt vocabulary in conversations and “consciously collecting words from authentic contexts” are her examples of metacognitive strategies (Hedge 2000: 118). The various strategies of teachers and students are highly interesting especially when comparing language proficiency levels, however, the main objective of this paper concerns the role of the L1 particularly for vocabulary teaching and learning in the EFL classroom. The comparison with the students’ L1 or translating words and phrases has already been outlined as one possible way to convey the meaning of new vocabulary and the next part will focus on this method, more precisely current beliefs and a few contemporary studies on the issue will be described.

The use of the L1 in vocabulary teaching and learning

As mentioned above, the suggestion of some CLT theorists as well as authors of teacher handbooks is the recognition of the L1 as a valuable resource for conveying the meaning of a new lexical item in a foreign language. However, not everyone within the field of CLT would agree, and therefore, the option of including the L1 in the teaching of vocabulary is “not viewed as an effective means to vocabulary teaching and learning” by some (Augustyn 2013: 362). Augustyn (2013: 362) proposes a critical view and calls for a reassessment of first language use for foreign language vocabulary learning as she writes:

While current beliefs about vocabulary acquisition in typical communicative-approach foreign language classrooms overwhelmingly discourage or stigmatize translation as a learning strategy, a small but growing number of SLA researchers are now questioning this overt ban on translation to reassess the principled use of the learner's first language."

This assessment of the author will be challenged by the following study with its focus on the investigation of teachers' and students' practices and attitudes towards L1 use and vocabulary teaching and learning. Cook's (2001: 414) perspective is that the L1 is to be efficiently included into the process of explaining new vocabulary and structures, as teachers thereby recognize "that the two languages are closely linked in the mind". In addition, this incorporation will help students feel more natural in the classroom (Cook 2001: 414). Both these statements are in line with other researchers, among them Jingxia (2010: 19), who views translation and code-switching as a natural means of conveying meaning in an EFL classroom. Similarly, Koletnik (2015: 2) outlines the great potential of translation as "most effective in relation to vocabulary", whereby "translation is both necessary and effective". Thornbury (2002: 77) regards translation as "the most direct route to a word's meaning" and assesses the inclusion of it into vocabulary presentation as useful, however, he warns of overusing it as students may become reliant on it and not able to develop an "independent L2 lexicon" anymore. This over-dependency is more thoroughly elaborated by Wallace (1982: 25), who writes that certain English words might be strongly related to the word in the students' mother tongue, so both languages share "the same derivation and are therefore similar in form" called cognates (example: Spanish *método* – English *method*). This is described as a clear "advantage" in language learning, but not at all an "unmixed blessing" (Wallace 1982: 26), because words which are similar in form in two languages might differ in meaning and are called "false friends" (Example: *confus* means embarrassed in French – *confused* means perplexed in English). Wallace (1982: 47) explains that translation was once the main method for vocabulary teaching. However, students were not exposed to the target language sufficiently and had little opportunity to practice the use of it in context. Thus, teachers tried to ban L1 from the classroom completely, but Wallace (1982: 48) states that the use of the L1 can be time-saving and reassure students. Nevertheless, he highlights that "translation" should be "kept under tight control" when it comes to vocabulary teaching (1982: 48). The more favorable method is to explain a word in the target language, thus paraphrasing, because students are exposed to the target language and will learn

this technique for themselves over time. It can be seen that, already in an early work, what we discussed as principled or judicious use of the L1 has been addressed in relation to vocabulary teaching.

More recently, it has also been recognized that, despite some studies that stand in favor of an incorporation of the first language into the conveying of meaning of new words, the level of effectiveness of either L1 translation or TL explanation in vocabulary teaching “has been under-researched” (Tian & Macaro 2012: 367). Nevertheless, Macaro (2009: 49) argues that there is “some evidence that some items of vocabulary” may be retained better when the instructor gives L1 equivalents, as “this triggers deeper semantic processing than might occur by providing second-language definitions or paraphrases”. Some studies will be reviewed as to give an overview of recent research and provide a basis for the discussion about the results of the study in the second part of this thesis.

Studies on the use of L1 in vocabulary teaching and learning

In the context of primary schools in Spain, García Mayo and Hidalgo (2017: 132) observed students’ language use during a communicative jigsaw task and found that the major function of the L1 is the assistance of students when dealing with unknown words. Concerning learners’ L1 use, the main function in more than 80 % of all L1 instances was addressing problems with understanding new vocabulary (García Mayo & Hidalgo 2017: 138). The authors conclude that, as the learners successfully completed the task with only little reliance on their L1, that this opportunity to include their L1 “when completing an oral communicative task in pairs should not prevent educators from carrying out this type of activity in the language classroom”, as the prohibition would possibly frustrate learners and create negative attitudes towards the language to be learned. Lucero (2011: 60) focuses on speaking in the EFL classroom and a typical function of students’ code-switching, namely “when the learners ask the teacher for the TL equivalent of an L1 word”. He conceptualizes this function linearly as three steps and calls this “interactional pattern the RPA sequence (Request – Provision - Acknowledgement)”, for, firstly, the learner asks for the TL equivalent by using their L1, then the teacher provides the correct form and lastly, the learner incorporates or does not incorporate the new vocabulary item successfully into their speaking (Lucero 2011: 61). The described interaction pattern presupposes not only

a shared L1 of learners and the teacher, but also a shared “interactive framework” (Lucero 2011: 70), which means that the teacher does not question the students’ L1 use and continues the interaction. In conclusion, Lucero’s (2011: 70) interaction pattern RPA “helps gain more understanding of code-switching as an interaction-communication strategy rather than a failure in using the TL in class”. Thus, the request for a TL equivalent by using the shared L1 is presented as a communicative need of students in oral classroom interaction. Results of a study by Barcroft (2009: 82f) revealed that first-year language learners use the strategies of associating or translating vocabulary with or into their L1 second and third most frequently, the most common strategy being “L2 word-picture association”. However, within this study, only words that could be portrayed visually were used, which could imply that comparisons with and translations into the L1 would be the most frequently used strategies when students face more abstract words that cannot be presented in pictures. Anyway, this study approves that lower level language learners use their L1 very frequently when new words occur. Likewise, a study by Pavičić Takač (2009: 111) shows that “translating words into L1” is the third-most used strategy among primary school learners of English according to self-reports in questionnaires.

Jingxia (2010: 19) recorded lessons and identifies functions and frequencies of instructor code-switching instances and, as a result, more than half of the teachers switch to Chinese, the L1 in this study, to facilitate the understanding of new words or words that cause problems within class by providing equivalents in the L1. Similarly, doing research on “focus-on-form episodes”, Nakatsukasa and Loewen (2015: 133) imply that teachers use the students’ L1 as frequently as the target language when it comes to conveying vocabulary meaning. Comesaña et al. (2009: 29) conclude from their study with learners, who received only one foreign language lesson, that there was more semantic interference for the strategy of comparing new words with pictures and “a nonsignificant [interference] effect for the L2–L1 method”, which supports bilingual learning strategies. Nevertheless, the interference effect could probably depend on the L1 and FL and this study was conducted with Basque children who learned Spanish or vice versa.

Nemati & Maleki (2014: 1340) test the effect of the so-called diglot-weave technique, in which TL words and phrases are incorporated in an L1 text, on vocabulary acquisition in Iranian EFL high school classrooms and, based on their test scores, conclude

that this method is an effective means to “reinforce vocabulary learning”. When this technique is used, students are presented novel TL words in the context of an L1 utterance at beginner’s level and as their proficiency level rises, the “use of the L1 in the classroom can be gradually phased out” (Nemati & Maleki 2014: 1341). The authors describe that the meaning is given by the context, which makes this technique a “natural process” (Nemati & Maleki 2014: 1342). Some studies consider testing the effects of L1 use for vocabulary teaching and learning. Anton Ramirez (2011: 103) concludes from his findings that learning via L1 equivalents may be a useful way both for “the acquisition of vocabulary and the grammatical structures with the only exception of the structure ‘be used to’”. Salem (2012: 148) found that including items in which students need to translate vocabulary in test situations “opens up an opportunity for test takers to express meaning in English”. In a comparative study, Joyce (2018: 224) gives evidence for his expectation that students achieve higher test scores when vocabulary items are assessed via translation into L1 than when being asked to provide paraphrases or explanations in the target language.

These studies do all indicate that learners and teachers are able to use their L1 successfully when learning and teaching new vocabulary items. Students seem to view translating into their L1 as a natural means of getting a better understanding of new FL words, ask for a TL word in their L1 and, especially primary EFL learners use translating into the L1 as a vocabulary learning strategy. Likewise, teachers incorporate the L1 when it comes to the teaching of vocabulary items and strategies with L1 use seem to improve test results and are thus facilitating the learning process. Nevertheless, a few studies indicate quite the contrary, as for example Alroe and Reinders (2015: 39) compared three groups - one learned vocabulary with translation equivalents, another group studied the words in context and a graphical aid and the last group was provided context, visualization and translation – of Thai first year university students with rather different proficiency levels in English. Their study found that contextual learning leads to better results than using translation and their study concludingly does not “support the contention that switching to L1 in EFL classes to introduce new vocabulary is justified” (Alroe and Reinders 2015: 39). It is, however, noteworthy that the group members who studied via translation did not receive “graphic illustrations”, a learning aid which might have given a clear advantage to the other groups, while all other groups received more than one resource for learning (Alroe and Reinders 2015: 39). This study could rather imply that a variety of teach-

ing and learning strategies improves vocabulary learning, as learners that receive two or three learning aids will, obviously, outperform those with only one.

Concerning the preferred strategies of teachers, Vasu and Dhanavel (2016) conducted a questionnaire-based study. The results of it indicate that, among Indian teachers, “the use of comparisons with L1 was the least preferred” (Vasu & Dhanavel 2016: 111) teaching strategy as concerns instruction, whereas the same teachers frequently employ techniques such as “guessing from the context to find the meanings of new words, group work to learn new words, and using new words in sentences to store them in memory” (Vasu & Dhanavel 2016: 103). Likewise, Fussi (2017: 74) investigated Austrian teachers’ attitudes by questionnaire and her results agree with Vasu and Dhanavel (2016), as Austrian instructors explain unknown vocabulary to a great extent in the target language, even though they are aware that the EFL classroom does not quite work without some use of students’ first languages. However, translation is mostly only “employed as a last resort” when definitions in the target language turn out to be ineffective (Fussi 2017: 74). This implies that there are teachers who view the L1 as an effective resource for vocabulary teaching while others do not, maybe depending on the region, their experiences and their tertiary education. As the following study is set in Austria too, the comparison with the latter cited study will be of high interest. In the light of the considered literature, the practical part of this paper may hopefully make a relevant contribution to the recent discussion. So far, we have gained an insight into the role of the L1 regarding general language teaching and the use of it in vocabulary teaching. Important aspects that may not be ignored are the actual in-class practice and teachers’ as well as students’ beliefs on the raised issues. Therefore, contemporary studies on their attitudes as regards language use in FL classrooms, focusing on vocabulary teaching and learning will be reviewed.

4. Teachers’ and learners’ attitudes

As the next step of the theoretical part, existing research on the attitudes of teachers and students on the use of the first language in the EFL classroom will be presented with the objective of a later contribution to the discussion about Austrian EFL teach-

ers' and students' attitudes. These attitudes are of high relevance, as they, after all, determine the in-class practices of teachers and learners. The results of the following study will be relevant, insofar as they can be compared to former research outlined in this section and with the teachers' actual observed practices. Besides reviewing studies on beliefs about L1 use in the language classroom in general, the special interest lies in the use of L1 for vocabulary teaching and learning.

4.1. Teachers' attitudes

At several Chinese universities the topic of code-switching in EFL classrooms was analyzed and a positive attitude was expressed by the majority of EFL instructors and learners (Jingxia 2010: 16). The study infers that the use of Chinese, the L1, is "prevalent in the EFL classrooms" of the investigated setting and that the influence in the teaching and learning process is a positive one (Jingxia 2010: 10). Moreover, a very high percentage of teachers (80 %) and a rather high percentage of students (61.8 %) agree with the use of L1 with the objective of translating "unknown vocabulary items" (Jingxia 2010: 16f), as suggested by this study. Equally, Mohebbi and Alavi (2014) found in their study based on a questionnaire that a high percentage of Iranian EFL teachers is in favor of using their students' L1 to facilitate FL learning. The highest score was given to the teaching of vocabulary via using the students' L1 (Mohebbi & Alavi 2014: 64). A similar study by Bruen and Kelly (2017: 368) at an Irish university indicates a clear tendency that supports a limited use of code-switching to the L1 in some situations, especially when mental overload and students' anxiety can be reduced. These instances include the clarification of difficult terms, explanation of complex concepts and grammar and the establishment of a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom. Explaining complex vocabulary items is among the most widespread uses of the L1, belonging to the category of explaining complex language, which "includes all words and phrases with which the lecturers perceive their students as having difficulty (Bruen & Kelly 2017: 373). Shabir (2017: 45) conducted a questionnaire-based study with 23 international EFL student teachers at an Australian university, suggesting that "the limited use of L1 is not unnecessary and has positive effects in certain activities." A few questions focus on vocabulary teaching in connection with L1 use and allude to controversy, as there is strong agreement

on students' demand for L1 to explain the meaning of new words while the participants agree that translation into the "L1 is not the only way to learn vocabulary" (Shabir 2017: 49), which may simply be due to the fact that they have experienced various ways to convey meaning of novel words and would suggest the use of a variety of strategies. Liu et al. (2004: 628f) found that teachers perceive that they should use 58% English in their EFL lessons and that some teachers often use their L1 because they think it is "more time-cost effective". The authors also conclude that "teachers' beliefs have a very important effect on their language use", one example being that the results indicate that the proficiency level of learners clearly influences the amount of L1 and TL use within the lessons (Liu et al. 2004: 629). Using only English would only work when learners "had achieved an appropriate English proficiency level", as teachers further argued that English-only instruction would be beneficial for learners that already reached a higher proficiency level, but harming the learning progress for lower proficiency learners (Liu et al. 2004: 629). The same teachers stated that they used students L1 to help those at lower levels (Liu et al. 2004: 629).

Quite differently from the findings above, Fussi (2017) conducted a study in Austria, the context of the present research, and found that elementary language teachers view the L1 as an inevitable part of their language lessons in English and French. They, however, believe that the use of German "should be kept to a minimum" by using the target languages as much as possible, because while employing monolingual ways of language teaching, the first language is "only considered as a last pedagogical resort" when the target language strategies did not show the desired effect (Fussi 2017: 74). This suggests that Austrian foreign language teachers tend to favor the English-only approach and want to maximize the use of the target language in their lessons, but they nevertheless tolerate a small amount of L1 use when checking understanding or for efficiency reasons concerning time management (Fussi 2017: 76). This study will be especially interesting for comparison, as it is set in the same context of Austrian EFL classes. In general, findings of the literature suggest a rather positive attitude by teachers towards L1 use for specific functions and for the purpose of vocabulary teaching.

4.2. Students' attitudes

Not only teachers' attitudes have been analyzed by researchers, but a few studies have focused on learners' perspectives on the use of L1 in the EFL classroom as well. For instance, Calis and Dikilitas (2012: 5079) indicate in their study that students ascribe positive roles to the use of the L1 as a support to learn the target language. More precisely, their positive attitude emerges especially towards translation in relation with the comprehension of reading texts and the retention of new vocabulary. Self-reports show that learners use bilingual dictionaries to translate reading texts for comprehension. The findings suggest that students believe that the incorporation of the L1 can be helpful when it comes to vocabulary acquisition, the development of reading skills, writing and speaking skills (Calis & Dikilitas 2012: 5081). Liu et al. (2004: 631) similarly suggest that learners prefer L1 use by their teachers when it comes to explaining vocabulary and grammar. The students also reported that the teachers' use of English improves their listening, speaking and reading skills.

Another study on students' attitudes which regards and compares the proficiency levels of students and the different views they might generate is mentioned. The study conducted by Macaro and Lee (2013) focuses on 798 Korean students' attitudes on L1 use in the EFL classroom and for vocabulary teaching as well. The researchers compared adult learners at university with children at primary school by distributing questionnaires and conducting interviews. The findings show that none of the groups favor an English-only approach in their lessons. However, adult university learners seem to be more satisfied with instruction that totally excludes their first language from the classroom, while the young learners prefer more L1 use in their EFL lessons. The authors interpret that this difference may be caused by the adult learners' "greater experience in language learning, although the possibility that their acceptance was also due to higher proficiency cannot be excluded" (Macaro & Lee 2013: 717). A minor emphasis of the study is vocabulary teaching and learning. The results of the matching questionnaire items suggest that young learners expect their teachers to use more L1 than English-only definitions regarding the conveying of meaning of new vocabulary. Nevertheless, only a small number of the overall participants are in favor of English-only instructions in vocabulary teaching. Adult learners seem to be more willing to accept English-only explanations by teachers if it remains

comprehensible, a finding that presents a major contrast to the children. However, both groups young and older perceive “teachers’ bilingual approach to vocabulary teaching as effectively fostering their comprehension” (Macaro & Lee 2013: 730) without noticeable differences. A question on reading texts shows that, coinciding with the findings above, adults prefer the teacher to provide English definitions or paraphrases to a larger extent than young learners when new words occur in a reading comprehension. Overall, the results suggest that learners with more experience in EFL classes or a higher proficiency level or both “are more willing to try EO [English-only] instruction than children, even though they find vocabulary explanations easier to grasp in the L1” (Macaro & Lee 2013: 730). In the light of these researchers’ findings, the suggestion that learners have positive attitudes towards the teachers’ usage of their L1 into EFL lessons in general and for teaching new vocabulary items can be made.

5. Language proficiency level as a factor of influence

So far, general arguments either in favor or against the incorporation of the students’ L1 into foreign language classrooms have been reviewed, with most authors disregarding the learners’ language proficiency level. Considering the weaker linguistic repertoire of beginners and a steadily growing range of competences and abilities of more proficient language learners would naturally imply that EFL teachers need to be aware of their learners’ proficiency level and consequently decide on the appropriate medium of instruction. Nemati & Maleki (2014: 1345) state:

The EFL teacher needs to bear in mind that, in foreign language classroom, the target language input by the teacher is considered as an important factor in language learning, but at the same time the level of students and their need for comprehensible input should be taken into consideration.

There are, indeed, some studies which focus on the interrelation between EFL students’ proficiency level and the effect of L1 use in vocabulary teaching or, at least, incorporate this issue into their fields of research. Lee and Macaro (2013: 887) provide support for the argument that links to the L1 do not only facilitate students’ vocabulary acquisition in general, but can also be more effective with lower level stu-

dents, who are often younger in age. The researchers' population are young beginners and adult learners at university. The test results of the two groups after they received either English-only instruction or explanations which include teacher code-switching indicate that both proficiency level groups benefit from instructions that incorporate the first language of students and that elementary students clearly benefit more than adults. The first indication is confirmed by Tian and Macaro's (2012: 367) study, which tests first year EFL university students and suggests that teacher code-switching is more effective than using an English-only approach as regards vocabulary acquisition. Furthermore, Lee and Macaro's (2013: 897) study assesses a questionnaire on learners' preferences in the language classroom and shows that "young learners strongly opposed an EO [English-only] pedagogy" and thus, regard the use of their L1 in the classroom as preferable more than adult learners do.

Ramachandran and Rahim (2004: 161), similarly, investigated the retention of vocabulary via a teaching method using translation as opposed to one which does not use the L1 and discerned an astonishing difference inferring that "the translation method has a positive impact on learners' recall and retention of the meaning of words that they learned". Comparable results by Latsanyphone and Bouangeune (2009: 186) suggest that using L1 as a strategy for vocabulary teaching at a low proficiency level can enhance the retention of new words "both in isolation and in context", as the group of students who received L1 translation outperformed the control group in the conducted tests. However, Joyce (2018: 219) criticizes the group constellations as "not comparable", because "the L1 translation group received a written definition of the target vocabulary, and participated in multiple learning consolidation activities" while the English-only group was only explained the target words orally. Therefore, this study is considered doubtful.

Even though the main focus of this thesis is on EFL classrooms, a study of CLIL classrooms in Hong Kong may contribute to the issue of the influence of the learners' proficiency level. Lo (2015: 270) concludes that teachers are aware of their students' language ability when they choose their medium of instruction, as a high amount of L1 is used in low proficiency English classes for elucidating the topics of the lesson, teacher-student interaction and referring to metalanguage, whereas high proficiency learners received less L1 input by their teachers. Interestingly, the main purpose for switching to the L1 was the translation of "subject-specific vocabulary items" in the

target language (Lo 2015: 270). Jingxia (2009: 49) analyzed the oral input of teachers in EFL lessons and concluded that a major reason, among fulfilling communicative needs and adapting to “the linguistic reality”, why teachers switch to students’ L1 is to “accommodate teachers’ and students’ language proficiency”. An astonishing result by Qian et al. (2009: 724) is that the amount of L1 use by two teachers in a primary school was more than 40 percent in the first form and drastically decreasing to less than five percent in the fourth form of primary school, which indicates that the level is a determining factor in teachers’ language use choices and that teacher might believe that lower-level students need more L1 input. Concerning the learners’ language use, as has been mentioned above, Sampson (2012: 296) and Eldridge (1996: 304) conclude that the students’ amount of code-switches in the FL classroom does not differ according to their different proficiency levels. From the findings within this section, we can assume that the proficiency level makes a clear difference as regards teachers’ amount of L1, but not for the students’ use of L1 within the classroom.

Taking into account the reviewed literature above, there are controversial findings as regards language use in CLT-dominated EFL classrooms, especially when it comes to using a shared L1. Some scholars and studies propose a judicious use of the learners’ L1 in the language classroom in general as well as for vocabulary teaching and learning, while others argue for an exclusive use of the target language. In this respect, questions on the practices of Austrian EFL teachers and students and their attitudes might be appropriate. Moreover, it would be of high relevance which of the proposed vocabulary teaching and learning strategies Austrian EFL teachers and learners actually employ and what role their L1 has in this regard. Again, their attitudes towards vocabulary teaching and learning and the use of translation would add possible reasons for actual classroom practices. For there is very little research on this aspect, the study compares two different proficiency levels and investigates the influence of the learners’ level on language choice and the teaching and learning of vocabulary. Well-considered research methods presuppose clearly defined research questions. After reflecting the discussed issues, the research questions for the empirical study must contain the topics of language use in the EFL classroom in general and for the purposes of vocabulary teaching and learning, teachers’ and learners’ attitudes towards L1 use and vocabulary teaching and learning, and the influence of the learners’ proficiency level on these issues. Every research question is addressed

within the context of the Austrian school system. In the light of these described areas of interest, the following four research questions are defined as a basis for the empirical investigation:

RQ1: What is the role of German in the Austrian EFL classroom?

RQ2: Which strategies do Austrian EFL teachers and learners use for the purposes of vocabulary teaching and learning?

RQ3: Which attitudes do Austrian EFL teachers and learners have towards their practices and the use of the L1, especially for the purpose of vocabulary teaching and learning?

RQ4: Does the proficiency level of the learners make a difference regarding the role of German, vocabulary teaching and learning strategies as well as in the teachers' and learners' attitudes?

PART II: Empirical investigation

6. Methodology

6.1. Purpose of study

This chapter will introduce the practical part of this thesis, a case study. Before going into detail about the data gathering instruments used, the purpose of the study will be clarified. The main interest of this study lies in the practical investigation of teachers' and students' classroom practices regarding the mediation of new vocabulary with a special focus on the use of the first languages of students as well as their attitudes towards this field of research. As a major purpose of this chapter, it is elaborated on how these points of interest can be addressed most adequately in order to obtain relevant results. As a first step, research questions were developed at the end of the previous section by considering issues discussed in the theoretical part. Secondly, a main feature of every study is the selection of participants. For this reason, the second section approaches the question which groups of people are needed to be able to answer the research questions. Finally, as a highly important step, research methods and instruments for conducting the study are decided on and the ways in which they were analyzed are described. To sum up, the purpose of this research is to gain information about classroom practices of Austrian teachers and students concerning language use, vocabulary teaching and learning strategies, their attitudes towards these controversially discussed topic and the proficiency level as a factor of influence.

6.2. Participants and setting

The research questions include the teachers as well as students, which is why teachers participated with their classes. As a main research objective included the comparison of two language proficiency levels, every teacher was asked to partici-

pate with two classes, one group of lower secondary students and one higher secondary class. Potential teacher research participants were approached through informal contacts of the researcher. The main task was to find three teachers who would teach the same age groups and proficiency levels in an Austrian AHS and would be willing to be observed and spend some of their valuable time in the classroom on letting their students fill in a questionnaire and some additional time for an interview. This type of school was mainly chosen, because it includes both the Austrian Unterstufe and Oberstufe which can be compared best in an AHS, as the same teachers are likely to teach both levels. Moreover, because of the explicit focus on level differences, it made sense to compare lower secondary with higher secondary forms. After finding three suitable teachers, the headmasters of the two schools were asked for permission and the "Landesschulrat für Niederösterreich" (now "Bildungsdirektion Niederösterreich") was sent all the relevant documents in order to get the official permission. Additionally, all parents of the participating students of the six classes were asked for their agreement with the fact that their son or daughter would be part of this empirical study. Three teachers of two different schools in Lower Austria were chosen with their consent and under the criterion of them teaching the same classes as concerns age and proficiency level, which usually belong together in standard Austrian AHS-classrooms although deviations were not excluded but would be stated explicitly in further explanations. The chosen levels were the 3rd form of AHS for the lower secondary level and the 6th form of AHS for the higher secondary level of education. According to the official curricula of the Austrian "Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung" when comparing these two grades the language proficiency levels of A1-A2 (https://bildung.bmbwf.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/ahs8_782.pdf: 5) and B1 (https://bildung.bmbwf.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/lp_ahs_os_lebende_fs_11854.pdf: 6), as defined by the Council of Europe (2001) in the Common European Frame of References were under investigation. Consequently, the participants of the study were three teachers of two different schools and the members of two of each of their classes, which makes a total of students of six Austrian AHS classes – three 3rd forms and three 6th forms. The overall number of students of the six classes was 127, whereby the total number of student participants during the six in-class observations was 120, 66 female and 54 male learners, and the questionnaire was filled out by 119 learners, 70 female and 49 male participants.

The two female teachers taught in the same AHS form, which is a big school in a rather small town in Lower Austria. The general principle of this school is liberal education and the facilitation of students' individual strength by offering various school branches and elective subjects in the higher secondary forms focusing on languages, the humanities and natural sciences, the fine arts and physical education, even though the religious background, which is part of their guideline as well, cannot be denied. The male teacher, who was more experienced in years than the two female teachers, was employed in an AHS in a larger city in Lower Austria, a school that offers three different branches in the upper classes, namely the foci on informatics and computer science, languages and sports education, and is committed to a functioning relationship between teachers, students and parents and optimizing students' performance by fostering their self-esteem and handling their individual strengths and weaknesses responsibly.

6.3. Research methods: data collection and analysis

The data collection was composed of a mixture of qualitative and quantitative research methods and conducted in three steps, which were in-class observations with audio recordings, the distribution of questionnaires to all students and semi-structured interviews with the participating teachers. The following is a presentation of reasons why these instruments were chosen, how they were prepared, constructed and conducted, and how they were analyzed.

6.3.1. Observation and audio recording

The classroom practices of both students and teachers were observed and recorded in their lessons, which formed the first method of research in the present study. According to Cohen et al. (2011: 456) the unique attribute of this research instrument is "that it offers an investigator the opportunity to gather 'live' data from naturally occurring social situations" and this makes it authentic and distinctive. Three teachers participated in this research project with two classes of different proficiency levels each,

which means that six lessons were observed and recorded in total. As research questions, hence the foci of the practical study, had been formulated already, the type of this instrument was a “structured observation” (Cohen et al. 2011: 459ff). The foci of the investigation of the observed lessons were the conveyance of vocabulary items by teachers and the use of the L1 by teachers and students in general and while dealing with these items. Thus, the purpose of the in-class observations and audio recordings was to gain information about the frequencies of German use and its purposes by students and teachers, the strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning, and the similarities and differences of language use and vocabulary teaching and learning between the two investigated levels, as “observational data must be collected that enable research questions to be answered” (Cohen et al. 2011: 459). This instrument could contribute to all research questions except for the issue on the attitudes of teachers and students. The results could indicate whether Austrian teachers rather try to avoid the L1, use it in limited situations or use it as the main means of vocabulary instruction and whether the proficiency level makes a difference in this regard. Moreover, the same indications may be made for students in relation with the question of whether students’ L1 use is rather encouraged or prohibited by teachers.

This research method required some preparation and resources for a successful implementation. Firstly, an observation sheet needed to be designed for me to take notes on while observing a lesson (see Appendix A). This was, however, not the most essential part, because spoken discourse could be listened to again on the audio recording. Nevertheless, taking notes in class about body language such as facial expressions and gestures, the behavior of students and teachers, and spoken utterances which were too quiet to be understood in the recording was obviously not a mistake, as not everything that could be relevant for answering the research questions could be taken directly from the audio files. Moreover, what was written on the board was noted down, the seating plan of every class was drawn and every utterance from students was assigned with an acronym (S1, S2, ...), so that it could be identified who said what while transcribing the recordings of the lessons. During the course of the first lessons, I realized that additional sheets for writing down all of the aforementioned were much more needed than the designed observation sheet, as most issues on it, such as frequencies of German usage by teachers and students and vocabulary teaching and learning strategies, could be analyzed more in depth

via the recordings. As a second step, I needed some kind of audio recorder like a dictating machine. Ideally, two or more recording devices are used for one lesson to be on the safe side. Thus, in addition to a Dictaphone, the recorder of a mobile phone was activated during the observed lessons and placed on a different position in the classroom.

The main resource for the analysis was the audio recorder, as it contained the six files of spoken discourse in the lessons. Additionally, my mobile phone functioned as a second source in case some utterances could not be understood. Firstly, after all lessons had been recorded, each of them was transcribed in full length using the computer program VoiceScribe (VOICE project 2007: <https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/voicescribe>) and formatted according to the VOICE transcription conventions (VOICE project 2007: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php?page=transcription_general_information).

Secondly, all instances of German usage by teachers as well as students were noted and assigned a purpose lesson after lesson via using the transcripts and observation sheets. Ten different purposes were identified, whereby one instance was classified as not understandable. This part of the analysis required the ability of qualitative interpretation by the researcher and could, therefore, be potentially subjective even though the work was done thoroughly and to the best of my knowledge and belief. The same counts for the next step, in which the strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning were analyzed qualitatively. Overall, sixteen strategies were recognized. The most difficult decision was the attribution of some strategies, like brainstorming, matching activities, guessing from context, word formation tasks and activities with synonyms and antonyms, to either students or teachers, because the teachers integrated those actively into the classroom whereas students then applied them after being told to do so. It was decided to assign all these activities to teachers' strategies and only assign strategies to the students that were uttered orally, spontaneously and were induced by themselves, which is why students' strategies only comprise German vocabulary translation, German vocabulary explanation, English vocabulary explanation and one synonym. After this, the handwritten data of both instances of German use and vocabulary teaching and learning strategies were typed into the statistics program SPSS, in order to be able to add all numbers and to compare and contrast the individual classes, the two proficiency levels and students with teachers.

This program was highly beneficial for analyzing the in-class recordings, “since the data can be converted into numbers, the panoply of suitable statistical analyses can be utilized” (Cohen et al. 2011: 464), as the qualitatively analyzed data could be quantified in a way, even though the major purpose of SPSS was to analyze the outcome of the questionnaire.

6.3.2. Questionnaire

In addition to the in-class observations, the students’ practices and attitudes were investigated via another research instrument as well, in order to gain more detailed insights into the addressed issues, as one recorded and observed lesson per class may have not been enough to cover the entire extent of the formulated research questions. Moreover, a questionnaire enabled the researcher to gain information about students’ beliefs and perceptions of classroom practices, serving as the main function of this instrument.

For this reason, students’ attitudes on their own and teachers’ L1 use when it comes to vocabulary teaching and learning were approached by quantitative analysis. The tool for this type of research was a questionnaire. According to Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 9f) a well-structured questionnaire asking for specific information or using scales is an instrument which is “particularly suited for quantitative, statistical analysis”. This method allowed the researcher to compare the attitudes of a large number of participants, composed of all students of the six classes with a focus on the differences or similarities between the two proficiency levels analyzed. This “unprecedented efficiency” regarding time, effort and finances for the researcher is one of the main advantages highlighted by Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 6). Moreover, the data can be processed rather easily and fast.

Despite the listed advantages, some issues had to be considered in relation with questionnaires. Firstly, questions needed to be formulated in a simple way, so that both age groups were able to understand them easily, for this quantitative research instrument cannot probe “deeply into an issue”, as it will show “rather superficial data” (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 7). Furthermore, there are other potential shortcomings of questionnaires such as demotivated participants, and “literacy problems” of respond-

ents, as a researcher cannot always know the reading and writing abilities of their participants (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 7). Because of the context of foreign language classrooms in the present study, this issue was of high relevance and the questionnaires were, therefore, written in simple language in the students' shared first language, which was German. Further, the validity might suffer, because the answers cannot be corrected in cases of misunderstandings, lack of knowledge and intentional truth deviation (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 8). Lastly, the "fatigue effect" might be regarded if the questionnaire is too long for students, as they may answer the last questions more inaccurately because of being too tired or bored (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 9).

Because of the possible pitfalls of questionnaires outlined above, their design needed to be thought through carefully. The first considerable issue was the length of the questionnaire and Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 12f) suggest not to exceed four pages and a processing time of thirty minutes. As, in this investigation, the questionnaire was filled in in precious classroom time, it was designed for a maximum of 15 minutes and was not longer than three and a half pages. Secondly, the layout was designed to be clear for students. The items were numbered and all written in the same font and format. The questionnaire started with general information on the overall topic followed by instructions on how the upcoming items are to be answered (see Appendix). The conductor clarified that the answers would not be evaluated in terms of grading, which means that there were no right or wrong answers for the learners. Thus, as opposed to achievement tests, the questionnaire as a research method is "non-evaluative" (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 4). The main part was a mixture of "behavioral questions" about the learners' practices in their current English language classroom and "attitudinal questions" about their opinions and interests in relation to the use of L1 in vocabulary teaching and learning (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 5). At the end, the questionnaire contained "factual questions" as to classify the students' age, gender and academic year as well as their grade in their last year of study (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 5).

As this part of the research was quantitative and I planned to code and analyze the answers via a statistical program, the chosen question type was closed-ended for all items with two minor exceptions and the used types were rating scales, multiple-choice questions and dichotomous questions (Cohen et al. 2011: 382-390). Likert-

scales were used for most items, which means that statements were given and students had to choose their extent of agreement ranging from “Stimme voll zu” to “Stimme gar nicht zu” (see Appendix B) and offering five options including a neutral option because learners could be indecisive in some cases (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 27). Two items were to be answered in the multiple-choice format, whereby learners were only allowed to tick a maximum of two answers, as these items were about highly frequently used strategies and students’ preferred strategies (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 33). These items included one open-ended option each, where students could indicate other used and preferred strategies of vocabulary teaching. One numeric item asked for the students’ age (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 35).

The formulation and arrangement of the individual items was elaborated very carefully and reflected on various times. The first step was the decision to which research questions the students’ data would contribute. In fact, students could contribute to all four questions and the chosen topics were strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning, German use in relation with vocabulary teaching and learning and the proficiency level as a factor of influence. Some “multi-item scales” were used for the questions whether the proficiency level makes a difference as regards German usage and whether the teachers use rather English or German for conveying vocabulary (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 23f). Additionally, more than one item was used for one issue such as strategies of students and teachers, students’ preferences, their beliefs on the influence of the L1 for EFL learning and the proficiency level (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 25). Generally, the questionnaire was divided into two sections, namely practices in the EFL classroom and students’ beliefs. Then, the items for these topics were formulated, discussed with the academic advisor and edited several times. The decision for giving statements rather than questions was made, because learners can indicate the level of agreement much better to given statements. A further step of arranging the items was mixing the different statements, so that the close similarity of some questions would not become too obvious to the students.

Conducting the questionnaire was, as a final step, the least complicated one and most effort was used for organizing and fixing the dates with the teachers. The parents of the participating students and the students themselves were informed about the anonymity of their data via a letter to the parents which included the formal question for permission (see Appendix G). Even though the items were not considered to

address particularly “sensitive topics” (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 16), the respondents might have felt more comfortable knowing that information they gave about their instructors, practices and personal attitudes would be dealt with anonymously. At the beginning of each of the six lessons, the questionnaire was explained and distributed. Ten to fifteen minutes were used to fill it in by students and, of course, I was available for any comprehension questions by students. After giving thanks to the learners and teachers, the lessons could go on as planned.

The results were analyzed via the program SPSS. This program was downloaded and the researcher had to acquaint himself with it via reading an introductory guide (Larson-Hall 2016) specific video tutorials (SPSSTutorials 2014: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCtbK7fE825BMtQfyXWmXwbw>). Before actually entering the data, the items and answers needed to be coded. As Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 84f) highlight, “the first step of data processing usually involves converting the respondents’ answers to numbers by means of coding procedures” and that coding is rather uncomplicated when using closed-ended items. The items were numbered (Q1, Q2, ...) and each answer received a value. The Likert-scales obtained possible ordinal values from one to five (1 = Stimme voll zu, 2 = Stimme zu, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Stimme nicht zu, 5 = Stimme gar nicht zu) and the multiple-choice answers were assigned six nominal values (1 = Englische Erklärung, 2 = Deutsche Übersetzung, 3 = Bilder und Gesten, 4 = Selbständig im Wörterbuch nachschlagen, 5 = Aus Kontext schließen, 6 = Andere Methode) (cf. Cohen et al. 2011: 382f). The answers for the students’ grade of the last school year (ordinal), their age and gender (both nominal) were coded as well. Thereafter, the data was typed into the SPSS tables value after value and class after class. During this process, missing values (-99 = Keine Angabe) and invalid answers (-77 = Ungültig), hence two answers which both indicated agreement or disagreement with mutually exclusive statements, were coded retrospectively. After having typed in the single classes, their data was analyzed descriptively and then the third forms were combined as well as the sixth forms. Then, all classes were combined and the statistical data of every single item was analyzed. All these steps were needed, in order to be able to gain significant statistics of the individual classes, the two investigated levels and of all classes combined. In the results section 7, it can be seen which data were considered relevant enough for which research question.

6.3.3. Interview

A qualitative research method was used in the context of the issues on the teachers' attitudes and practices. Therefore, semi-structured interviews, which included questions on teachers' practices and attitudes, but were open to a free discussion between interviewer and interviewee as to gain insights into the genuine perspectives of three individual Austrian EFL teachers, were conducted. Further, one purpose of the interview was to investigate whether their attitudes conformed to the observed practices in the classroom. As Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 10) point out the ineffectiveness of collecting qualitative data by using open-ended questions in questionnaires, they suggest that "if we are seeking long and detailed personal accounts, other research methods such as a personal interview are likely to be more suitable for our purpose". This instrument was chosen, in order to be able to gain deeper insights into the practices and attitudes of the participating teachers and in fact, the obtained data could contribute to all four formulated research questions.

Many issues had to be considered before actually being able to conduct the interview. First of all, the topics which were supposed to be investigated, in order to answer the research questions, were identified. The specified variables (cf. Cohen et al. 2011: 415) were teachers' German use in the classroom, strategies for vocabulary teaching, use of German for vocabulary teaching, whether students are allowed to use German for vocabulary learning or not, dictionary usage, vocabulary check-ups, the level-dependency of German use in general and for vocabulary teaching, the view on the influence of other languages on EFL learning and translanguaging. As the observations had happened before the interviews, typical instances of German use, language usage for vocabulary teaching and similarities or differences between the two forms were listed for every teacher, in order to discuss them with the respective one. As a second step, questions that addressed the above-mentioned issues were formulated. The first decision in this respect was that the interview would be conducted in German, because of it being the shared first language of the researcher and all the teachers. Cohen et al. (2011: 423) highlight the consideration of both participants' language, for it is important to translate academic jargon into easier everyday language as well as to formulate clear questions. In the present study, this aspect was not considered a major issue, as the interviewer and interviewees were ex-

pected to share their frames of reference to a great degree, because they shared German as their mother tongue and the researcher was at the end of his English studies in order to become a teacher while the respondents were teachers of English who may have experienced a similar academic program. Nevertheless, the researcher focused without doubt on a clear and comprehensible formulation of explanations and questions.

Secondly, the design of the questions, thus how they were formulated and structured, was obviously of high importance. The interview was divided thematically into the topics “Sprachverwendung im Englischunterricht”, “Vokabellehren und -lernen” and “Levelabhängigkeit von Sprachgebrauch”. Then, potential questions were formulated, reviewed and edited several times in cooperation with the academic advisor of the thesis. The questions formed a mixture of mainly “open-ended items” and “fixed-alternative items” (Cohen et al. 2011: 416). Cohen et al. (2011: 421) state that the views of the interviewer should not be communicated to the respondent and the interviewer should not judge the respondent’s statements. Therefore, instead of revealing findings and suggestions of the analyzed literature, the questions in the conducted interview focused on the practices, which include, more precisely, frequent practices in the EFL classroom to be stated by the interviewee and observed practices by the researcher, and on the participants’ attitudes towards the discussed issues. The open-ended items were intended to leave room for the respondents’ answers, so that they could say as much as they want when replying to a certain question whereas the dichotomous questions required a positive or a negative answer, hence a “yes” or “no”. However, probing questions made these issues more open and asked the respondents to give reasons or examples, hence to elaborate further on the issues at hand. Factual questions about teachers’ practices and those asking for opinions on the discussed topics were formulated (cf. Cohen et al. 2011: 417). Mostly, the interviewees had the possibility to give unstructured responses aimed at giving them as much freedom in the way they choose to answer certain questions (cf. Cohen et al. 2011: 419). One fill-in response asking for the duration of their jobs as teachers was included, so that the factor of teachers’ experience could be analyzed potentially.

As the respondents were asked about their observed practices in the recorded lessons and whether they considered these as rather typical or not for their EFL lessons, this instrument was in part a focused interview which characteristically “focuses

on a respondent's subjective responses to a known situation in which she has been involved and which has been analysed by the interviewer prior to the interview" (Cohen et al. 2011: 415).

Through the course of editing the questions, the decision to conduct semi-structured interviews was made. These provide researchers with the possibility "to attend to lived experience and pursue questions from extant theory", as Galletta (2013: 52) points out. As literature had been reflected before conducting the study for this thesis and in-class observations had been undertaken before the teachers were interviewed, this type of interview seemed suitable for the conducted research. Galletta (2013: 37) highlights that open-ended questions that aim to gain insight into the participant's experiences as well as theoretical questions that ask for more specific information in connection with existing concepts are included in a semi-structured interview. Cohen et al. (2011: 421) describe a main characteristic of the semi-structured interview, in which "topics and open-ended questions are written but the exact sequence and wording does not have to be followed with each respondent". The name does not mean that no planning is involved, but rather that some aspects need to be considered thoroughly and well-planned. As suggested, prompts for a clear definition of topics and probes for specific inquiry were prepared especially for fixed-alternative questions, as they helped the interviewer "to ask respondents to extend, elaborate, add to, provide detail for, clarify or qualify their response" (Cohen et al. 2011: 420). Asking for reasons, repeating questions and answers in a different tone, expressing interest and requesting examples or further clarification are examples of how probes were used during these interviews (Cohen et al. 2011: 420f). The schedule for the semi-structured interview contained the overall topics, specific formulations of questions for the topics, issues that regard the specific questions and several prompts and probes for the questions (Cohen et al. 2011: 421; see Appendix C).

As I conducted such an important interview for the first time, I practiced the procedure several times. The teachers were contacted, in order to arrange suitable dates for both interviewer and interview and locations for an uninterrupted interview. In consent with the teachers and principals, the interviews were conducted in the schools and the teachers provided quiet rooms. Before actually initiating the interview itself, I explained my research and purpose of the interview in the opening sequence.

Additionally, gratitude for the respondents' participation was expressed and the interviewees were informed about their rights to not answer a question or stop the interview in case they would feel uncomfortable.

In the present study, consent to conduct and audiotape the interview had been given by the participants beforehand in a written document, which asked them to permit conducting the study with them and their classes, as they were the English teachers of the six participating classes as well, clarifying the effort and procedure in as much detail as needed (see Appendix F). Nevertheless, they were asked again whether they agreed with being recorded and their data being used for research purposes directly before the interview started. Moreover, the interviewees were informed about the whole procedure of the interview beforehand and "factual, personal data" were collected and asked for rather at the end of the interview (Cohen et al. 2011: 421). As concerns the ethical dimension, the participants were ensured again that the information they gave would be dealt with cautiously and anonymously before the interview was initiated. Additionally, I defined which parts of the conversation would be employed as data, namely everything that would be recorded.

I was aware that an interview is not only an instrument for gaining valuable data, but also an interpersonal face-to-face conversation, thus "a social encounter" (Cohen et al. 2011: 422). For this reason, I had to provide interactional patterns, so that the respondents felt comfortable and were willing to discuss as honestly as possible about the raised issues. Several aspects were drawn attention to. I had sufficient knowledge about the questions discussed, but did not appear overbearing to the interviewee (Cohen et al. 2011: 422). Further, I was aware that communication via mime, gestures and other non-verbal aspects directed the interaction emotionally and that he needed to "establish and maintain a good rapport", which concerned politeness, respect and "handling the situation sensitively and professionally" (Cohen et al. 2011: 422).

Another important aspect was the level of "directiveness", which means that I had to be able to proceed the conversation in a way that the sought data were elicited and ranged from "making encouraging noises", probing comments and ideas of the interviewee to "introducing a new topic" (Cohen et al. 2011: 422f). This aspect was considered especially relevant in a semi-structured interview. This type of interview proved to be highly useful in a number of situations. The planned questions were

slightly differently formulated sometimes, their position was changed in some cases, for example when a teacher introduced a topic that was originally planned to be discussed at a later point, and sometimes the discussion of the observed in-class examples was preponed or postponed depending on the interviewee's answers. Thereby, the semi-structured interview confirmed its use, as Friedmann (2012: 188) explain that the interview should be used in its literal meaning and that "[d]epending on how the interview develops, the interviewer might change the order of questions, add further questions to clarify, follow up, or probe more deeply into a response, or drop some questions entirely." In this way, it was possible to lead a fluid and genuine conversation. The interviews with T1 and T2 took 38:30 minutes and 38:00 minutes respectively, and the conversation with T3 lasted 42:40 minutes.

The first step of analyzing interview data was the transcription of the three interviews in full length. These were transcribed just like the recordings of the lessons, thus the VOICE transcription and spelling conventions (VOICE project 2007: http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php?page=transcription_general_information) were followed. However, no non-verbal features were included, whereas the transcription of the classroom recordings indicated non-verbal instances relevant for the research questions such as situations when the teachers wrote new words onto the blackboard. Then, the transcripts were printed out and numbered, so that the three interviews and their order could not get confused. The data were analyzed qualitatively via coding the transcribed discourse thematically, that is to say by applying a content analysis (Friedmann 2012: 191) or thematic analysis (Riessman 2008, in Zacharias 2012: 124). Zacharias (2012: 124) states that this approach focuses "on the contents or themes across the participants" and Vaughn (2016: 50) realizes:

One of the greatest challenges of conducting qualitative research is determining what is worth analyzing. Coding along themes and topics can help to highlight priorities and provide focus to the process of analyzing qualitative data.

Thus, the interviews were, after finishing the transcripts, read and listened to again, in order to comprehend the ideas and attitudes of the individual teachers holistically and "understand the overall context" (Zacharias 2012: 125). After this, a more detailed analysis was made and the most important aspects of every respondents' answer which could possibly contribute to a research question were highlighted. These highlighted utterances were summarized and assigned categories, which had been de-

terminated beforehand, in line with the research questions. The categories were German usage in the classroom, strategies for vocabulary teaching, teachers' attitudes and statements that mentioned similarities or differences between the two analyzed proficiency levels or between lower and higher secondary forms. Hence, according to Zacharias (2012: 124) "separate utterances of the interview transcript [were] extracted, classified, and gathered into these categories". An important step was "axial coding" (Friedmann 2012: 191), as categories were compared not only across the participants, but also within one interview, for example remarks on level differences were often identified as parts of responses to questions that did not focus on this topic. Summarizing as well as categorizing the interviewees' statements may have been rather subjective tasks typical for qualitative analysis. After categories had been assigned to every answer, they were reported and described in the following results section for each research question.

7. Results

This chapter addresses the outcome of the case study which has already been described above. It is thematically structured and organized according to the research questions (see section 6.1.). Firstly, the question of the role of German in the Austrian EFL classroom, in general, will be approached by focusing on the in-class analysis and recorded instances of German use as well as on teachers' utterances during the interviews. Secondly, the observed and reported strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning will be focused on via analyzing the findings of all three research instruments in this respect. Thirdly, teachers' and students' beliefs on EFL vocabulary teaching and learning will be presented, compared and contrasted based on their reports in the conducted questionnaires and interviews. Finally, the influence of the students' proficiency level on the topics of German use, the strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning and the participants' attitudes will be analyzed in detail by comparing the results of the two levels under investigation.

7.1. The role of German in the Austrian EFL classroom

As has been introduced, this topic has its focus on the recorded observations and the interviews with the teachers. While analyzing the cases in which German was used in the observed lessons, I decided to distinguish between utterances made by students and those made by teachers. Furthermore, each instance of German use was interpreted as having one main purpose, which means that every use of the shared L1 was assumed to serve a certain function. The awareness is given that particular instances of using L1 could serve more than one function and that the selection of the main purpose is a rather subjective matter. In total, ten different purposes were identified, namely vocabulary translation, vocabulary explanation, grammar explanation, organization, discipline, humor, comment, lexical gap, chatting and not understandable. The last category does not identify a function, but covers the one single utterance where, although it was clearly identified as a German phrase, it was not comprehensible on the audio recording. In addition to the data from the observed lessons, the teachers' answers from the recorded interviews which concern the general role of German in an EFL classroom will be dealt with, excluding the topic of vocabulary teaching and learning relatively as it is the main focus of the next section.

RQ 1: What is the role of German in the Austrian EFL classroom?

The first finding that concerns this research question is the fact that German was used in all of the six partaking classes. Even though the frequencies and functions differ according to the individual teachers and classes, this result already indicates that German definitely has a role in the Austrian EFL classroom.

Table 2: Instances of German use in the EFL classroom

	T1_3rd_ST	T1_3rd_TT	T1_6th_ST	T1_6th_TT	T2_3rd_ST	T2_3rd_TT	T2_6th_ST	T2_6th_TT	T3_3rd_ST	T3_3rd_TT	T3_6th_ST	T3_6th_TT
NGültig13	6	6	3	27	21	9	5	42	17	14	8	

In the third forms German was used 19 times (T1), 48 times (T2) and 59 times (T3), which makes a total of 126, whereby there were overall 45 instances of German use in the sixth forms, 9 (T1), 14 (T2) and 22 times (T3) in the three classes (see Table

2). When adding all cases together, the sum of German instances in the six classes is 171 (see Table 3). Table 3 shows the overall instances of German in all the observed lessons with their identified purposes, which were interpreted by using the transcripts and the notes on the observation sheets.

Table 3: Frequencies of German use: all classes

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use	Vocabulary translation	70	40,9%
	Vocabulary explanation	10	5,8%
	Grammar explanation	3	1,8%
	Organisation	51	29,8%
	Humor	5	2,9%
	Discipline	1	0,6%
	Comment	24	14,0%
	Lexical gap	5	2,9%
	Chatting	1	0,6%
	Not understandable	1	0,6%
Gesamt		171	100,0%

Before going into detail, some purposes identified might be worth explaining. The difference between the first two is that vocabulary translation describes an utterance of the literal German equivalent or a guess at the same on the students' side, thus a direct translation of a new English word or phrase, whereas a vocabulary explanation is at least a whole phrase that explains the vocabulary item without using a translation or when L1 equivalence was uttered before or after the explanation. When a phrase or sentence was spoken in German in order to expound a grammatical structure, the purpose grammar explanation was chosen. Organization defines German utterances that do not concern the thematic content of the English lesson, but are of organizational importance such as excursions, the postponement of a test or when a learner needs to leave earlier. Humor was used by teachers or students to make a joke or make the class laugh while discipline was chosen when a student was urged by the teacher. Comments were made by students only and regard utterances that can possibly refer to the content of the lesson but do not belong to the other categorized purposes. The lexical gaps describe identified intra-sentential switches, in which teachers or students only used one German word within a sentence when they lacked the English term or wanted to move on quickly. Chatting was chosen for one

utterance when two students talked in German about something different than the content of the lesson and one time a definitely German utterance of a student could not be understood on the audio recording.

Across classes, students and teachers the main function German served was vocabulary translation, followed by organization and comment. German was, moreover, used for vocabulary explanation ten times, which makes a total of 46.7 % among German utterances that were used for clarifying vocabulary items in all observed lessons. The purposes humor and the intra-sentential switch were used 5 times each and in three instances of German grammar was explained. For both disciplining students and chatting among two students, German was only used one time while one instance of German was not understandable.

Students' German use

As stated above, the distinction was made whether the teacher or students uttered an instance of German. Students were responsible for 111 of the whole 171 usages of the shared first language, which makes 64.91 %. Hence, learners used more German than their teachers in the six recorded EFL lessons.

Table 4: Frequencies of German use: all students

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use ^a	Vocabulary translation	34	30,6%
	Vocabulary explanation	5	4,5%
	Grammar explanation	1	0,9%
	Organisation	41	36,9%
	Humor	1	0,9%
	Comment	24	21,6%
	Lexical gap	3	2,7%
	Chatting	1	0,9%
	Not understandable	1	0,9%
Gesamt		111	100,0%

The most widely used purpose among the participating students was organization with 36.9% (see Table 4). This purpose was used for issues that did not concern the content of the English lesson, but rather classroom management like asking for allowance to get a sheet from the back of the class (T1_3rd_SX) or the one-word ques-

tion, “Weiter?” (T2_6th_S15) during an activity when the student wanted to know whether she should continue reading the comparison of the homework. Another case of German use on that front was, “Frau ‘Fessor ich hab wieder Fußballspiel. Kann ich fünfzehn Minuten vorher gehen?” (T1_3rd). The organizational purpose also included many questions on the structural procedure of the current or the next English lessons as for example the question whether the students will get their tests back (T3_6th), questions on whether they will have an oral vocabulary check-up (T3_3rd) or questions that regard homework like, “Könnten wir heute keine Aufgabe haben? Wir haben morgen Mathe Schularbeit.”, (T1_3rd) or, „Bis wann müssma die Vokabeln können?” (T2_3rd). Additionally, quite a few students apologized for not having done the expected homework in this respect (T1_3rd, T2_3rd, T3_3rd), for instance, “Frau Professor ich habe die Vokabel nicht eingeschrieben erm also ich habe die Vokabel eingeschrieben aber die word file nicht.” (T1_3rd). In one sixth form (T1_6th) neither the teacher nor the learners used German for organizational matters and one teacher did not use the L1 for organization in the sixth form (T3_6th).

Students used German 34 times (30.6%) for giving an L1 equivalent while vocabulary was explained in German five times. A German translation was frequently used by students as a response after being asked what a certain English word or phrase could mean or after being explicitly requested to provide a translation by the teacher or by class mates. A few illustrative examples of learners who give a German vocabulary translation are listed below:

T3: how would you translate this [S5]? when riches fall into your lap.

S5: <L1de> erm wenn's auf auf deinen schoss fällt </L1de>

S3: what are districts?

S2: <L1de> bezirke </L1de>

Five students explained vocabulary items by applying the German language. An explanation happened when students defined the novel word in a phrase or a whole sentence that could include the German translation or not. Therefore, vocabulary explanation was chosen when a German utterance longer than and more precisely defined than a mere translation was expressed with regard to a new vocabulary item. Two examples can be found below.

T2: what is that? (1) what do they have problems with?

S23: <L1de> ja wenn die (.) erm (1) die gelenke=

T2: the joints yeah.

[...]

S23: so in der art einrosten. </L1de>

T2: <L1de> wisst's ihr was missionaries sind? missionare habt's ihr das in geschichte schon gemacht? das kommt nämlich da drin vor </L1de>

S19: <L1de> das sind leute die den glauben weiterbringen sollen. </L1de>

The last noteworthy purpose of learners' German usage is the expression of a comment, a function that was only used by students and most frequently in one third form that a few very lively male learners attended. The students of this class (T3_3rd) alone produced 15 of all 24 comments, hence 62.50 %. In each of the other classes one to three German utterances were interpreted as comments. Typically, a comment is an expression that does not really regard the lesson content or facilitate the learning progress, but rather a remark on what happens in class, giving an opinion or stating facts. In the following a few examples of students' German usage for the purpose of commenting are given.

T1: what's the antonym for inactive (3) [S1]?

S1: active

T1: exactly

SX: <L1de> das war schwer @ </L1de>

T3: big ben is the bell. (.) the bell inside. [...] not the heads not the clock it's the bell. (.) okay do not shout out okay.

S2: <L1de> herr 'fessor. das wird gerade renoviert. </L1de>

The other functions were rarely used by students. Three utterances of German were intra-sentential switches with a lexical gap and one German expression was chosen for grammar explanation, humor and chatting each whereby one usage of L1 was classified as not understandable. For obvious reasons no student used German in order to discipline other students.

Teachers' German use

In all the six observed lessons the teachers used German 60 times, of which 36 instances of German functioned as vocabulary translation and five as vocabulary explanation (see Table 5). Thus, 68.3% of German utterances by teachers were used for clarifying vocabulary items. Teachers provided the German equivalent mostly when a new English word occurred to ensure that all learners understand it and as

pre-reading or post-listening activities when they wanted to make sure that students can understand or understood a text.

Table 5: Frequencies of German use: all teachers

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use ^a	Vocabulary translation	36	60,0%
	Vocabulary explanation	5	8,3%
	Grammar explanation	2	3,3%
	Organisation	10	16,7%
	Humor	4	6,7%
	Discipline	1	1,7%
	Lexical gap	2	3,3%
Gesamt		60	100,0%

T2: water jug. erm then there is (.) psh (3) then there is the word opportunity. (writes opportunity on board) (4) did we already have that? no. right? (.) an opportunity?

SX: erm.

T2: <L1de> möglichkeit. </L1de> that's a difficult one. <L1de> möglichkeit. </L1de> i give you that. (writes möglichkeit on board) (4) it is a great opportunity for [SX] to be in this school and learn latin with a beautiful teacher.

A longer vocabulary explanation in the students' L1 was used when teachers wanted to go a bit more into detail, mostly for defining more difficult words or phrases for the third forms like "missionaries", "rheumatism" or "to set a trend in fashion" for example.

T3: yeah london is a trend setter. (.) it sets a lot of trend. you understand this? to set a trend? okay then write it down. (.) to set a trend in (.) let's say (.) fashion (writes on board) (3) a translation [S4] to s to set a trend in fashion?

S4: <L1de> einen trend setzen in fashion? </L1de>

T3:<L1de> in der modebranche (.) ja? einen trend setzen. (.) erm (.) das heißt die londoner ziehen was an und alle anderen auf der welt folgen folgen dem ganzen. </L1de>

16.7% of teachers' German usages were interpreted as serving organizational purposes. First of all, it is worth mentioning that almost all instances of German from students for organizational purposes were answered by the teachers in English, which is why students used German for this purpose more often.

Therefore, the majority of the ten cases of German use for organization sprang from the teachers themselves. The reason for this kind of L1 use was to ensure the students' comprehension of important topics that do not concern the current lesson content. Teachers explained, for example, a writing competition organized by the students' work book and the postponement of a test. Additionally, they talked about classroom management, reminded the students in German to clean their untidy classrooms two times and answered questions of their learners on time in German. An example from the audio recordings are stated below.

T1: [...] were you informed that we need to postpone our f (.) our second exam? (.) <L1de> unsere zweite schularbeit müssen wir übrigens verschieben da ihr da ein programm für maedchen und die technik machen werdet. </L1de> this sounds really cool and interesting so i said yes. [...]

Now the minor purposes of instructors' German usage will be outlined. T2 disciplined one third-form student who came too late to the classroom via using German and made use of German for the purpose of being humorous four times in a third form. One example is given below.

T2: [...] alright. so no vocabulary check today you had a maths test (.) how was it? (.) hope good? bad?
SS: very difficult.
T2: very difficult? (.) you need to study harder. (.) i always tell you that.
<L1de> jetzt konzentriert's euch so auf latein weil's so eine tolle lateinlehrerin habt's (.) eine huebsche (1) und jetzt machts nix anderes mehr goe?
(.) jaja. </L1de>
SS: @ @ @

In addition, she explained a grammatical structure namely the present perfect tense in German two times in the same third form.

T2: present perfect tense very good. and when do we use that? why do we use it in this sentence? (.) so far it has taken? (.) you can tell me in german as well if it's (.) if you can explain it [S18]?
S18: <L1de> wenn es noch andauert? </L1de>
T2: <L1de> ja was is so far? was heißt das? </L1de> (.) so far? (.) what does it mean so far? [S8].
S8: <L1de> bis jetzt. </L1de>
T2: <L1de> bis jetzt. und weil es bis jetzt dauert has taken okay? </L1de>

Two teachers also employed German to make up for a lexical gap or save time in an intra-sentential switch. T3's use of "Schularbeit" within an English utterance was in-

interpreted as having been used because of time reasons, even though it could have been easily replaced by the word *test*, whereas the first part of the following instance, “Dachstein Gletscher” is a name of a location that cannot be directly translated.

S20: we was on the <L1de> dachstein </L1de>.

T1: okay you went to the <L1de> dachstein gletscher. </L1de> (1) alright.

Interviews

The general role of the first language in the EFL classroom was the first topic in the guideline for the interview with the three teachers as well. In this respect, the first question on whether German is supposed to have a role in English lessons was answered with a definite yes by one teacher, whereas the other two rather stated that it is inevitable, has an eligible role in the first years of education but that the aim would be to use the target language in their lessons for the most part. The three interviewees agreed, quite interestingly without being explicitly asked in the first question, that German use is more prominent in lower secondary classes than in higher secondary education. T2 commented that it depends whether all students in a class share German as their mother tongue, as the topic on using German in an EFL class gets more complex in classrooms with students with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

T1 agreed that she wants to avoid using German in her EFL classes generally, because when teachers do not act as an example to use English as the working language, students will be misled and use German very soon. Hence, T1 believes that there should be a maximum input in English to learn the language most efficiently giving the following reason.

T1: ich glaub es ist leicht dass man in an schlendrian verfällt wenn man selber ein (.) schlechtes vorbild ist quasi dann (.) könnte es die schüler dazu verleiten auch miteinander zum beispiel als arbeitssprache deutsch zu verwenden wenn sie eine aufgabe erledigen wollen. um schneller zu sein ist natürlich deutsch effizienter (.) aber i will ihnen da vorleben dass man (.) englisch schon auch als arbeitssprache verwenden kann.

I: mhm. also (.) die zielsprache die zu lernen ist?

T1: mhm

I: glauben sie dass man die (.) dann auch am besten lernt wenn quasi fast maximaler input dann in der in der zielsprache ist?

T1: ja schon ein großer anteil.“

Similarly, T3 believes that the reduction of German to a minimum is what makes a successful lesson. T2 answered that she could refrain from using German, but will not avoid it as she is not obliged to do so. She agrees that the target language should be used most of the time, but clearly states that it does not help students when they are not able to comprehend fundamental structures.

The next question concerned situations in which the use of German makes sense in the English classroom. All of the respondents agreed that the use of German makes sense for organizational matters and classroom management. T1 and T2 are of the opinion that difficult grammatical rules and structures can be explained in German in the first years of lower secondary education. Discipline is another function which was mentioned by T2 and T3. Other stated situations in which using the L1 can be useful are important explanations to ensure that everyone understands them (T1), humor (T2) and difficult vocabulary items (T3). The question on situations in which students are allowed to use German was answered rather scarcely. T2 forbids German when the focus is on a speaking activity and students are explicitly invited to use English all of the time while T3 does not allow the use of German when the same students uses German during an EFL lesson repeatedly.

As a last issue of this topic teachers were provided with examples from the observed and recorded lessons in their classes and asked whether these were typical instances of German use. The functions of vocabulary translation and vocabulary explanation were excluded, because the second part of the interview focused on vocabulary teaching and learning (see next section). T1 answered a students' German organizational question in English several times and clearly clarified that this is a typical reaction of her.

T1: [...] hin und wieder stellen schüler auch zwischenfragen auf deutsch und da versuch ich schon auf englisch zu reagieren (.) manchmal möchte ich aber auch schnell sein und dann wirds wieder deutsch [...]

I: erm warum ist das so? warum antworten sie da in englisch in diesen situationen?

T1: sollt für die schüler denk ich schon klar sein dass es (1) im englischunterricht so der brauch ist

I: genau

T1: es ist zwar nicht direkt mit dem lernstoff verbunden aber sie können diese dinge eigentlich schon erledigen auf englisch

In contrast to her English responses, T1 verified that she typically uses German for important organizational purposes herself when everybody needs to understand the given information, especially in the lower secondary forms, as she did five times in the observed lesson in the third form. For T2, explaining a complicated grammatical structure is a typical function of German in the lower secondary EFL classrooms, because this would be too difficult for students sometimes.

I: [...] genau und dann haben sie eben noch weiter erklärt und weil es bis jetzt dauert (.) gehört has taken. also das wär so eine typische grammatik erklärung?

T2: mhm genau genau das ist wirklich isolierte grammatik weil (.) erm wir schreiben natürlich auch auf auf englisch so far und a duration und a result until now. aber erm gerade present perfect ist zum beispiel eine (.) eine zeit die sehr sehr schwierig ist für die schüler zu verstehen und da greife ich dann schon auf deutsch zurück und erklär ihnen das nochmal auf deutsch dass es nochmal (.) erm automatisiert wird. das würd ich in der oberstufe nicht mehr machen zum beispiel.

Additionally, she uses humor and discipline frequently because students can understand the emotional level better their L1. These functions were used by T2 five times in the third form. Just like T1, T3 often answered students' German questions that concerned classroom management issues in English and explained why he typically does so:

T3: ja also dass zumindest einer konsequent beim englischen bleibt nämlich der lehrer@ in der hoffung dass das überspringt und dass sie irgendwann mal selber soweit sind auf englisch solche sachen erm (.) zu fragen. wobei die besseren schüler das durchaus machen. (.) die nicht so guten sind vielleicht (.) nicht so gut oder auch zu bequem aber ich versuch natürlich erm auf englisch zu reagieren. außer es ist was ganz was außergewöhnliches wo es wichtig ist dass wirklich das alle gut verstehen.

T3 considers the fact that he very seldomly uses German himself for organizational purposes, discipline or humor as typical in his lessons, because this is a more natural reaction for an English teacher who even thinks in the English language.

In sum, when considering all the covered purposes, the role of German in the six partaking classes cannot be denied. Students used their L1 most commonly for the purposes of organization, vocabulary translation and explanation and making comments while teachers used German predominantly for translating vocabulary items and fewer times for organizational purposes. The teachers' German usages for explaining

vocabulary or grammar, disciplining students or expressing humor are worth mentioning even if these did not occur with a high frequency. The same is true for grammar explanation, humor, lexical gaps and chatting on the students' side. In general, the most common investigated purposes of integrating German into the Austrian EFL classroom are vocabulary teaching and learning and the communication of important organizational issues. Because of the frequent occurrences in the six classes and the main focus of this paper, the next part connects to the most frequently used purpose of German utterances which is vocabulary translation and explanation. These two and other methods of vocabulary teaching and learning were explored and will be the main components of the next part.

7.2. Strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning

This part describes the identified strategies of conveying new vocabulary items or becoming familiar with such. The results of all three research instruments *videlicet* the recorded lessons, questionnaires and interviews are being presented. Therefore, the used strategies in the six in-class observations by teachers and students, the learners' statements on the practiced and preferred strategies in the questionnaires and teachers' self-appraisals from the interview are taken into account. A distinction is made between the strategies that were observed and recorded and those that were self- and other-reported. Then, a comparison is made between the practices in the classrooms and what learners and instructors stated in the interrogations. During the data evaluation of the observed strategies, the distinction between methods of vocabulary teaching that teachers incorporate in their EFL classrooms and strategies that students use when being confronted with a novel vocabulary item was drawn.

RQ 2: Which strategies do Austrian EFL teachers and learners use for the purposes of vocabulary teaching and learning?

Table 6: Frequencies of used vocabulary strategies: all classes

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
All strategies ^a	German vocabulary translation	70	33,5%
	German vocabulary explanation	10	4,8%
	English vocabulary explanation	39	18,7%
	Pictures and gestures	5	2,4%
	Dictionary use	1	0,5%
	Guess from context	3	1,4%
	Matching activity	2	1,0%
	Let S use vocabulary in a sentence	3	1,4%
	Use vocabulary in an example sentence (T)	13	6,2%
	English on board	38	18,2%
	German on board	14	6,7%
	Synonyms	3	1,4%
	Antonyms	2	1,0%
	Word formation	4	1,9%
	Collocations	1	0,5%
	Brainstorming	1	0,5%
Gesamt		209	100,0%

Altogether sixteen different strategies were defined during the analysis of the observed and recorded data within the six lessons that were part of the study and 209 situations were identified as one of those sixteen strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning (see Table 6). The most commonly used strategies by students and teachers were the translation and explanation of vocabulary items in German, English explanations, the incorporation of the board as a visual learning support by writing new English words, definitions and L1 translations on it and the usage of new words in example sentences. Teachers provided pictures and gestures, activities with synonyms and antonyms, word formation tasks, let students guess from context and do matching activities a few times as well. The use of dictionaries and collocations and a brainstorming activity were observed one time each.

7.2.1. Learners' strategies

The distinction between students' and teachers' strategies needs to be described in more detail, as activities and exercises that were actively incorporated into the lessons by the teachers were counted as teachers' strategies even though students used these very same strategies during these exercises. Examples are matching activities, guessing from context and dictionary use. Those situations in which a new English word was dealt with orally and students were asked what this word could mean and subsequently gave an answer were counted as students' strategies, thus, the audible oral answers of students during classroom discussions.

Observed strategies

The learners in the participating classes translated English words or phrases overall 34 times and explained them in German five times (see Table 7). Vocabulary items were explained or defined in English 9 times and one English synonym was given by students. The following excerpt from a third form (T2) is an illustrative example in which learners translate a given word in German and explain the same in their L1.

Table 7: Frequencies of students' vocabulary learning strategies

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
All students ^a	German vocabulary translation	34	69,4%
	German vocabulary explanation	5	10,2%
	English vocabulary explanation	9	18,4%
	Synonyms	1	2,0%
Gesamt		49	100,0%

T2: [...] do you know (.) there is a word it's (2) rheumatism (writes rheumatism on board) (2) do you know what that is in german? (.) because it's very difficult also in german if that is. it's an illness

SX-m: <L1de> krankheit? </L1de>

S6: <L1de> rheuma? </L1de>

T2: <L1de> rheuma. </L1de> do you know what that is? (.) wha you have problems with sorry?

S6: my mum has it.

T2: your mum has it. okay. erm a very dear friend of mine has it too. (.)
 erm one of my students in my second form has it well. what is that? (1)
 what do they have problems with?
 S23: <L1de> ja wenn die (.) erm (1) die gelenke </L1de>=
 T2: the joints yeah.
 S23: erm
 SS: @@
 T2: yeah because of join.
 S23: <L1de> so in der art einrosten. </L1de>

Below, one example of a learners' English definition is given.

T2: [...] what are food miles? what do you think? you call them food miles.
 (1) bananas have food miles too for example. (.) [S15].
 S15: it's the distance from where they come from (.) to where they go?

Self-reported strategies

In the questionnaires, students faced different statements about their classroom practices and had to choose a level of agreement. Nine of these statements concerned their own strategies of vocabulary learning in and outside the classroom. Concerning the question of how students react in speaking to new English words in the classroom, only a very small tendency towards German translations and explanations was identifiable as the item for English explanations of new words shows a slightly negative mean of 3.08 (see Table 8) while the mean of the item for German translations and explanations lies at 2.90 (see Table 9), which nevertheless indicates that students perceive that both German translations or explanations and English explanations are used by them in the classroom when being faced with a new English word. This result does not approve the outcome of the observations, which showed that 79.6% of students' reactions to new vocabulary items were either German translations or explanations (see Table 7).

Table 8: Descriptive statistic Q7

Im Unterricht erkläre ich neue englische Wörter auf Englisch.

N	Gültig	119
	Fehlen	0
Mittelwert		3,08
Median		3,00
Std.-Abweichung		1,010
Spannweite		4
Minimum		1
Maximum		5

Table 9: Descriptive statistic Q11

Bei einer neuen englischen Vokabel im Unterricht übersetze und erkläre ich sie auf Deutsch.

N	Gültig	119
	Fehlend	0
Mittelwert		2,90
Median		3,00
Std.-Abweichung		,960
Spannweite		4
Minimum		1
Maximum		5

The next considered issue was how new vocabulary items are written down by Austrian learners in the classroom. The results of the evaluated statements reveal that the partaking EFL students rather do not tend to write down English explanations or notes in a text with only 17.8% and 19.3% agreeing respectively and the shared mean of 3.40 for both items (see Table 10 & 11). On the contrary, 84% of the surveyed learners state that they write down German translations when new vocabulary items arise and only 3.4% disagree with the statement (see Table 12).

Table 10: Descriptive statistics Q14

Im Unterricht schreibe ich bei einer neuen Vokabel eine englische Erklärung auf.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	4	3,4	3,4	3,4
	Stimme zu	17	14,3	14,4	17,8
	Neutral	40	33,6	33,9	51,7
	Stimme nicht zu	42	35,3	35,6	87,3
	Stimme gar nicht zu	15	12,6	12,7	100,0
	Gesamt	118	99,2	100,0	
Fehlend	Keine Angabe	1	,8		
Gesamt		119	100,0		

Table 11: Descriptive statistic Q8

Im Englischunterricht schreibe ich bei neuen Wörtern Notizen im Text auf.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	3	2,5	2,5	2,5
	Stimme zu	20	16,8	16,8	19,3
	Neutral	40	33,6	33,6	52,9
	Stimme nicht zu	38	31,9	31,9	84,9
	Stimme gar nicht zu	18	15,1	15,1	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

Table 12: Descriptive statistic Q5

Bei einer neuen Vokabel im Unterricht schreibe ich die deutsche Übersetzung auf.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	54	45,4	45,4	45,4
	Stimme zu	46	38,7	38,7	84,0
	Neutral	15	12,6	12,6	96,6
	Stimme nicht zu	2	1,7	1,7	98,3
	Stimme gar nicht zu	2	1,7	1,7	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

This result matches with the one of the first analyzed statements regarding the issue how students learn English vocabulary, as 40.7% strongly agree and 28% agree that they use English-German word lists for vocabulary learning (see Table 13). There is a rather high tendency of disagreement when it comes to the other statements about vocabulary learning, as for example 58.8% of all learners do not use bilingual dictionaries, 81.5% do not use monolingual dictionaries (see Table 14) and 58% disagree with the statement that they use notes in the text for the purpose of learning new English words. As a result, it can be stated that students rather use bilingual dictionaries than monolingual ones, if they consider to use dictionaries for vocabulary learning at all.

Table 13: Descriptive statistic Q6**Beim Vokabellernen verwende ich oft englisch-deutsche Wörterlisten.**

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	48	40,3	40,7	40,7
	Stimme zu	33	27,7	28,0	68,6
	Neutral	23	19,3	19,5	88,1
	Stimme nicht zu	7	5,9	5,9	94,1
	Stimme gar nicht zu	7	5,9	5,9	100,0
	Gesamt	118	99,2	100,0	
Fehlend	System	1	,8		
Gesamt		119	100,0		

Table 14: Descriptive statistic Q3**Beim Vokabellernen verwende ich oft ein rein englisches Wörterbuch.**

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	3	2,5	2,5	2,5
	Stimme zu	4	3,4	3,4	5,9
	Neutral	15	12,6	12,6	18,5
	Stimme nicht zu	40	33,6	33,6	52,1
	Stimme gar nicht zu	57	47,9	47,9	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

7.2.2. Teachers' strategies

Observed strategies

When the six recorded EFL lessons were analyzed, those written, spoken or gestured utterances in which instructors tried to help their learners understand a new vocabulary item better were counted as strategies of vocabulary teaching. Additionally, the teachers frequently gave instructions for certain activities which included strategies of vocabulary learning. As those tasks, for instance matching activities, letting students form sentences or use a dictionary, were actively included into the lesson by the teachers, they were counted as strategies of vocabulary teaching. More concrete examples will follow.

Overall, 160 cases of strategies for vocabulary teaching were identified and the most frequently used strategy was writing the new English word, an example sentence or

an English definition on board closely followed by providing the German translation for a vocabulary item, these two strategies adding up to 46.3% of all used teachers' strategies (see Table 15). English vocabulary explanations were used thirty times, whereas only five German explanations by teachers were identified. 10% of the strategies included an example sentence, whereby the teachers either provided it themselves or let the learners form one. 14 German translations on the blackboard were recognized in the six observed lessons. Instructors used pictures or gestures five times and word formation tasks four times. Moreover, only minor percentages were calculated for situations in which teachers let students guess from context, do matching activities or use their dictionaries, conducted a brainstorming task or activities with synonyms, antonyms and collocations. The recorded strategies of the individual teachers will be included in the next section on the self-reported strategies.

Table 15: Frequencies of teachers' vocabulary teaching strategies

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
All teachers ^a	German vocabulary translation	36	22,5%
	German vocabulary explanation	5	3,1%
	English vocabulary explanation	30	18,8%
	Pictures and gestures	5	3,1%
	Dictionary use	1	0,6%
	Guess from context	3	1,9%
	Matching activity	2	1,3%
	Let S use vocabulary in a sentence	3	1,9%
	Use vocabulary in an example sentence (T)	13	8,1%
	English on board	38	23,8%
	German on board	14	8,8%
	Synonyms	2	1,3%
	Antonyms	2	1,3%
	Word formation	4	2,5%
	Collocations	1	0,6%
	Brainstorming	1	0,6%
Gesamt		160	100,0%

Self-reported strategies

This section considers the teachers' statements about their classroom practices in the recorded interviews as well as the observed strategies of the respective teachers. In general, it is noteworthy that the interview included two questions quite similar in nature about how teachers think new English vocabulary items should ideally be conveyed and how they convey new words in their own lessons. All the teachers answered the second question by answering the first one, talking about their own practices naturally.

T1's strategies

T1 stated that vocabulary should be taught via various methods and highlighted that the used method should incorporate the new words in a context. In the lower secondary classes, she uses pictures and gestures for example to demonstrate movements and directions. As an instructor, she thinks that it is important to contextualize new words herself and to enmesh herself in a story for instance. Furthermore, she works with word families, forming the fitting nouns, verbs and adjectives, in the higher secondary levels for test and Matura preparation and believes that it is important to discuss words that are important for text comprehension before a reading or listening activity. In fact, T1 used all the strategies that she stated in the two lessons except for pre-reading or -listening activities. During reading activities, she let students guess a word or phrase from the contexts once in the third and sixth form each. The younger learners had to explain the word altitude sickness after reading two short texts in which the word was used. After a short pair work, the new vocabulary item was discussed with the whole class and the teacher led them to explaining the word in English without making use of their L1 consciously. During the interview, T1 leading to the English definition for a new English word or phrase in her EFL lessons was described as a typical situation.

T1: okay speaking of which (.) [S8] (.) now you've just been talking about altitude sickness. can you explain what this is. do you feel good or do you feel bad?

S8: <L1de> auf englisch oder auf deutsch auf englisch oder auf deutsch?
</L1de>

T1: let's try in english first. (.) do you feel good or bad?

S8: feel bad.

T1: feel very bad. (.) why'd you feel bad? where are you if you suffer from altitude sickness? are you at the beach (.) high up in the mountains

S8: up in the mountains.

T1: very good point you're making. (1) how high? like a thousand meters?

S8: higher.

T1: much higher up in the mountains like five thousand meters. (6) what about breathing (.) in and out (.) easy? or difficult if you're high up in the mountains?

S11: no. it's difficult.

T1: how does that makes you (.) how does it make you feel? (2) well. (.) you're a little dizzy. (4) (writes "dizzy on board") you're a little light-headed (5) (writes "light-headed" on board) but most importantly you might feel sick (.) as if you were about to vomit because you're very sick. alright. now we found out about the meaning of the word and there's no need to use german for that. is it?

The learners in T1's sixth form were instructed to understand the meaning of the idiomatic phrase "the straw that broke the camel's back" through the context, which was a longer text about domestic violence. In addition to these two examples, T1 let her students use a new English word in an example sentence three times, for example when discussing about the word family of accusation, which was at the same time an activity for word formation. The work with word families and collocations was stated to be highly typical in T1's EFL lessons, as she does not want her students to use repetitions in their texts and wants to prepare them for the word formation tasks that occur in their tests and the Matura.

T1: [...] now (.) what about the adjective? did you find an adjective [S2]?

S2: accused.

T1: could you give me an example?

S2: he is accused erm of murder or something?

T1: good example. [...]

T1 used pictures in the school book as visual material too in the course of a matching activity. In addition to the stated strategies, this teacher used three German translations, four English explanations, let students do research on a phrase in online dictionaries, wrote English on the board three times and did one activity with antonyms (see Table 16). On the handout about domestic violence, she provided collocations for the word accusation as well. The work with antonyms in the sixth class was the comparison of a homework and counted as one strategy, even though students used the antonyms of words 18 times and the teacher seven times. Below, there is an illustrative excerpt of this situation.

T1: [...] let's come to a verb. to increase. what's the opposite [S17]?

S17: decrease

T1: good
 S17: sensational is boring
 T1: excellent. (.) what about fearful of [S16]?
 S16: unbothered? to be unbothered by something
 T1: well that's a good expression. did you find anything else [S19]?
 S19: unafraid (.) unafraid
 T1: yeah (.) that's good as well (1) you could also be unconcerned about something. (3) can you find the antonym for to avoid something (3) [S19]?
 S19: to confront

Table 16: Frequencies of T1's vocabulary teaching strategies

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Used strategies ^a	German vocabulary translation	3	12,0%
	English vocabulary explanation	4	16,0%
	Pictures and gestures	1	4,0%
	Dictionary use	1	4,0%
	Guess from context	2	8,0%
	Matching activity	2	8,0%
	Let S use vocabulary in a sentence	3	12,0%
	English on board	3	12,0%
	Antonyms	1	4,0%
	Word formation	4	16,0%
	Collocations	1	4,0%
Gesamt		25	100,0%

In response to the question about which strategies she considers as highly effective personally, she mentioned doing vocabulary check-ups on a regular basis, elaborating vocabulary items in context, finding collocations, synonyms and antonyms, sorting words by topics and comparing the register of words with similar meanings. Another question was whether German is actively integrated into the methods of vocabulary teaching and T1 stated that she does integrate the L1 in the lower secondary forms but tries to avoid German in the higher secondary classes or gives a German translation, if at all, in addition to an English definition for example. T1's lower secondary learners are instructed to write down vocabulary items into their vocabulary books while her higher secondary learners are allowed to create lists on their computers or print out lists. Additionally, T1 attaches foot notes with vocabulary definitions to her worksheets. In general, she tries to vary how new English words are writ-

ten down and gave the examples of creating a mind maps at the beginning of a new topic or unit and English-German word lists that she had currently handed out in a sixth form for concrete examples of weather phenomena. Regarding dictionaries, T1 thinks that printed ones are outdated, but uses online dictionaries in classes that are allowed to use laptops and smartphones in the classroom. When students reach the 5th or 6th form they are able to use monolingual dictionaries and T1 mostly prescribes the “Oxford’s learners’ dictionary” which provides English definitions and explanations. The lower secondary forms only use bilingual dictionaries for their home exercise texts. In this respect, T1 mentioned an interesting aspect that concerns digitalization in modern times and her learners’ self-responsibility.

T1: [...] meine erste klasse zum beispiel die haben gefragt ob sie wörterbücher kaufen sollen und i find print wörterbücher sind (.) nicht mehr notwendig die haben alle handys mit und die können vernünftig umgehen damit beziehungsweise müssen sie es ohnehin lernen.

She suggests bilingual as well as monolingual online dictionaries in the classroom, such as dict.cc, pons.de and the Oxford learners’ dictionary and moreover warns her students of automatic translation tools on the internet. In terms of the evaluation of students’ vocabulary progress, T1 conducts only written check-ups in the lower secondary classes after every unit every two or three weeks in form of banked gap-fill exercises, English-German translations, forming sentences, matching exercises or finding the correct word to English definitions. Her students need to know the vocabulary items of the last few English lessons.

T2’s strategies

T2, like T1, believes that various methods should be used for the purpose of vocabulary teaching, in order to appeal to the different learning styles and mentioned that she uses not only translated word lists, but also pictures or drawings, words in example sentences, word formation tasks, memory, brainstorming activities and mind maps. Of these self-reported methods, T2 used pictures and gestures three times, formulated seven example sentences when explaining a new word and did one brainstorming activity, but did not do word formations tasks or memory games in the recorded lessons. In addition, she wrote fifteen English words or phrases on the blackboard and six German translations. Orally, vocabulary items were translated into German 13 times, which T2 reported as typical in the third form especially be-

cause they did a pre-reading exercise and discussed words that were important for text comprehension, and explained three times in the shared first language. In contrast, English vocabulary explanations occurred eleven times. One time each she let students guess from the context, provided a synonym and an antonym (see Table 17). According to her answers during the interview, the use of synonyms is regarded as highly effective, together with brainstorming activities, English-German word lists and sometimes words with a given definition.

Table 17: Frequencies of T2's vocabulary teaching strategies

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Used strategies ^a	German vocabulary translation	13	21,0%
	German vocabulary explanation	3	4,8%
	English vocabulary explanation	11	17,7%
	Pictures and gestures	3	4,8%
	Guess from context	1	1,6%
	Use vocabulary in an example sentence (T)	7	11,3%
	English on board	15	24,2%
	German on board	6	9,7%
	Synonyms	1	1,6%
	Antonyms	1	1,6%
	Brainstorming	1	1,6%
Gesamt		62	100,0%

A few illustrative examples of T2's observed lessons will be given. She used a gesture, for instance, to demonstrate the meaning of the word water jug by simulating that she was pouring water into a glass and drew a picture of a subway (the British English meaning) onto the board. In the third form, she used example sentences when explaining new words quite frequently like the first example on page 53, which functions as an example for providing a German translation as well. Furthermore, in the third form, German was used for explaining novel English words or phrases. This teacher made use of English vocabulary explanations too.

T2: [...] good. that is the most important here. (.) erm at the second text we have (.) a water jug. (.) what is a jug? (2) you put water (.) into a water jug

sometimes and to put it into the (.) table onto the table and people can pour water into their classes. (.) how do you call that?

T2 answered that she incorporates German actively in her vocabulary teaching methods when she wants to draw a parallel as in the next excerpt. In addition, she explains complex words which are even difficult to comprehend in the learners' mother tongue in German.

T2: hm (.) dann wenn ich eine (.) also wie wir vorher schon gesagt haben ah so eine parallele herstellen möchte dass ich sag okay das deutsche wort ist ähnlich oder es ist sogar das gleiche. (.) empathy ist immer so ein beispiel das finden sie sehr schwierig. dann sag ich okay auf deutsch gibt's das auch (.) empathie was heißt das auf deutsch? (.) genau dann verwend ich wirklich aktiv weil ich möchte dass sie diese verbindungen finden. [...]

Similar to T1, T2 demands from her third form students to write new vocabulary items into their vocabulary books during their lessons and the words from a new unit need to be written down as a home exercise. The higher secondary forms mostly write or print out lists or write words down on their laptops and have the freedom to choose. This teacher regards dictionaries as very useful and thinks that monolingual ones are too difficult for lower secondary students while the learners from 5th to 8th form shall be able to use them. She stated that she sometimes conceptualizes activities for which students have to search for English definitions in a monolingual dictionary. In the EFL lessons, T2 suggests both types of dictionaries, but only online versions, as students do not receive physical books and are not allowed to use them for the Matura examination.

T2 assesses two of her students in the lower secondary forms orally every lesson by giving either the English or the German word and requiring the other. Every two to three weeks, there is an announced written progress check which includes a mixture of translations, fill-in activities and synonyms for which students need to learn the words from their vocabulary books and the completed last unit. In the higher secondary forms, T2 has no time for oral check-ups, which is why she does a written check-up with ten words every week constructing language in use activities like word formation or multiple-choice tasks and trying to incorporate these formats students need to be familiar with at the Matura.

T3's strategies

Concurrent with the observed lessons, T3 puts emphasis on the use of the board when being asked about the ideal way of conveying new vocabulary. In this regard, he writes the new English word and the German translation onto the board and lets his students write them down into their vocabulary books. Furthermore, he stated that topic-specific vocabulary can be conveyed through the context, that he lets students guess from the context if time allows it and that students are encouraged to use new words productively. Vocabulary check-ups are considered to be an important method by T3 as well. This teacher stated that he, additionally, conveys certain words or phrases via spontaneous ideas:

T3: „[...] und i lass mich aber auch gern von (.) spontanen einfällen mit-reissen und dann kommt mir ein vokabel interessant vor und dann schreib ich das eben an die tafel obwohl es nicht direkt mit unserem thema zu tun hat aber weil ich's so faszinierend finde (.) ich hab da ein paradebeispiel to walk your talk zum beispiel (.) erm da lass ich immer die schüler raten was das heißen könnte weil walk kennt man talk kennt man (.) aber in dieser kombination kennt man's nicht. und so (.) auf diese art versuch ich eben (.) erm (.) die (.) wie soll i sagen? (.) die liebe zum englischen zu entfachen. [...]“

The observed method of writing almost every novel vocabulary item onto the board was confirmed by T3 to be a typical strategy in his lessons. Within the two recorded units, twenty English expressions and eight German translations were written onto the board, which makes a total of 38.4 % among all his used strategies (see Table 18). The stated strategy of conveying topic-related vocabulary through the context was recognized partly in practice, as he used new words in a sentence six times. In the observed lessons, twenty German vocabulary translations and two German vocabulary explanations by the teacher were identified.

T3 demanded the German translation from his students too when a new vocabulary occurred, which was described to be a typical strategy during the interview. Fifteen novel vocabulary items were explained in the target language. In addition, he used the big map in the classroom to illustrate the Gulf stream in the third form and did an activity for which his sixth form students had to find synonymous phrases for given phrases. Both of these methods were described as typical, as the first one is a way to incorporate his own knowledge and create a more vivid learning atmosphere and the second one is a way of preparation for the higher secondary students' final exam and

the included language in use tasks. This activity which was about finding alternative phrases with the same meaning was counted as one activity, even if students uttered eleven synonyms and the teacher six ones.

Table 18: Frequencies of T3's vocabulary teaching strategies

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Used strategies ^a	German vocabulary translation	20	27,4%
	German vocabulary explanation	2	2,7%
	English vocabulary explanation	15	20,5%
	Pictures and gestures	1	1,4%
	Use vocabulary in an example sentence (T)	6	8,2%
	English on board	20	27,4%
	German on board	8	11,0%
	Synonyms	1	1,4%
Gesamt		73	100,0%

In the following, some examples for T3's used strategies can be found. The first excerpt includes the strategies of writing the English word, a German translation and an example sentence on the blackboard, using an example sentence and the German translation orally, in order to convey the meaning of the verb "to flow" in the third form.

T3: the thames. the river thames. (.) by the way flow (.) a river flows. write that down in your vocabulary books. a river flows the thames flows through london. (1) so (.) german <L1de> fließen </L1de> to flow (T writes flow and fließen on board). (2) write that down <L1de> fließen </L1de> (1) and an example sentence the river thames flows through (.) london (writes example sentence on board) (13) okay. (.) flow.

The last example illustrates the mentioned activity with synonymous phrases in the sixth form.

T3: okay (.) we stick to the map can you replace that?
 S9: if we hold on to the map.
 T3: if we?
 S9: hold on?

T3: hold on? (.) let's hold on. (1) erm (.) erm not quite. (.) other alternatives?

S17: erm follow the map?

T3: yah. (.) if we follow the map (.) erm we won't get lost. [...]

T3 could tell from his own experience that a word or phrase that causes students to laugh and vocabulary that is used frequently in various contexts will be remembered more likely. He remarks that students can access a new English word or phrase receptively rather fast, but not use them productively in their own texts. In relation to German usage, T3 stated that a vocabulary item is written down on the blackboard, used in context and, as a last step, the translation is written down or given orally as well. According to him, students should be allowed to give the German translation when a new English word or phrase occurs for the first time for the purpose of clarification. Both lower and higher secondary learners are supposed to write new English words into their vocabulary books which have three columns for the new word, the German translation and an example sentence.

One rule in T3's lessons is that a vocabulary item that is written on the blackboard by the teacher must be written into the students' vocabulary books. These words and phrases and the last two or three units from their work books must be studied for their vocabulary check-ups which, according to T3, take place four to five times per semester in written form and every lesson orally. The teacher gives fifteen English and fifteen German words to translate in the higher secondary forms and ten English and ten German words to translate in the lower secondary ones for the written check-ups while two students get ten words either German or English for translation at the oral check-ups. Regarding dictionaries, T3 thinks that online dictionaries are more practicable than printed books in modern times. In his EFL lessons, only the teacher searches for unknown words on the class computer, because the students shall not make use of their smartphones during the lessons in this school. Rather seldom, a student may search for the meaning of a word on the class computer. As stated in the interview, learners of all age groups and proficiency levels fixate rather on bilingual online dictionaries with only very few exceptions in form of the best students in the higher secondary levels.

Student-reported strategies

The participating learners were asked to tick a level of agreement for the statements that predicate that their teachers use mainly English explanations for vocabulary teaching and that they use mainly German translations for conveying the meanings of new English words. When comparing these two items, it was found that twelve students, ten from the third forms and two from the sixth forms, gave inconsistent answers, all of them agreeing with both of the statements. After long and careful consideration, the researcher decided not to dismiss the inconsistent answers, as it is possible that these learners might feel that both strategies are used in their EFL lessons at a rather high frequency. Nevertheless, the coding of the second statement, Q12, was reversed, because the two items are converse, in order to be able to compare them. As a clear result, even the assembled answers, when portrayed as being mutually exclusive, show that 59.3% agree with the statement that their teachers use mainly English vocabulary explanation (see Table 19). The single item of this statement shows 73.1% of agreement among all interrogated students and no single answer of disagreement (see Table 20). Thus, in all classes combined the teachers seem to explain new English words rather in the target language than by giving a German equivalent. The single item which states that German translation are mainly used by the teacher received 26.5% of agreement and 46.1% of disagreement. These perceptions do not confirm the results of the lessons, in which German translations and explanations were used more frequently than English explanations.

Table 19: Descriptive statistic Q4 & Q12

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Neue Vokabeln auf Englisch erklärt ^a	Stimme voll zu	38	16,1%
	Stimme zu	102	43,2%
	Neutral	64	27,1%
	Stimme nicht zu	26	11,0%
	Stimme gar nicht zu	6	2,5%
Gesamt		236	100,0%

Table 20: Descriptive statistic Q4

**Im Englischunterricht werden neue Vokabeln von der Lehrperson
größtenteils auf Englisch erklärt.**

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Pro- zente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	32	26,9	26,9	26,9
	Stimme zu	55	46,2	46,2	73,1
	Neutral	32	26,9	26,9	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

In the questionnaire, students were asked which methods occur most frequently in their lessons and they were allowed to tick a maximum of two answers. The learners of the six investigated classes state that the most frequently used strategies are English explanations with 44.1% and German translations with 42.8% (see Table 21).

Table 21: Frequencies of perceived strategies Q15

		Antworten		Prozent der Fälle
		N	Prozent	
Methoden im Unterricht ^a	Englische Erklärung	98	44,1%	82,4%
	Deutsche Übersetzung	95	42,8%	79,8%
	Bilder und Gesten	1	0,5%	0,8%
	Selbstständig im Wörterbuch nachschlagen	3	1,4%	2,5%
	Aus Kontext schließen	20	9,0%	16,8%
	Andere Methode	5	2,3%	4,2%
Gesamt		222	100,0%	186,6%

There is a big gap to the next stated method guessing from context which was chosen by twenty students to be a frequently used method. Five of the students ticked the box for other method and wrote alternative methods. Three third-form students wrote, "wird ins Vokabelheft geschrieben", "ein wenig mit anderen Sprachen vergleichen" and "Beispielsätze", and two sixth-form students thought that, "Synonyme" and "selbstständig im Internet heraussuchen", are common strategies in their English lessons. One third-form student wrote, "einen Beispielsatz", in addition to two chosen answers. Only three of the asked learners think that searching in a dictionary is a common method and only one believes that the method of using pictures and gestures for the purpose of vocabulary conveyance occurs often in their EFL lessons. This does not mean that these methods are extremely rare, but rather that oral Eng-

lish explanations and German translations are by far the most common used strategies within the six classes under investigation, from the students' perspective.

7.3. Attitudes of students and teachers

This section approaches the issue of students' and teachers' beliefs on vocabulary teaching and learning. In relation with the last section, students were asked which methods for vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom they prefer. Moreover, they should agree or disagree with statements on the influence of already known languages on the acquisition of English and on the difference that the learners' age makes regarding the amount of German use. The last issue will be dealt with in the next section. Teachers were asked attitudinal questions about the general role of German in the EFL classroom, about the influence of other already known languages on the learning of English, about the different ways of conveying vocabulary and about the influence of the students' proficiency level on the use of German in general and for the purpose of vocabulary teaching. Again, the results of the last point will be presented in the next section.

RQ3: Which attitudes do Austrian EFL teachers and learners have towards their practices and the use of the L1, especially for the purpose of vocabulary teaching and learning?

7.3.1. Students' attitudes

Students' most preferred methods are, like their perceived most frequently used teachers' strategies, German translations and English explanations. However, in contrast to Q15, it is remarkable that 88.2% of all asked students prefer a German translation when being faced with a new vocabulary item (see Table 22). 76 of 119 learners would like to get an English vocabulary explanation. The method guessing from context scored 7.4% and 5.1% of all answers were pictures and gestures. Only five students prefer an independent search in a dictionary and three students chose the answer for inserting an alternative method. Two third-form learners ticked the option other method and wrote, "Vokabelkaiser", which is a game focusing on vocabulary knowledge, translation and speed, and, "Beispielsätze". One student wrote addition-

ally to two ticked answers “Vokabeln aufschreiben” and one student from a third form prefers “Eselsbrücken”, which is a kind of mnemonic.

Table 22: Frequencies of preferred strategies Q24

		Antworten		Prozent der Fälle
		N	Prozent	
Bevorzugte Methoden ^a	Englische Erklärung	76	35,2%	63,9%
	Deutsche Übersetzung	105	48,6%	88,2%
	Bilder und Gesten	11	5,1%	9,2%
	Selbstständig im Wörterbuch nachschlagen	5	2,3%	4,2%
	Aus Kontext schließen	16	7,4%	13,4%
	Andere Methode	3	1,4%	2,5%
Gesamt		216	100,0%	181,5%

Two items of the questionnaire stated that learners prefer either English vocabulary explanations or German vocabulary translations by their teachers. These two statements were not counted as mutually exclusive, because some students might agree with both statements without having a preference. 37.3% of all students like English explanations from their teachers and 22% do not prefer them, but the biggest percentage does neither agree nor disagree with this statement (see Table 23). Only fourteen students are neutral to the statement that new English words should be translated into German and only six do disagree with it, which means that, in sum, 83.2% of all asked learners think that German vocabulary translations make sense in the EFL classroom, more than a half of those agreeing totally (see Table 24). A similarly posed item, stating that the German translation is important when it comes to English vocabulary teaching and learning, resulted in an even clearer tendency towards agreement among students. 42% totally agreed and 44.5% agreed with the assertion and only three learners within the six partaking classes disagreed with it (see Table 25). These two results support the most preferred strategy above, namely that students feel that they need to be provided German equivalents when being confronted with new English words or phrases.

Table 23: Descriptive statistic Q18

Ich bevorzuge englische Erklärungen von der Lehrkraft bei neuen englischen Vokabeln.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	17	14,3	14,4	14,4
	Stimme zu	27	22,7	22,9	37,3
	Neutral	48	40,3	40,7	78,0
	Stimme nicht zu	19	16,0	16,1	94,1
	Stimme gar nicht zu	7	5,9	5,9	100,0
	Gesamt	118	99,2	100,0	
Fehlend	Keine Angabe	1	,8		
Gesamt		119	100,0		

Table 24: Descriptive statistic Q22

Bei neuen englischen Wörtern finde ich die deutsche Übersetzung von der Lehrkraft sinnvoll.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	52	43,7	43,7	43,7
	Stimme zu	47	39,5	39,5	83,2
	Neutral	14	11,8	11,8	95,0
	Stimme nicht zu	5	4,2	4,2	99,2
	Stimme gar nicht zu	1	,8	,8	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

Table 25: Descriptive statistic Q21

Ich glaube, dass das Übersetzen von Englischvokabeln beim Lehren und Lernen von neuen Wörtern sehr wichtig ist.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	50	42,0	42,0	42,0
	Stimme zu	53	44,5	44,5	86,6
	Neutral	13	10,9	10,9	97,5
	Stimme nicht zu	2	1,7	1,7	99,2
	Stimme gar nicht zu	1	,8	,8	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

52% of students answered that they enjoy English vocabulary learning while 38.7% chose the neutral position and only a minor percentage do not like learning new English words (see Table 26). There is, further, a positive tendency as concerns the rea-

sonable conveyance of new vocabulary in the learners' EFL lessons by their teachers with a mean of 2.08 (see Table 27).

Table 26: Descriptive statistic Q1

Ich lerne gerne neue englische Vokabeln.					
		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	17	14,3	14,3	14,3
	Stimme zu	45	37,8	37,8	52,1
	Neutral	46	38,7	38,7	90,8
	Stimme nicht zu	6	5,0	5,0	95,8
	Stimme gar nicht zu	5	4,2	4,2	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

Table 27: Descriptive statistic Q2

In unserem Englischunterricht werden neue Vokabeln gut und verständlich erklärt.

N	Gültig	119
	Fehlend	0
Mittelwert		2,08
Median		2,00
Modus		2
Spannweite		4
Minimum		1
Maximum		5

Two items of the questionnaire were attitudinal statements about the influence of other known languages and the mother tongue on the acquisition of English and English vocabulary. There was a very low tendency for disagreement with the statement that English should be learned without the help of other already known languages with a mean of 3.08, but generally a clear item of dissension (see Table 28). A considerably higher positive tendency was reached for the statement that one's mother tongue facilitates English vocabulary learning with a mean of 2.56 and 45.8% agreeing with the statement and 37.3% being neutral (see Table 29).

Table 28: Descriptive statistic Q16

Englisch sollte ohne Hilfe anderer Sprachen, die man schon kann, gelernt werden.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	10	8,4	8,5	8,5
	Stimme zu	24	20,2	20,5	29,1
	Neutral	41	34,5	35,0	64,1
	Stimme nicht zu	31	26,1	26,5	90,6
	Stimme gar nicht zu	11	9,2	9,4	100,0
	Gesamt	117	98,3	100,0	
Fehlend	Keine Angabe	2	1,7		
Gesamt		119	100,0		

Table 29: Descriptive statistic Q19

Englisches Vokabellernen wird durch die eigene Muttersprache erleichtert.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme voll zu	19	16,0	16,1	16,1
	Stimme zu	35	29,4	29,7	45,8
	Neutral	44	37,0	37,3	83,1
	Stimme nicht zu	19	16,0	16,1	99,2
	Stimme gar nicht zu	1	,8	,8	100,0
	Gesamt	118	99,2	100,0	
Fehlend	Keine Angabe	1	,8		
Gesamt		119	100,0		

7.3.2. Teachers' attitudes

The teachers' attitudes on the general role of German in an English classroom have already been discussed above in section 7.1. Teachers were asked whether they believe that other known languages can facilitate the learning process of a foreign language and they gave quite different answers. T1 and T2 agreed without doubt and T1 said that every language that you know is an advantage. In response to the question why T2 thinks that other languages can help, she stated:

T2: weil man auf das vorwissen zurückgreifen kann weil man verbindungen herstellen kann. (.) erm je mehr sprachen man natürlich hat im repertoire desto leichter ist es (.) viele wörter die sind lehnwörter aus anderen sprachen (.) erm wenn man zum beispiel französisch kann hat man sehr viele wörter die im englischen genau so sind oder ähnlich sind nur die aussprache anders.

I: mhm könnten sie ein beispiel geben ad hoc?

T2: erm was hab ich letztens gesagt? (.) erm da hab ich letztens erst eines gegeben. (1) erm resume zum beispiel ist ein französisches wort (.) und to resume hat eine ähnliche bedeutung auf auf englisch.

In contrast to these two language instructors, T3 was rather cautious and meant that he could not report anything from his own experience, but knew from his former English teachers that the parallel learning of more than one language could lead to interferences. On the other hand, he mentioned bilingually raised people who have advantages in comparison with monolingual people who learn two languages through the course of education.

T3: kann ich erm nicht viel aus eigener erfahrung berichten aber ich weiß dass meine englischlehrer also es war ein ehapaar und eine hab ich in französisch gehabt die andere den andern in englisch und die haben immer gesagt ja nicht zwei sprachen studieren also wie zum beispiel englisch und französisch weil es da zu interferenzererscheinungen kommt und es oft schwierig ist die zu unterscheiden. (.) ja also (.) i glaub eine andere sprache kann das auswendiglernen fördern aber jetzt direkt auf englisch abgestellt weiß ned ob das ein vorteil ist. vielleicht eine die überhaupt nichts mit englisch zu tun hat. eine sprache die sehr eng verwandt ist wie französisch (.) da könnt's zu interferenzererscheinungen kommen.

The participating teachers perceived ideal and most effective strategies of conveying new English vocabulary items have already been presented in the previous section, just like their preferences regarding dictionary use, writing down new words, progress check-ups and the teachers' and students' use of German in relation with vocabulary teaching and learning. Further, the teachers' attitudes on the influence of the students' proficiency level on target and first language usage and transmitting English vocabulary items will be presented in the next section, which has its focus on the students' level.

7.4. The proficiency level as a factor of influence

Another focus of the practical study was the learners' language proficiency level in English which, in the Austrian school context, varies with their age. The older the students are the higher their proficiency level should be, as students who do not reach a certain level by the end of a school year must theoretically repeat one year. The last research question considers English proficiency and scrutinizes whether the language level of students makes a difference as regards the amount of German utterances in general and with respect to vocabulary teaching and learning and the teachers' and students' attitudes. All three research instruments used will be taken into account, hence differences in German use frequencies and vocabulary teaching strategies were ascertained from the results of the observations, students' answers to level-specific questions as well as significant differences between third- and sixth-form items were analyzed in the results of the questionnaires and teachers' thoughts on the proficiency level as a difference maker were gained via the interviews conducted.

RQ4: Does the proficiency level of the learners make a difference regarding the role of German, vocabulary teaching and learning strategies as well as in the teachers' and learners' attitudes?

Language use in EFL lessons

The first issue regards general language usage of teachers and learners within the recorded lessons especially German utterances and their functions. This focus of the first addressed research question is extended to level-specific differences of German use in the classroom. Therefore, the frequencies of teachers' and learners' German use in the lessons were analyzed and those of the three third and sixth forms compared. Further, the teachers' beliefs on differences that underlie the level of a certain class were taken into consideration. A remarkable difference was recognized between the total frequencies of German use of the third and sixth forms, as there were 126 total instances of German by students and teachers in the lower secondary level and 45 instances, which make only 26.32% of all observed German utterances, in the

higher secondary classes (see ... and ...). The specific purposes for using the shared first language vary according to the students' level as well. Vocabulary was translated significantly more frequently in the third forms than in the sixth forms, nevertheless, the purpose of vocabulary translation makes 60% of all German utterances in the higher forms and 34.1% in the lower secondary levels. This is the case, because there were far more instances of other uses of German in the third forms. German vocabulary and Grammar explanations were only identified in the third forms, which implies that the teachers and students under investigation might rather avoid longer German explanations in the sixth form and provide only a German equivalent instead. What is more, in the third classes, German was used 41 times for organizational purposes and ten times in the sixth forms while the purposes of humor and discipline were not used at all there (see Table 30 & 31). Lastly, comments by students were recognized far more often in the lower level.

Table 30: Frequencies of German use: third forms

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use ^a	Vocabulary translation	43	34,1%
	Vocabulary explanation	10	7,9%
	Grammar explanation	3	2,4%
	Organisation	41	32,5%
	Humor	5	4,0%
	Discipline	1	0,8%
	Comment	19	15,1%
	Lexical gap	4	3,2%
Gesamt		126	100,0%

Table 31: Frequencies of German use: sixth forms

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use ^a	Vocabulary translation	27	60,0%
	Organisation	10	22,2%
	Comment	5	11,1%
	Lexical gap	1	2,2%
	Chatting	1	2,2%
	Not understandable	1	2,2%
Gesamt		45	100,0%

When analyzing the three teachers' statistics, it was noticeable that only fourteen vocabulary translations by instructors make 87.5% of all German instances in the sixth form (see Table 33). Even though teachers used half of their German utterances for giving German equivalents in the third forms, their L1 usage showed remarkably more appearances for other purposes, like vocabulary and grammar explanation, organization, humor and discipline, than in the higher secondary classrooms (see Table 32 & 33).

Table 32: Frequencies of teachers' German use: third forms

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use ^a	Vocabulary translation	22	50,0%
	Vocabulary explanation	5	11,4%
	Grammar explanation	2	4,5%
	Organisation	9	20,5%
	Humor	4	9,1%
	Discipline	1	2,3%
	Lexical gap	1	2,3%
Gesamt		44	100,0%

Table 33: Frequencies of teachers' German use: sixth forms

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
German use ^a	Vocabulary translation	14	87,5%
	Organisation	1	6,3%
	Lexical gap	1	6,3%
Gesamt		16	100,0%

These results are largely consistent with the teachers' statements during the interviews, in which all teachers gave their opinions that higher-level students would be in need of less German in the EFL classroom than lower-level students. The three teachers reported prior knowledge of English to be one major reason why higher-level learners do not depend on as much German as lower-level learners. T1 and T2 mentioned the multilingualism of the older students, associated with their capability of making connections, as well as their higher English proficiency level as further reasons while T3 highlighted that teachers think upper class students are capable of learning English without the help of other languages, because they are generally more mature and have more experience in English. The stated multilingualism seemed to be facilitated in the upper classes of the school of T1 and T2, as they both

highlighted this reason in great detail. A demonstrative excerpt of T1's interview supports this notion:

T1: besonders diese [...] klasse die lernen französisch bei der kollegin und erm griechisch und latein. die haben so viele sprachen auf die sie zugreifen können. die können so gute verbindungen herstellen die können wörter ableiten wenn sie sie sehen. () die brauchen weniger übersetzung generell denke ich.

I: mhm und das führen sie auf jeden fall auf das höhere sprachniveau zurück?

T1: höheres sprachniveau (.) und ich denk schon die mehrsprachigkeit macht den unterschied. unsere o r g klassen (1) sind ned so leistungsstark wie diese langformklasse die so viele sprachen lernt.

Additionally, all of them agreed that they use more German in lower secondary classes than in higher secondary ones themselves. Concerning this issue T1 and T3 emphasized that, apart from their general agreement, there can be great differences between classes with the same age and presumed language level which determine the amount of German too. T3 said in this respect:

T3: ja zweifellos. (.) erm hängt ja auch von der klasse ab. wenn es eine sehr gute klasse ist dann redet man weniger deutsch (.) wenn es eine schlechtere klasse ist (.) erm hat man das gefühl man muss mehr mit deutsch (.) also ausbessern und (.) in der oberstufe versucht man überhaupt das deutsche zu minimieren (.) ja aber es hängt auch von der (.) von der qualität der klasse ab. (.) also wann die schlechte klasse ist muss man trotzdem öfters mit deutsch arbeiten.

Teachers were confronted with observed situations that were interpreted to represent typical level-specific differences within their lessons. T1 and her third-form learners used German for organizational purposes 15 times, which was not used once by T1 or her students in the sixth form. This great difference was approved to be representative of her EFL lessons. Only one inconsistency was realized when interviewing T1, as she did not use German vocabulary translations in the third form at all but three in her sixth class, even though she was convinced that it would be contrariwise. Her students in the sixth class, likewise, translated English words two times and not one single time in the third form. T2 and her learners used more German for purposes that did not concern the content of the lesson, like organization, humor and discipline, more frequently in the lower-level than in the higher-level classroom, which she described as typical. T3's students uttered more phrases in German for organizational purposes, which was described as typical as well. This teacher wrote more German words and phrases onto the board in the third form, which he considered as rep-

representative as well. One fact that was highly remarkable for the researcher was that all the three interviewed teachers mentioned a difference between the various age groups in response to the very first interview question on the general role of German in English lessons without being explicitly asked about the different levels, as has been described in section 7.1.

Strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning

The second focus lies on the observed and reported strategies of vocabulary teaching and learning and whether any differences between the two analyzed levels can be identified. Therefore, the results of the in-class recordings were analyzed level-wise just like the student questionnaires, which were investigated in order to find potential differences between the learners' beliefs on perceived and preferred practices. The teachers' views during the interviews are taken into account, too. With the intention to remain with the topic of German usage in EFL classrooms, at first, the significant difference between 65 identified vocabulary teaching or learning strategies that involve German by teachers and students in the third forms and 29 in the sixth forms must be stated (See Table 34 & 35).

Table 34: Frequencies of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies: third forms

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Strategies_3rd_forms ^a	German vocabulary translation	43	37,1%
	German vocabulary explanation	10	8,6%
	English vocabulary explanation	16	13,8%
	Pictures and gestures	3	2,6%
	Guess from context	1	0,9%
	Matching activity	2	1,7%
	Let S use vocabulary in a sentence	1	0,9%
	Use vocabulary in an example sentence (T)	9	7,8%
	English on board	19	16,4%
	German on board	12	10,3%
Gesamt		116	100,0%

More specifically, the statistics show that longer German vocabulary explanations only occurred in the third forms studied and only two of fourteen realized German words or phrases on the board were written down in the higher-level classrooms. Thus, teachers and students in the sixth forms rather try to avoid other strategies that involve German while still adhering to the strategy of translating new English words into the shared mother tongue orally 27 times, although many more instances of giving German equivalents, namely 43, were identified in the lower-level lessons.

Table 35: Frequencies of vocabulary teaching and learning strategies: sixth forms

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Strategies_6th_form ^a	German vocabulary translation	27	29,0%
	English vocabulary explanation	23	24,7%
	Pictures and gestures	2	2,2%
	Dictionary use	1	1,1%
	Guess from context	2	2,2%
	Let S use vocabulary in a sentence	2	2,2%
	Use vocabulary in an example sentence (T)	4	4,3%
	English on board	19	20,4%
	German on board	2	2,2%
	Synonyms	3	3,2%
	Antonyms	2	2,2%
	Word formation	4	4,3%
	Collocations	1	1,1%
	Brainstorming	1	1,1%
Gesamt		93	100,0%

Apart from the differences in the use of the L1, it can be seen that teachers integrated rather simple activities, like working with pictures, providing example sentences or matching activities, in the third forms and more complex tasks in the sixth forms, for example activities with synonyms, antonyms and collocations, word formation tasks and individual dictionary research. All teachers stated that such tasks, which can be included in the language in use formats in their tests or at the written Matura examination, are important practices for these exams. T1 described this level-dependent

difference, in response to the level-neutral question on how vocabulary should ideally be transmitted in EFL lessons, in the following way:

T1: verbunden mit kontext (.) womöglich auf viele verschiedene arten in der unterstufe gerne mit bildern (.) bewegungen kann man vorzeigen (2) man kann versuchen die wörter selber zu kon kontextualisieren oder sich in eine geschichte quasi zu verstricken (1) in der oberstufe machen wir gern arbeit mit wortfamilien wo sie adjektive nomen verben und so weiter zu einem stamm suchen und finden müssen (.) das brauchen sie dann zum beispiel auch für language in use bei den schularbeiten und dann später bei der matura (2) die wörter die ich mir raussuche sind meistens (.) wichtig für's verständnis von einer listening oder von einem text (.) oder ich denk mir es wär schön wenn sie die selber auch aktiv verwenden könnten.

In reply to the question whether the particular language proficiency level of the students makes a difference in the use of German while teaching new English vocabulary items, all teachers answered that the level certainly makes a difference in this regard and that more German is used for conveying vocabulary in the lower secondary forms. T1 stated shortly but quite representatively:

T1: je niedriger der sprachlevel in der zielsprache desto höher ist der anteil an deutschem wahrscheinlich auch.

Likewise, all teachers agreed with the statement that they rather translate or let their learners translate new English words or phrases in the classes with a lower proficiency level, even T1 who tries to avoid German translations and only gives an L1 equivalent when a new word or phrase leads to a problem in understanding. T2 answered hereto:

T2: hm. (3) ja auch die jüngerer lass ich eher übersetzen. in der oberen st (.) oberen also in den älteren (.) klassen. (.) höheren klassen frage ich dann okay wenn sie mir das deutsch geben (.) sag ich okay kannst du mir aber ein englisches synonym geben oder kannst du mir eine englische erklärung geben. ich ver schau schon eher dass sie das engl (.) auf englisch übersetzen können oder (.) sich erklären können auf englisch

Vocabulary learning strategies

As has been seen, students were asked about the strategies they use for vocabulary learning and the ones their instructors use when conveying novel English words as well as their attitudes on the influence of the students' proficiency level. The results of each participating class were analyzed and the outcome of the three third and three sixth forms was compared, in order to find potential level differences. Only the most relevant selected similarities and differences between the two levels under investiga-

tion are presented in this section, as not each of the 27 questionnaire items can be elaborated on in detail. The theme of students' strategies of vocabulary learning was divided into strategies they use for learning and strategies they use when a new vocabulary item occurs in the classroom. For the first point, both third and sixth-form learners use monolingual English dictionaries hardly ever and the younger ones do rarely use bilingual dictionaries while 37.5% of the older ones report to use English-German dictionaries for vocabulary learning, but are generally neutral to it with a mean of 3.16. In sum, both age groups prefer bilingual dictionaries over monolingual ones. Quite accordingly, learners of both levels seem to use English-German word lists for vocabulary learning very frequently. Only a few students agreed that they use notes in a text for vocabulary learning without level-dependent difference. There was a small but noticeable difference between the two levels as regards the noting down of new English words. In spite of the agreement of both groups (mean 3rd form: 1.56; mean 6th form: 1.98) that they rather write down German translations, more learners of the sixth forms (29.6%) than of the third forms (7.9%) state that they write down English explanations when being faced with new vocabulary. Third-form students rather agree that they translate new English words in EFL lessons into German (mean: 2.59) and sixth-formers rather disagree (mean: 3.25) with this statement. However, both levels agree that they are allowed to do so in their EFL lessons. In accordance with this result, a few more students of the higher secondary forms (mean: 2.91) agree that they provide English explanations than lower secondary learners (mean: 3.22).

Vocabulary teaching strategies

91.1% of sixth form students agree with the statement that their teachers provide mainly English explanations for vocabulary items while 57.1% of the third-formers agree that their teachers do so and the rest is neutral, but strikingly, no single student of the whole study disagreed with this statement. The counter-statement revealed the significant difference that more lower-level learners (45.9%) than higher-level students (5.4%) feel that their teachers convey new English words via a German translation mostly. The answers to these two items contained twelve inconsistent ones which were, nevertheless, counted as valid, because students might perceive that their teachers use both strategies quite frequently even though both statements con-

tained the word “größtenteils”. These two strategies, German translation and English explanation, were by far the most ticked answers in response to Q15 (“Diese Methode/n wird/werden bei neuen Vokabeln im Englischunterricht am häufigsten verwendet (maximal 2 ankreuzen)”) in both level groups. However, differences can be recognized, as younger students perceive German translation as the main strategy (90.5% of students) and older students regard English explanations as the most frequent method (94.6% of students) (see Table 36 & 37). Furthermore, a quarter of all sixth-form learners think that guessing from context is a frequently used strategy in their English lessons (see Table 37).

Table 36: Frequencies of perceived strategies: third forms

		Antworten		Prozent der Fälle
		N	Prozent	
Methoden im Unterricht ^a	Englische Erklärung	45	40,2%	71,4%
	Deutsche Übersetzung	57	50,9%	90,5%
	Bilder und Gesten	1	0,9%	1,6%
	Aus Kontext schließen	6	5,4%	9,5%
	Andere Methode	3	2,7%	4,8%
Gesamt		112	100,0%	177,8%

Table 37: Frequencies of perceived strategies: sixth forms

		Antworten		Prozent der Fälle
		N	Prozent	
Methoden im Unterricht ^a	Englische Erklärung	53	48,2%	94,6%
	Deutsche Übersetzung	38	34,5%	67,9%
	Selbstständig im Wörterbuch nachschlagen	3	2,7%	5,4%
	Aus Kontext schließen	14	12,7%	25,0%
	Andere Methode	2	1,8%	3,6%
Gesamt		110	100,0%	196,4%

Almost all third formers (96.8% of students) chose German translation as one of their two preferred strategies, a bit more than a half picked English explanation and 8 students like pictures and gestures. Sixth-form students prefer German translations (41.1% of answers) and English explanations (40.2% of answers) to an equal extent and thirteen students prefer guessing from context. In response to the attitudinal questions on the preference of English vocabulary explanations or German translations by the teacher, students of both levels rather agree that they prefer German translations, even though both items have positive means and the slight difference

that the two means of the sixth form (2.59 and 2.00) converge more to each other than the means of the third form (2.92 and 1.60), which suggests that younger students perceive the need for German translations more than their older counterparts who favor English explanations by their instructors as well. Almost all learners of all age groups agree that the translation of new English vocabulary is of high importance.

In response to the attitudinal questions about the influence of other known languages and the mother tongue on learning English, both levels rather agreed that the mother tongue facilitates English vocabulary learning, but had divided opinions regarding the statement “Englisch sollte ohne Hilfe anderer Sprachen, die man schon kann, gelernt werden”, resulting in no tendency for agreement or disagreement in both age groups (see Table 28 & 29).

The additional items on students' beliefs were about the influence of the language level on German usage in the EFL classroom. The coding of item Q23 was reversed in order to analyze the answers of Q17 and Q23 together, as they were formulated as mutually exclusive items. Overall, the answers of eight students to these two items were made invalid, because they either agreed or disagreed with both statements, which causes inconsistency. The statistical data of the combined items reveal that the surveyed students are in agreement with the statement that younger students are more dependent on German in their EFL lessons, as 71.2% agree with this or disagree with the opposing statement and only nine answers disagree with this assertion (see Table 38).

Table 38: Descriptive statistic Q17 & Q23

		Antworten	
		N	Prozent
Jüngere SuS brauchen mehr Deutsch ^a	Stimme voll zu	55	24,8%
	Stimme zu	103	46,4%
	Neutral	55	24,8%
	Stimme nicht zu	6	2,7%
	Stimme gar nicht zu	3	1,4%
Gesamt		222	100,0%

The learners of the two levels generally share their beliefs on level-dependent differences in German usage. The mean values of the two contradictory questions lie closer to each other in the results of the third forms (2.24 and 3.61) than in those of the sixth forms (1.81 and 4.08), which implies that the older students are even more convinced that their younger counterparts are more reliant on German within their EFL lessons than they are themselves. The last attitudinal item was similarly formulated, but did not mention the age of the students but only the students' capability and stated that weaker learners can understand new English words only through English explanations. 71.4% of all students disagreed and only four students agreed with this statement (see Table 39). The third-formers' opinions were in line with the sixth-formers beliefs as concerns Q20.

Table 39: Descriptive statistic Q20

Weniger begabte SchülerInnen können neue englische Wörter nur durch englische Erklärungen verstehen.

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Stimme zu	4	3,4	3,4	3,4
	Neutral	30	25,2	25,2	28,6
	Stimme nicht zu	59	49,6	49,6	78,2
	Stimme gar nicht zu	26	21,8	21,8	100,0
	Gesamt	119	100,0	100,0	

8. Discussion and implications

This section will summarize the main findings of the study, relate them to the reviewed literature and make implications. As regards the first research question, generally, the findings suggest that there is a definite role of the L1 in the Austrian EFL classroom. Teachers as well as learners use their shared L1 in every lesson with varying frequencies, the main functions on both sides being vocabulary translation and organizational purposes, supporting the results of Liu et al. (2004: 616-622) and Jingxia (2010: 21). The teachers' uses of German seem to be controlled, including the minor functions of grammar and vocabulary explanation, humor and discipline while learners also use it for comments and chatting, the former frequently employed

function could be related to Iyitoglu's (2016: 257) study where students expressed their attitudes in the L1. As opposed to some existent literature (Rezvani & Rasekh 2011; Iyitoglu 2016), no teachers praised their learners in German in the present study.

In general, when approaching the second research question, it could be recognized in only two lessons by each teacher that teachers try to employ a variety of vocabulary teaching strategies in their lessons. The most frequently used ones are writing English onto the board, translating into German and explaining in English. The participating instructors seem to be in line with Cook (2001), Macaro (2009), Jingxia (2010) and others who argue that the integration of translation for vocabulary teaching is effective. It is suggested that Austrian teachers use both German translations and explanations as well as English explanations for conveying vocabulary meaning in an almost equal amount approving the outcome of Nakatsukasa and Loewen's (2015: 133) study. There is inconsistency between three similar items in the questionnaire, as the learners' perception of their teachers using mainly English for explaining new words does not accord with the data of the lessons, even if the results of the multiple-choice item do accord with the data, as English explanations and German translations are by far perceived as being most frequently used. The used strategies of writing a German translation on the board and using or letting use the word in context are also noteworthy. Overall, the strategies used by the teachers were confirmed as typical by their own appraisals during the interviews. The identified teaching strategies are almost identical with the suggested strategies by Nation (2008) and Hedge (2000).

Learners utter mostly German oral vocabulary translations or explanations in the lessons, which does correspond with findings from Barcroft (2009: 82f) and Pavičić Takač (2009: 111) but not with their self-perceptions where they stated that they explain words in English almost just as often. According to their self-reports, students rather write down German translations for new vocabulary items and learn mainly via English-German word lists. Moreover, the results indicated that Austrian learners would rather consult a bilingual dictionary than a monolingual one, if at all.

The attitudes of teachers and learners were addressed in relation to the third research question and further, it is elaborated whether the participants' attitudes conform with their practices. T1 and T3 aim to reduce the amount of German to a mini-

mum, which agrees with the found attitudes in Fussi's (2017: 74) study to a certain degree, however, there is a great difference between their two overall frequencies, as T1 made of German 9 times while T3 used it 25 times. T2 does not want to exclude German, but is aware that English should be the main medium in the EFL classroom and she used it 26 times. Interestingly, only T3 mentioned the purpose of conveying the meaning of vocabulary items as effective and typically used in his lessons during the interview, even if this was the most commonly used function within the lessons, while all teachers approved that German is used for organizational purposes typically. The clarification of T2 and T3 to use German for disciplining can be related to Cook's (2001: 416) statement that teachers do so to emphasize that "the threat is real".

The outcome indicates that Austrian students definitely welcome German translations in relation to novel vocabulary in their lessons, confirming Calis and Dikilitas' (2012: 5079) and Liu et al.'s (2004: 631) results, and, additionally, are in agreement that the mother tongue can facilitate foreign language learning. However, learners as well as teachers are not in agreement about the influence of other known languages on the learning of a new foreign language, thus, there is no indication about Austrian teachers' and learners' beliefs on translanguaging in the EFL classroom (Garcia & Kleyn 2016; Mazak 2017), even if one may notice that the difference between the teachers may be their different periods of experience, as the two teachers who have worked three or five years as teachers totally agree with the statement that any language one knows is a clear advantage, while the teacher with 28 years of experience raises his doubts.

In relation to all participants' attitudes and the next research question on the influence of the learners' language proficiency level, it can be summarized that teachers and learners believe that the language proficiency level has a definite influence, insofar as lower-level learners, who are usually younger in age, are more reliant on German in class than higher-level learners. The teachers gave reasons of more prior knowledge, maturity and the advancing multilingualism in higher secondary forms. Accordingly, the general amount of German showed a significant difference, with 73,68% of all instances identified in the third forms, with a much higher proportion for students' comments, the organizational purpose and vocabulary translation, in accordance with Qian et al.'s (2009: 724) findings that the amount of the L1 decreases

over time as the proficiency level rises. Interestingly, teachers use German in the sixth forms almost exclusively for translating vocabulary, just like in Lo's (2015: 270) study. The fact that teachers use more German in the lower-level classes in general as well as for vocabulary teaching was confirmed by all of their statements and beliefs expressed during the interviews.

Concerning vocabulary teaching, younger students perceive German translation as the main strategy and older students regard English explanations as the most frequent method in their EFL lessons. This finding is consistent with the fact that teachers and learners used German vocabulary explanations exclusively in the lower level classes, far more vocabulary translations in the third forms and an almost equal amount of German translations and English explanations in the sixth forms, which relates positively to Lee and Macaro's (2013: 887) outcome indicating that lower-level, or younger, students benefit more from L1 vocabulary explanations. As concerns the kinds of strategies, the level seems to play a certain role too, because teachers incorporate rather simple tasks, such as matching activities, in the third forms and more complex tasks, like activities with word formation, collocations, synonyms and antonyms in the sixth forms. All teachers stated that the latter kinds of activities aim to prepare their higher secondary forms for the centralized Matura examination in Austria.

It could be found, that the students' needs differ according to the different levels, implying that learners with a lower proficiency want their teachers to translate new words while those with a higher level prefer both English explanations and German translations, a consistent finding with Macaro and Lee's (2013: 717) and Lee and Macaro's (2013: 897) conclusion that lower-level learners prefer the L1 more than the higher-level learners.

The outcome of this study implies that Austrian EFL teachers are aware of their language use in English lessons and accept the role of German for vocabulary teaching as well as for general purposes like classroom organization, even if they all highlight that they try to conduct their lessons in the target language mainly, which is in concordance with Butzkamm (2003: 38) and Cook (2001: 413), who states that, in spite of recommendations about how a shared L1 can be positively used in an EFL classroom, language teachers may not forget that "it is clearly useful to employ large quantities of the L2, everything else being equal". Moreover, the results suggest that

Austrian EFL teachers have awareness about certain level differences and act correspondent to their beliefs, agreeing with Lo's (2015: 270) findings. Explicit as well as implicit vocabulary teaching strategies seem to be a central part in Austrian EFL classrooms and all practices and attitudes of teachers suggest that a variety of strategies should be employed in this respect. The teachers' language choices and integrative use of the learners' L1 did not seem to hinder their learning or significantly reduce time for TL input, which leads to the pedagogical implication that the shared L1 might be viewed as an additional resource in the EFL classroom, for general outlined purposes as well as for the conveyance of the meaning of new vocabulary items, if used judiciously and controlled.

A further implication of this work is that, in Austria, defined curricula und standardized final exams might possibly influence teaching strategies, as all teachers stated that, in the higher secondary forms, they include formats and tasks in their teaching which students must be able to master by the end of their secondary education, hence the final Matura examination.

9. Potential shortcomings

Obviously, a researcher must be aware that the elaborate endeavor of such a study, especially when conducting such for the first time, may not or cannot be perfect and that there is always space for improvement. This study only gave a hint on what teachers and learners actually do and believe, which is not irrelevant. However, one could ask the questions how effective their practices are, or whether the described practices facilitate language learning and in which way? Therefore, the issue of this thesis could be extended. Firstly, the scale of the study was rather small, which means that a greater number of participants and more observed lessons would probably make the results more significant and representative. Secondly, one could use a certain vocabulary teaching strategy, say only English explanation for one group, only German translations and explanations for the other and both for a control group, exclusively and then, test, compare and analyze the results of the groups. This could also be conducted with different levels, as to gain further insights in this respect. The researcher realized after the study had already been conducted that the formulation

of Q15 and Q24 should have been improved, as it is not clear whether the investigator means teachers' or students' methods or both, which could have led to discrepancies. In addition, it must be mentioned that the subjective ascription of single purposes to individual L1 uses within the lessons did not leave much space for interpreting that one utterance could have multiple purposes. Nevertheless, it can be stated with a clear conscience that the study provides significant results and potential impulse for further research to be undertaken.

10. Conclusion

All in all, this diploma thesis has aimed to explore the practices and attitudes of Austrian EFL teachers and learners by observing in-class lessons, conducting questionnaires and interviews. In the end, significant results were reported and interpreted and can hopefully contribute to this field of research. After reviewing relevant and contemporary literature, the aim of the study was to address the covered issues of language use in the EFL classroom, especially for vocabulary teaching and learning, and focused via an empirical investigation on the Austrian AHS context by analyzing teachers' and learners' practices and attitudes and comparing two different language proficiency levels, in order to research level-dependent differences or similarities. The findings showed that a significant role of the L1 in general and for the functions of vocabulary teaching and learning is approved by the participants' practices and attitudes. Further, the proficiency level of language learners is a distinct difference maker as concerns L1 usage, vocabulary teaching and learning strategies and teachers' and learners' attitudes.

11. References

- Alroe, M.; Reinders, H. 2015. "The role of translation in vocabulary acquisition: a replication study". *The Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1(1), 38-59.
- Antón Remírez, Susana; Lázarolbarrola, Amparo. 2011. "Lost in translation? Translation as a valid tool for the EFL classroom". *Filología y Didáctica de la Lengua* (11), 103-114.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Augustyn, Prisca. 2013. "No dictionaries in the classroom: Translation Equivalents and Vocabulary Acquisition" *International Journal of Lexicography* 26(3), 362-385.
- Awan, Muhammad Afzal; Sipra, Muhammad Aslam. 2015. "A 'Judicious' Use of L1 in TL Classroom: Socio-Political, Psychological and Functional Dimensions". *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. 6(5), 16-21.
- Barcroft, Joe. 2009. "Strategies and performance in intentional L2 vocabulary learning". *Language Awareness* 18(1), 74-89.
- Bruen, Jennifer; Kelly, Niamh. 2017. "Using a Shared L1 to Reduce Cognitive Overload and Anxiety Levels in the L2 Classroom". *Language Learning Journal* 45(3), 368-381.
- Brumfit, Christopher John. 1984. *Communicative methodology in language teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Butzkamm, Wolfgang. 2003. "We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma". *The Language Learning Journal* 28(1), 29-39.
- Byram, Michael; Méndez García, Marí del Carmen. 2009. "Communicative language teaching". In Knapp, Karlfried; Seidlhofer, Barbara; Widdowson, Henry George (eds.). *Handbook of foreign language communication and learning*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 491-516.
- Calis, Eda; Dikilitas, Kenan. 2012. "The Use of Translation in EFL Classes as L2 Learning Practice". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46, 5079-5084.
- Carter, Ronald. 1998. *Vocabulary: applied linguistics perspectives*. (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Cohen, Louis; Manion, Lawrence; Morrison, Keith. 2011. *Research methods in education*. (7th edition). London: Routledge.
- Comesaña, Montserrat; Perea, Manuel; Piñeiro, Ana; Fraga, Isabel. 2009. "Vocabulary teaching strategies and conceptual representations of words in L2 in children: evidence with novice learners". *Journal of experimental child psychology* 104(1). 22-33.
- Cook, Vivian. 1991. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Cook, Vivian. 2001. "Using the First Language in the Classroom". *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(3), 402-423.
- Cook, Vivian. 2011. "Teaching English as a foreign language in Europe". In Hinkel, Eli (ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Erlbaum, 140-154.

- Cummins, Jim. 2009. "Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: pedagogical considerations". *TESOL Quarterly* 43(2), 317-321.
- Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer; Liebscher, Grit. 2009. "Teacher and Student Use of the First Language in Foreign Language Classroom Interaction: Functions and Applications". In Turnbull, Miles; Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer. *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 131-144.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán; Taguchi, Tatsuya. 2010. *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration, and processing*. (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Eldridge, John. 1996. "Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school". *ELT Journal* 50(4), 303-311.
- Ellis, Rod. 2005. "Principles of instructed language learning". *System* 33. 209-224.
- Friedmann, Debra A. 2012. "How to collect and analyze qualitative data". In Mackey, Alison; Gass, Susan M. (eds.). *Research methods in second language acquisition: a practical guide*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 180-200.
- Fussi, Barbara. 2017. *On the use of the L1 in beginner's English and French language classrooms: a case study of Austrian teachers' beliefs and practices*. Unpublished diploma Thesis, University of Vienna.
- Galleta, Anne. 2013. *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond: from research design to analysis and publication*. New York: New York University Press.
- García Mayo, María Del Pilar; Hidalgo, María de Los Ángeles. 2017. "L1 use among young EFL mainstream and CLIL learners in task-supported interaction". *System* 67, 132-145.
- Garcia, Ofelia; Kleyn, Tatyana. 2016. "Translanguaging theory in education". In Garcia, Ofelia; Kleyn, Tatyana (eds.). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. New York: Routledge, 9-33.
- Hedge, Tricia. 2000. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hymes, Dell Hathaway. 1972. "On Communicative Competence". In: Pride, John Bernard; Holmes, Janet (eds.). *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 269-293.
- Ilyitoglu, Orhan. 2016. "Code-switching from L2 to L1 in EFL classrooms". *Croatian Journal of Education* 18(1), 257-289.
- Jingxia, Liu. 2009. "Switching to L1 in the EFL Classroom-the Perspective of Adaptation". *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 2(1), 45-49.
- Jingxia, Liu. 2010. "Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom". *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 3(1), 10-23.
- Joyce, Paul. 2018. "L2 vocabulary learning and testing: the use of L1 translation versus L2 definition". *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-12.
- Koletnik, Melita. 2015. "Expanding Vocabulary Through Translation – An Eclectic Approach". *Scripta Manent* 7(1), 2-12.
- Larson-Hall, Jenifer. 2016. *A guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS and R*. (2nd edition). London: Routledge.
- Latsanyphone, Soulignavong; Bouangeune, Souvannasy. "Using L1 in Teaching Vocabulary to Low English Proficiency Level Students: A Case Study at the National University of Laos". *English Language Teaching* 2(3), 186-193.
- Lee, Jang Ho; Macaro, Ernesto. 2013. Investigating age in the use of L1 or English-only instruction: Vocabulary acquisition by Korean EFL learners. *Modern Language Journal* 97(4), 887-901.
- Levine, Glenn S. 2009. "Building meaning through code choice in second language learner interaction: a D/discourse analysis and proposals for curriculum design

- and teaching". In Turnbull, Miles; Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer. *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 145-162.
- Levine, Glenn S. 2011. *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Littlewood, William. 2014. "Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here?". *Language Teaching* 47(3), 349-362.
- Liu, Dilin; Ahn, Gil-Soon; Baek, Kyung-Suk; Han, Nan-Ok. 2004. "South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 38(4), 605-638.
- Lo, Yuen Yi. 2015. "How Much L1 Is Too Much? Teachers' Language Use in Response to Students' Abilities and Classroom Interaction in Content and Language Integrated Learning". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 18(3), 270-288.
- Macaro, Ernesto. 2006. "Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy". In Llorca, E. *Non-native language teachers: perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. New York: Springer. 63-84.
- Macaro, Ernesto. 2009. "Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: exploring 'optimal use'". In Turnbull, Miles; Dailey-O'Cain, Jennifer. *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 35-49.
- Macaro, Ernesto. 2013. "Overview: Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research?". *Codeswitching in University English-Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives*, 10-23.
- Macaro, Ernesto; Lee, Jang Ho. 2013. "Teacher Language Background, Codeswitching, and English-Only Instruction: Does Age Make a Difference to Learners' Attitudes?". *Tesol Quarterly* 47(4), 717-742.
- Macswan, Jeff. 2012. "Code-Switching and Grammatical Theory". In Bhatia, Tej K.; Ritchie, William C. *The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Second Edition. Chichester, West Sussex: Malden, 321-350.
- Mazak, Catherine M. 2017. "Introduction: Theorizing translanguaging practices in higher education". In Mazak, Catherine M.; Carroll, Kevin S. (eds.). *Translanguaging in higher education: Beyond monolingual ideologies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 1-10.
- Milroy, Lesley; Muysken, Pieter. 1995. "Introduction: Code-switching and bilingualism research". In Milroy, Lesley; Muysken, Pieter (eds.). *One speaker two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1-14.
- Milton, James. 2009. *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Milton, James; Fitzpatrick, Tess. 2014. *Dimensions of vocabulary knowledge*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mohebbi, Hassan; Alavi, Sayyed Mohammad. 2014. "Teachers' First Language Use in Second Language Learning Classroom Context: A Questionnaire-based Study". *Bellaterra: journal of teaching and learning language and literature* 7(4), 57-73.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1997. "Code-switching". In Coulmas, Florian (ed.). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. London: Blackwell, 217-237.
- Nakatsukasa, Kimi; Loewen, Shawn. 2015. "A Teacher's First Language Use in Form-Focused Episodes in Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom". *Language Teaching Research* 19(2), 133-149.

- Nation, Ian Stephen Paul. 2008. *Teaching Vocabulary: strategies and techniques*. Boston: Heinle.
- Nation, Ian Stephen Paul. 2013. *Learning vocabulary in another language*. (2nd edition). Cambridge: CUP.
- Nemati, Azadeh; Maleki, Ensieh. 2014. "The Effect of Teaching Vocabulary through the Diglot-Weave Technique on Vocabulary Learning of Iranian High School Students". *Procedia – Social and behavioral sciences* 98, 1340-1345.
- Otwinowska, Agnieszka. 2017. "English Teachers' Language Awareness: Away with the Monolingual Bias?". *Language Awareness* 26(4), 304-324.
- Oxford, Rebecca L. 2011. "Strategies for learning a second or foreign language". *Language Teaching* 44(2), 167-180.
- Park, Sung-Won; Manning, Shaun Justin. 2012. "L1 vs. L2 use and classroom interaction in team-taught elementary school classes in Korea". *English Teaching* 67(2), 105-134.
- Pavičić Takač. 2008. *Vocabulary learning strategies and foreign language acquisition*. Pennsylvania: Multilingual Matters.
- Poplack Shana. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching". *Linguistics* 18(7-8), 581-616.
- Qian, Xiaofang ; Tian, Guisen ; Wang, Qiang. 2009. Codeswitching in the Primary EFL Classroom in China--Two Case Studies. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics* 37(4), 719-730.
- Ramachandran, Sharimllah Devi; Rahim, Hajar Abdul. 2004. "Meaning recall and retention: The impact of the translation method on elementary level learners' vocabulary learning". *RELC Journal* 35(2), 161-178.
- Richards, Jack C.; Rodgers, Theodore S. 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. (2nd edition). Cambridge: CUP.
- Riessman, Catherine. 2008. *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Salem, Ilana. 2012. "L1-L2 Sentence Translation in Classroom Grammar Tests". *ELT Journal* 66(2), 147-155.
- Sampson, Andrew. 2012. "Learner Code-Switching versus English Only". *ELT Journal* 66(3), 293-303.
- Savignon, Sandra J. 2000. "Communicative language teaching". In: Byram, Michael (ed.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Routledge, 124-129.
- Savignon, Sandra J. 2007. "Beyond communicative language teaching: what's ahead?". *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(1), 207-220.
- Shabir, Muhammad. 2017. "Student-Teachers' Beliefs on the Use of L1 in EFL Classroom: A Global Perspective". *English Language Teaching* 10(4), 45-52.
- Song, Yanan; Andrews, Stephen. 2009. *The L1 in L2 learning - teachers' beliefs and practices*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- Stern, Hans Heinrich. 1983. *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Swan, Michael. 1985. "A critical look at the communicative approach (2)". *ELT Journal* 39(2), 76-87.
- Tian, Lili, Macaro, Ernesto. 2012. "Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A lexical focus-on-form study". *Language Teaching Research* 16(3), 367-391.

- Thornbury, Scott. 2002. *How to teach vocabulary*. Harlow: Longman.
- Vasu, Sindhu; Dhanavel, Senkamalam Periyasamy. 2016. "Exploring the vocabulary learning strategy use of teachers in their vocabulary instruction". *Croatian Journal of Education* 18(1), 103-135.
- Vaughn, Porcia; Turner, Cherie. 2016. "Decoding via coding: analyzing qualitative text data through thematic coding and survey methodologies". *Journal of Library Administration* 56(1), 41-51.
- Walker, Izumi; Chan, Daniel Kwang Guan; Nagami, Masanori. 2018. "New perspectives on the development of communicative and related competence in foreign language education: An introduction to the book". In Bourguignon, Claire; Chan, Daniel Kwang Guan; Nagami, Masanori; Walker, Izumi (eds.). *New perspectives on the development of communicative and related competence in foreign language education*. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1-20.
- Wallace, Michael J. 1982. *Teaching vocabulary*. London: Heinemann.
- Widdowson, Henry George. 2003. *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Zacharias, Nugrahenny T. 2012. *Qualitative research methods for second language education: a coursebook*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Online-resources:

- Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung. n.d. *1-2LFS Unterstufe*. https://bildung.bmbwf.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/ahs8_782.pdf (17 May 2019).
- Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung. n.d. *Lehrplan AHS Oberstufe: Lebende Fremdsprache (Erste, Zweite)*. https://bildung.bmbwf.gv.at/schulen/unterricht/lp/lp_ahs_os_lebende_fs_11854.pdf (17 May 2019).
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. <https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97> (13 May 2019). Cambridge: CUP.
- Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: structured overview of all CEFR scales*. <https://rm.coe.int/168045b15e> (17 May 2019).
- SPSSTutorials. 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCtbK7fE825BMtQfyXWmXwbw> (17 May 2019).
- VOICE Project. 2007. *VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1]*. http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php?page=transcription_general_information (17 May 2019).
- VOICE Project. 2007. *VoiceScribe*. <https://www.univie.ac.at/voice/page/voicescribe> (17 May 2019).

12. Appendix

Appendix A: Observation sheet

Frequency of German use by teacher:

- Purpose:

Frequency of German use by students:

- Purpose:

Methods used for conveying new vocabulary items by teacher:

- English explanations:
- German translations:
- Gestures:
- Images:
- Dictionary use:
- Letting students guess from context:
- Other:

Frequency of English vocabulary explanations by students:

Frequency of German vocabulary translations by students:

- Allowed by teacher:
- Not allowed by teacher:

Draw seating plan:

Interesting comments by students:

Comments on students' behavior:

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Fragebogen über den Englischunterricht für SchülerInnen der 3. und 6. Klassen

Dieser Fragebogen wird im Rahmen einer Diplomarbeit an der Universität Wien durchgeführt und versucht konkrete Einblicke in die Praktiken im und Einstellungen zum Englischunterricht von Lehrkräften und SchülerInnen im Kontext von österreichischen Gymnasien zu erhalten.

Die Inhalte dieses Dokuments sind streng vertraulich. Informationen, welche die Befragte oder den Befragten identifizieren, werden unter keinen Bedingungen offengelegt oder weitergegeben.

Instruktion: Im Folgenden sind Aussagen gelistet, bei welchen Sie Ihre Zustimmung oder Ablehnung äußern sollen. Bitte markieren Sie den zutreffenden Grad der Zustimmung („Stimme voll zu“, „Stimme zu“, „Neutral“, „Stimme nicht zu“ oder „Stimme gar nicht zu“) mit (X) und wählen Sie nur eine Antwort aus. Um die Studie nicht zu verfälschen und valid zu erhalten, werden Sie um die ehrliche Meinung gebeten – es gibt kein „richtig“ oder „falsch“.

I. Wie läuft der Englischunterricht ab?

1. Ich lerne gerne neue englische Vokabeln.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
2. In unserem Englischunterricht werden neue Vokabeln gut und verständlich erklärt.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
3. Beim Vokabellernen verwende ich oft ein rein englisches Wörterbuch.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
4. Im Englischunterricht werden neue Vokabeln von der Lehrperson größtenteils auf Englisch erklärt.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
5. Bei einer neuen Vokabel im Unterricht schreibe ich die deutsche Übersetzung auf.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
6. Beim Vokabellernen verwende ich oft englisch-deutsche Wörterlisten.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
7. Im Unterricht erkläre ich neue englische Wörter auf Englisch.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

8. Im Englischunterricht schreibe ich bei neuen Wörtern Notizen im Text auf.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
9. Im Englischunterricht darf ich ein neues Vokabel auf Deutsch übersetzen.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
10. Beim Vokabellernen verwende ich Notizen im Text.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
11. Bei einer neuen englischen Vokabel im Unterricht übersetze und erkläre ich sie auf Deutsch.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
12. Von der Lehrkraft werden neue englische Wörter im Unterricht größtenteils durch die deutsche Übersetzung erklärt.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
13. Beim Vokabellernen verwende ich oft ein englisch-deutsches Wörterbuch.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
14. Im Unterricht schreibe ich bei einer neuen Vokabel eine englische Erklärung auf.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
15. Diese Methode(n) wird/werden bei neuen Vokabeln im Englischunterricht am häufigsten verwendet (maximal 2 ankreuzen):
☐ Englische Erklärung
☐ Deutsche Übersetzung
☐ Bilder und Gesten
☐ Selbstständig im Wörterbuch nachschlagen
☐ Aus Kontext schließen
☐ Andere Methode: _____
-

II. Meine Einstellungen zum Englischlernen

16. Englisch sollte ohne Hilfe anderer Sprachen, die man schon kann, gelernt werden.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu
17. Jüngere SchülerInnen (Gymnasium Unterstufe) sind im Englischunterricht mehr auf Deutsch angewiesen als ältere SchülerInnen (Gymnasium Oberstufe).
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

18. Ich bevorzuge englische Erklärungen von der Lehrkraft bei neuen englischen Vokabeln.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

19. Englisch Vokabellernen wird durch die eigene Muttersprache erleichtert.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

20. Weniger begabte SchülerInnen können neue englische Wörter nur durch englische Erklärungen verstehen.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

21. Ich glaube, dass das Übersetzen von Englischvokabeln beim Lehren und Lernen von neuen Wörtern sehr wichtig ist.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

22. Bei neuen englischen Wörtern finde ich die deutsche Übersetzung von der Lehrkraft sinnvoll.
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

23. Ältere SchülerInnen (Gymnasium Oberstufe) brauchen mehr deutsche Übersetzungen bei englischen Vokabeln als jüngere SchülerInnen (Gymnasium Unterstufe).
☐ Stimme voll zu ☐ Stimme zu ☐ Neutral ☐ Stimme nicht zu ☐ Stimme gar nicht zu

24. Ich bevorzuge diese Methode beim Vokabellernen im Englischunterricht (maximal 2 ankreuzen):

- ☐ Englische Erklärung
- ☐ Deutsche Übersetzung
- ☐ Bilder und Gesten
- ☐ Selbstständig im Wörterbuch nachschlagen
- ☐ Aus Kontext schließen
- ☐ Andere Methode: _____

Note im Unterrichtsfach Englisch im Schuljahr 2017/2018:

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Alter: _____ Schule: _____ Klasse: _____

Geschlecht: ☐ männlich
 ☐ weiblich

Appendix C: Interview guide – Interview with teachers

Themenkreis: Sprachverwendung im Englischunterricht

Glauben Sie, dass Deutsch im Englischunterricht eine Rolle haben soll? Warum (nicht)?

In welchen Situationen macht die Verwendung der Erstsprache Ihrer Meinung nach Sinn?

Würden Sie sagen, dass Sie generell auf Deutsch im Englischunterricht verzichten wollen? Warum (nicht)?

Zu welchen Zwecken / In welchen Situationen wird Deutsch in Ihren Englischstunden verwendet?

In welchen Situationen dürfen Ihre SchülerInnen Deutsch verwenden?

Beispiele von Observationen ansprechen:

Ist dies ein typischer Fall dafür, wie Sie Deutsch im Englischunterricht einsetzen?

Wie war es in dieser Situation hilfreich?

Themenkreis: Vokabellehren und -lernen

Glauben Sie, dass das Lernen einer Fremdsprache durch andere Sprachen, die man schon kann, erleichtert wird? (Translanguaging), Warum (nicht)? Könnten Sie vielleicht ein Beispiel geben?

Wenn Sie an die Vermittlung von neuen Vokabeln im Englischunterricht denken, wie sollte das idealerweise passieren? (Wie sollen neue Vokabel im Englischunterricht vermittelt werden?)

Wie vermitteln Sie im Englischunterricht neue Vokabel?

Welche Methoden empfinden Sie persönlich/Ihrer Erfahrung nach als besonders effektiv? Warum?

(englische Erklärung/Synonyme, deutsche Übersetzung, Bilder und Gestik, SchülerInnen aus Kontext schließen lassen, Selbstrecherche von SchülerInnen, andere?) (nur wenn die Methoden nicht von sich aus genannt werden, konkret danach fragen)

Wenn Sie im Unterricht neue englische Vokabeln vermitteln, wie versuchen Sie Deutsch aktiv einzubinden?

Inwiefern sollten SchülerInnen neue Vokabeln im Englischklassenzimmer auf Deutsch übersetzen dürfen? (Immer? In bestimmten Kontexten? ...)

Beispiele von Observationen ansprechen:

Ist dies ein typischer Fall von Vokabelvermittlung/Deutschgebrauch/wie SchülerInnen Vokabeln erklären?

Wie sollten sich SchülerInnen neue englische Vokabeln im Unterricht notieren? Warum?

Welche Regeln gibt es in Ihrem Englischunterricht in dieser Hinsicht? (Warum?)

Halten Sie die Verwendung von Wörterbüchern im Unterricht für sinnvoll?

Welche? Warum?

Was schlagen Sie SchülerInnen für den individuellen Gebrauch von Wörterbüchern zum Englisch- und Vokabellernen zuhause vor?

Wie überprüfen Sie den Fortschritt der SchülerInnen beim Vokabellernen? Wie oft?

Was müssen Ihre SchülerInnen dafür lernen? (Listen, Buch, Handouts...)

Themenkreis: Levelabhängigkeit von Sprachgebrauch

Denken Sie, dass ältere SchülerInnen (= höheres Sprachniveau in den meisten Schulkontexten) weniger auf Deutsch im Englischunterricht angewiesen sind als jüngere SchülerInnen? Warum (nicht)? (Bezug: Vergleich 3. und 6. Klasse)

Würden Sie meinen, dass Sie in der Unterstufe mehr Deutsch im Englischunterricht verwenden als in der Oberstufe?

In Bezug auf Vokabellehren, macht das jeweilige Sprachniveau einen Unterschied was die Verwendung von Deutsch angeht?

Übersetzen Sie bzw. lassen Sie in einer bestimmten Altersklasse neue Vokabel häufiger auf Deutsch übersetzen?

Beispiele von Observationen:

(bewusst, dass eine Stunde nicht komplett repräsentativ ist, doch würden Sie meinen, dass diese Situationen typischerweise gleich/unterschiedlich in den beiden Klassen gehandhabt werden?)

Allgemeines

Wie viele Jahre unterrichten Sie bereits Englisch?

Warum haben Sie sich dazu entschieden Englisch zu studieren (und zu unterrichten)?

Appendix D: Genehmigung der Durchführung einer empirischen Untersuchung



Herrn
Lukas Kloibhofer
ao1246075@unet.univie.ac.at

Genehmigung der Durchführung einer empirischen Untersuchung

Die Bildungsrichtung für Niederösterreich genehmigt die Durchführung der vorgelegten empirischen Untersuchung im Rahmen der Diplomarbeit an der Universität Wien zum Thema „Using the L1 in vocabulary teaching and learning: Teachers' and learners' practices and attitudes in the Austrian EFL classroom“ durch Herrn Lukas Kloibhofer an folgenden Schulen:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

Die an der Untersuchung teilnehmenden SchülerInnen sind vor Beginn der Erhebung ausdrücklich auf die Freiwilligkeit der Teilnahme hinzuweisen, außerdem ist deren Anonymität im Rahmen der Diplomarbeit jedenfalls zu wahren.

Unterrichtsbeobachtungen dürfen nur dann durchgeführt werden, wenn alle Erziehungsberechtigten der betroffenen Klasse, alle SchülerInnen, die betroffene Lehrperson und die Schulleitung hierzu ihr Einverständnis erklärt haben.

Es wird angeregt, bei der im Elterninformationsblatt enthaltenen Einverständniserklärung auch die Möglichkeit der Nicht-Teilnahme vorzusehen.


Vor Beginn der Erhebung sind die Zustimmung der jeweiligen Direktion und das Einverständnis der Erziehungsberechtigten einzuholen.

Auf die Einhaltung der Datenschutzbestimmung wird besonders hingewiesen.

Das Interview mit der Lehrperson ist außerhalb der Unterrichtszeit durchzuführen; wird das Interview aufgezeichnet, ist vor Beginn des Gesprächs die Zustimmung der/des Betroffenen hierzu einzuholen.

Für den Bildungsdirektor:
HR Mag. Markus Loibl

Elektronisch gefertigt

	Signaturwert	3206411b43504ff882734f5b44660653
	Unterzeichner	Bildungsdirektion für Niederösterreich
	Datum/Zeit-UTC	11.02.2019 15:02:25
	Aussteller-Zertifikat	CN=a-sign-corporate-light-02, OU=a-sign-corporate-light-02, O=A-Trust Ges. f. Sicherheitssysteme im elektr. Datenverkehr GmbH, C=AT
	Serien-Nr.	173709985936
Prüfinformation	Informationen zur Prüfung der elektronischen Signatur finden Sie unter: https://www.a-trust.at/pdfverify Informationen zur Prüfung des Ausdrucks finden Sie unter: http://www.bildung-noe.gv.at/index.php/amtssignatur.html	
Hinweis	Dieses Dokument wurde amtssigniert. Auch ein Ausdruck dieses Dokuments hat gemäß § 20 E-Government-Gesetz die Beweiskraft einer öffentlichen Urkunde.	

Appendix E: Letter to schools

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sehr geehrter Direktor Mag. [REDACTED]!

Ich, Lukas Kloibhofer, führe im Rahmen meiner universitären Diplomarbeit am Institut für Anglistik in Wien eine Studie mit sechs Klassen durch. Dies ist meine Abschlussarbeit als Lehramtskandidat und mein Interesse liegt darin, besser zu verstehen, in welcher Weise neue Vokabel im österreichischen Englischunterricht vermittelt werden und was die Einstellungen von LehrerInnen und SchülerInnen zu bestimmten Methoden sind. Hiermit bitte ich um Bewilligung zur Durchführung meiner Studie, welche zum Teil in Ihrer Schule stattfinden wird.

Ein Professor Ihrer Schule, Herr Mag. [REDACTED], hat als Teilnehmer zugesagt und insgesamt wären zwei Klassen vom [REDACTED] involviert, eine 3. und eine 6. Klasse. Im Folgenden erhalten Sie alle relevanten Informationen zum Ablauf meiner Studie:

Bei der Studie wird eine reguläre Englischstunde je Klasse in der Schule beobachtet und mit einem Aufnahmegerät aufgezeichnet. Des Weiteren wird ein Fragebogen, in dem die SchülerInnen über Praktiken im und ihre Einstellungen zum Englischunterricht befragt werden, ausgeteilt. Dies wird als Teil (etwa 10-15 Minuten) einer zusätzlichen Stunde passieren. Sowohl die Ergebnisse der beobachteten Stunde als auch die Daten des Fragebogens werden anschließend ausgewertet. Als letzter Schritt wird ein Interview mit der Lehrkraft gemacht, was selbstverständlich nicht im regulären Unterricht durchgeführt wird. Beim Schreiben der Diplomarbeit werden die Daten der Professorinnen und der SchülerInnen anonym behandelt, was bedeutet, dass keine Namen verwendet werden, weder von einzelnen SchülerInnen, LehrerInnen oder Schulen. Von Relevanz sind lediglich das Alter der SchülerInnen und ihr Sprachniveau im Unterrichtsfach Englisch.

Die Ergebnisse der Studie werden als Diplomarbeit der Universität Wien zusammengefasst. Eine Kurzzusammenfassung wird auch an die teilnehmenden Schulen gesandt. Sollten Sie noch Fragen haben, wenden Sie sich bitte an mich, Lukas Kloibhofer (a01246075@unet.univie.ac.at), oder an meine Diplomarbeitsbetreuerin Universitäts-Professorin Mag. Dr. Julia Hüttner (Julia.Huettner@univie.ac.at).

Mit herzlichem Dank und freundlichen Grüßen,

Lukas Kloibhofer

Ich bewillige hiermit die partielle Durchführung der Studie von Lukas Kloibhofer, welche im Rahmen seiner Diplomarbeit zum Lehramtstudium Englisch an der Universität Wien verfasst wird, im [REDACTED]:

Unterschrift:

Datum:

Appendix F: Letter to teachers

Sehr geehrte Frau Mag. [REDACTED]!

Ich, Lukas Kloibhofer, führe im Rahmen meiner universitären Diplomarbeit am Institut für Anglistik eine Studie mit sechs Klassen durch. Dies ist meine Abschlussarbeit als Lehramtskandidat und mein Interesse liegt darin, besser zu verstehen, in welcher Weise neue Vokabel im österreichischen Englischunterricht vermittelt werden und was die Einstellungen von LehrerInnen und SchülerInnen zu bestimmten Methoden sind. Sie haben bereits informell zugestimmt, dass Sie mit einer 3. und einer 6. Klasse an der Studie teilnehmen würden und ich bitte Sie hiermit um die offizielle Zusage. Im Folgenden erhalten Sie alle relevanten Informationen zum Ablauf meiner Studie:

Bei der Studie wird eine reguläre Englischstunde je Klasse in der Schule beobachtet und mit einem Aufnahmegerät aufgezeichnet. Des Weiteren wird ein Fragebogen, in dem die SchülerInnen über Praktiken im und ihre Einstellungen zum Englischunterricht befragt werden, ausgeteilt. Dies wird als Teil (etwa 10-15 Minuten) einer zusätzlichen Stunde passieren. Sowohl die Ergebnisse der beobachteten Stunde als auch die Daten des Fragebogens werden anschließend ausgewertet. Als letzter Schritt wird ein Interview mit der Professorin gemacht, was selbstverständlich nicht im regulären Unterricht durchgeführt wird. Beim Schreiben der Diplomarbeit werden die Daten der Professorinnen und SchülerInnen anonym behandelt, was bedeutet, dass keine Namen verwendet werden, weder von einzelnen SchülerInnen, LehrerInnen oder Schulen. Von Relevanz sind lediglich das Alter und das Sprachniveau im Unterrichtsfach Englisch. Zusammenfassend beschränkt sich der Aufwand für Sie also auf:

- Eine beobachtete reguläre Englischstunde pro Klasse (3. und 6.)
- 10-15 Minuten für das Ausfüllen des Fragebogens von den SchülerInnen in einer zusätzlichen Stunde
- 20-30 Minuten für ein Interview mit mir nach den beobachteten Stunden

Die Ergebnisse der Studie werden als Diplomarbeit der Universität Wien zusammengefasst. Eine Kurzzusammenfassung wird auch an die teilnehmenden Schulen gesandt und kann auf Wunsch gerne auch an Sie persönlich geschickt werden. Sollten Sie noch Fragen haben, wenden Sie sich bitte an mich, Lukas Kloibhofer (a01246075@unet.univie.ac.at), oder an meine Diplomarbeitbetreuerin Universitäts-Professorin Mag. Dr. Julia Hüttner (Julia.Huettner@univie.ac.at).

Mit herzlichem Dank und freundlichen Grüßen,

Lukas Kloibhofer

Hiermit bestätige ich, dass ich mit meinen Klassen, [REDACTED] und [REDACTED], an der Studie von Lukas Kloibhofer, welche im Rahmen seiner Diplomarbeit zum Lehramtstudium Englisch an der Universität Wien verfasst wird, teilnehmen werde:

Unterschrift:

Datum:

Appendix G: Letter to parents

Liebe Eltern der 3. Klasse!

Ich, Lukas Kloibhofer, führe im Rahmen meiner universitären Diplomarbeit am Institut für Anglistik in Wien eine Studie mit sechs Klassen durch. Dies ist meine Abschlussarbeit als Lehramtskandidat und mein Interesse liegt darin, besser zu verstehen, in welcher Weise neue Vokabel im österreichischen Englischunterricht vermittelt werden und was die Einstellungen von Schülerinnen und Schülern zu bestimmten Methoden sind.

Ich habe bereits das generelle Einverständnis der Englischlehrkraft Frau Mag. [REDACTED] und der Schulleitung, diese Abschlussarbeit durchzuführen, aber ich bitte Sie hier auch um Ihre Zustimmung, da Ihre Tochter/Ihr Sohn eine der Klassen, die ich untersuchen möchte, besucht.

Im Folgenden erhalten Sie alle relevanten Informationen zum Ablauf meiner Studie:

Bei der Studie wird eine reguläre Englischstunde in der Schule beobachtet und mit einem Aufnahmegerät aufgezeichnet. Des Weiteren wird ein Fragebogen, in dem die SchülerInnen über Praktiken im und ihre Einstellungen zum Englischunterricht befragt werden, ausgeteilt. Dies wird als Teil (etwa 10 Minuten) einer zusätzlichen Stunde passieren. Sowohl die Ergebnisse der beobachteten Stunde als auch die Daten des Fragebogens werden anschließend ausgewertet. Beim Schreiben der Diplomarbeit werden die Daten der SchülerInnen anonym behandelt, was bedeutet, dass keine Namen verwendet werden, weder von einzelnen SchülerInnen, LehrerInnen oder Schulen. Von Relevanz sind lediglich das Alter und das Sprachniveau im Unterrichtsfach Englisch. Die Teilnahme an der Studie ist freiwillig.

Die Ergebnisse der Studie werden als Diplomarbeit der Universität Wien zusammengefasst. Eine Kurzzusammenfassung wird auch an die teilnehmenden Schulen gesandt und kann auf Wunsch gerne auch an Sie geschickt werden (bitte teilen Sie mir bei Interesse Ihre Post- oder Emailadresse mit). Sollten Sie noch Fragen haben, wenden Sie sich bitte an mich, Lukas Kloibhofer (a01246075@unet.univie.ac.at), oder an meine Diplomarbeitsbetreuerin Universitäts-Professorin Mag. Dr. Julia Hüttner (Julia.Huettner@univie.ac.at).

Mit herzlichem Dank und freundlichen Grüßen,

Lukas Kloibhofer



Ich bestätige hiermit, dass meine Tochter/mein Sohn an der Studie teilnehmen darf:

Unterschrift:

Datum:

Appendix H: Sample observation

Transcript – T2_6th

<beg 181018_0005_00:00>

Tf: okay. (.) good. erm lukas is with us today. (.) you know what he's doing. (.) erm anything you need to (.) tell them? say anything?

Lukas: no.

Tf: we just go on?

Lukas: you can go on.

Tf: good. alright. (.) so. (.) we don't have a check-up today because you had a test. how was it? one lesson two?

SX: one lesson.

Tf: one lesson okay. alright. so. (1) erm (3) let's see what we're going to do today. (2) you had a homework language in use (.) in your book right? (5) erm in your vo- erm student's book page ninety-six ninety-seven.

SX-f: language in use.

Tf: alright. so we go through it in a second. was it difficult? (1) can you remember? (2) erm usually with those language in use where you have to (.) find (.) different or where you have four words given (.) there are always two words that are totally wrong (.) where you really know that it can't <1> be </1>

SX-f: <1> <un> xxx </un>

Tf: you were ill. (.) do it with us now. okay? erm two are always totally wrong and two are (.) quite similar sometimes (1) and (1) there is only (5) small difference. we go through it. (9) [S1] you wanna start? (5) can you start reading? (.) yeah.

S1: experts are increasingly united in the e- erm (.) cause (.) erm opinion that the climate change we are ex- (.) experiencing is (.) at least partly man-made. (.) the main cause appears to be the greenhouse gases that we are (1) erm letting in the into the atmosphere (.) <pvc> particularly {particularly} </pvc> carbon dioxide.

Tf: okay wait a second. (.) so first one was right. what is another word for cause? (2) how would you another english word? cause (.) or? (3) [S13] you have an idea? (3) you said it already right?

S13: a german one.

Tf: okay. [S11].

S11: reason.

Tf: reason. (.) another word is a reason. (.) cause. to cause something you know that already. okay? so in number two [S1]'s answer was not correct which one did you write?

SX-f: sending?

Tf: no.

SX-f: releasing?

Tf: releasing. be careful erm (.) carbon dioxide and all those (.) dioxide and all those gases are always released. (.) release is (.) in german? [S3]?

S3: <L1de> freilassen </L1de>.

Tf: <L1de> freilassen </L1de>. letting you can (.) letting is not the word for <L1de> freilassen </L1de> and erm (.) <L1de> das is nur lassen </L1de> (.) and sending you send a letter you send a person somewhere (.) right? but you release emissions.

[S15] you wanna go on?

S15: mhm.

Tf: yeah? experts.

S15: experts believe global warming if it is not (.) reduced will lead to changing weather patterns and (.) an increased frequency of (.) na- natural disasters.

Tf: natural disasters. alright. good well done. (.) any questions about that? (2) no? good <whispering>. (3) [S16] can you go on?

S16: mhm. (.) the polar ice caps will melt along with <un> xxx </un> and sea levels will rise causing floods on the one hand also droughten more deserts on the other hand. this will lead to the extinction of many animal species and (.) erm destruction of the natural habitats.

Tf: good. destruction. (.) what is construction? is the=

S16: =opposite?

Tf: opposite of destruction. right good. (.) erm what is drought? did we have that already? the vocabulary. drought. (.) if not write it down it's a very important word. (2) drought. when you [SX-f] when you describe drought which condition is it?

SXf: it's very hot and there is no water?

Tf: hot and no water (.) so? (1) [S5].

S5: dry. trocken

Tf: it's very dry yeah. (.) so it's

S5: <L1de> dürre? </L1de>

Tf: <L1de> dürre </L1de> good. (.) erm dry (.) hot (1) erm (.) condition. {Tf writes "dry, hot condition" on board} (3) for example in desert {Tf writes "desert" on board} (1) be careful with desert and dessert. (.) when spelling and writing. (.) good. dessert is written with (.) how is dessert written? [SX-f]?

SX-f lara: with double s?

Tf: double s right. (.) good. (1) go on (2) who can go on? (.) [S2].

S2: many of these events are already occ- occurring and if they (.) continue as predicted they will eventually have a strong effect on our way (.) of life <2> some sci- </2>

Tf: <2> yes. way of life </2>. mhm. go on.

S2: some scientists predict the new ice age will occur as the flow of the golf stream is reversed. (.) others think that <un> xxxxxx </un> global warming is more likely with (.) enormous increases in temperatures in temperature as a result of the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Tf: very good. very good. any questions? why another word is not (.) there. (2) okay go on. [S3]?

S3: hollywood has already produced several climate disaster movies. (.) the day after tomorrow (.) two thousand four tells the story of climate disaster takes place within a few weeks.

Tf: mhm. (2) go on.

S3: most scientists agree that this could not (.) erm definitely happen at such speed but the film was very successful and helped increase the interest in climate issues among non-scientists.

Tf: mhm. (.) good. (.) did you have in eleven what did you have?

S3: i wasn't sure if it's possible or definitely.

Tf: it's possibly. (.) i didn't hear that. possibly okay? agree that it could not possibly happen. (.) you can't say it's not definitely happen not possibly. cause definitely is surely and erm for could not you can can't use that. everything clear? all the words? (.) when we have something like that at the test you know what to do? (.) so as i said usually there are two very similar ones where you really have to think and two you can rule out definitely (.) okay? erm (.) these tasks are really about vocabulary knowledge and knowledge of collocations so words that go together (.) phrases. sometimes you have a preposition given (.) in the text where you know it can only be this word because it only goes with this preposition. (1) that's why i always write the preposition for the vocabulary as well. (.) good erm well done. so from the twelve if you have seven or eight out of twelve correctly (.) it's good. alright? (3) good can you go to page ninety-nine in your (.) book? (2) page ninety-nine in your book. (1) so (.) on the picture (.) what do you see there? what is it? [S11].

S11: kiwis?

Tf: a kiwi. who likes kiwis? (2) alright. kiwis are very very healthy (.) they have a lot of vitamins (.) do you know where they come from? do we have kiwis in austria? (2) no. right. (.) where do they come from when you buy them? (.) [S1].

S1: new zealand?

Tf: they come from new zealand there's also a bird that's a kiwi. right? erm so. it says already in the text that they come from new zealand (.) erm what is the problem with kiwis then? why do we talk about kiwis (.) today? (2) [S3].

S3: because they travel such a long way to us.

Tf: yeah. they need a very long way. travel a very (.) erm far distance. erm (1) and (2) how do they travel to us [S1]?

S1: they need planes or (.) maybe ships.

Tf: right. they need planes or ships (.) and (1) why is this a problem? @ [S13].

S13: erm (.) because of the greenhouse gases?

Tf: yeah right. we i told you already that planes emit a lot of (.) erm fuels into the air (.) erm so they a (.) are a big part of our pollution (.) so what are (.) in number one a they ask you what are food miles. we wouldn't listen to the listening exercise because you can do that. what are food miles? what do you think? you call them food miles. (1) bananas have food miles too for example. (.) [S15].

S15: it's the distance from where they come from (.) <3> to where </3> they go?

Tf: <3> right. </3>

Tf: to where they go. so where do they usually go?

S15: europe?

Tf: not always europe but

S15: different countries?

Tf: different countries. and then in these countries? (.) where do they go? (.) [S13]?

S15: in the store.

S13: to the supermarket?

Tf: supermarket and then? (.) @ yes @.

S13: erm (.) to our homes.

Tf: yeah right. so food miles is the distance write that into the (.) you need to know this word. (.) erm into erm onto the line. (.) distance the food travels (4) from (1) where (.) it grows. (3) or where it is (.) erm (.) produced. (7) to (.) our plate. {Tf writes English definition on board} so it's all the miles (.) food (3) has (.) when they travel. how much is a mile? in kilometers. one mile in kilometers.

SX-m: i think about one point 2 (.) kilometers

Tf: or was it a bit more? [SX-f].

SX-f: one point four?

Tf: one point six. (.) one mile is one point six kilometers. okay? good. so you know erm how that works. can we read erm through the little red box find out where the lunch has come from. (1) [S13] can you read?

S13: erm the average (.) kiwi fruit flown in from new zealand travels twelve thousand miles to be at (.) to be part of your lunch. and according to the experts that kiwi fruit @ (.) fruits@ creates five times its own rate in greenhouse gases getting there. (.) which might le- (.) lead you to ima- <pvc> imagine </pvc> that the little fruit spent the entire trip farting. (.) as quite a lot of people do on planes and most of them are obli=

Tf: =oblivious.

S13: oblivious to the fact because they are very huge <un> xxxxxxxx </un> but in fact it's just because of the fuel (employed) in getting the fruit here. (.) still if the (.) image of the farting kiwi fruit makes you think twice about eating stuff flown <un> xxx </un> maybe it's a useful one.

Tf: okay good. what do you think about the image of the farting kiwi fruit@? @ (2) [S5].

S5: yeah really weird image.

Tf: sorry?

S5: a really weird image.

Tf: yeah a really weird image. i think so too (.) erm but it's just the author wants to make clear erm (.) what it means to buy kiwis from another country. so erm (3) what is better kiwis by boat or kiwis by plane? (1) [S12].

S12: kiwis by plane?

Tf: by plane? okay why do you think so?

S12: i think erm erm boat makes more pollution than a plane.

Tf: mhm. what how do they pollute? (.) boats. (1) which things? (4) how do boats pollute? what do they pollute? how can they (1) be damaging. (.) [S11].

S11: erm (.) they exhaust fumes from their motor erm in the air

Tf: from the engine yeah.

S11: from the engine in the air and erm (.) sometimes oil who erm which erm drops out of the =

Tf: right yeah. that's a really very true [S11] very good. a oil. a lot of oil coming into (.) the sea erm because of boats and also (2) it takes much longer by boat than by plane so in the time (1) the kiwi is (.) in austria or in europe erm (.) a plane already (1) has <pvc> flown </pvc> has flown there (.) few weeks ago. alright? so it takes much longer and this time they can emit more (.) erm fumes and (.) fuels. okay good. erm let's go to page one hundred (.) one (9) greener travel. we already talked about eco-tourism. (.) erm what kind of transport means of transport are there? what kinds of means of transport do you know? (6) {Tf writes on board} a lot of them are in the book. (4) what [S6].

S6: cars?

Tf: cars. right. (1) what else?

S12: bus.
Tf: bus. [S8]?
S8: trains.
Tf: train. (2) [S15].
S15: boats.
Tf: boat. what is a bigger boat? (.) [S16].
S16: a <pvc> yacht </pvc>?
Tf: yacht? yeah you can say that.
S7: erm (.) plane.
Tf: plane yah. (.) a bigger boat ship. (1) right?
S5: erm by the underground?
Tf: right good. underground. (.) what is the american way of underground ah american word for underground? (.) did we already talk about that?
S9: the subway.
Tf: subway is the american word for it. (.) what does subway mean in british english? because there is the word as well. {Tf writes "subway" on board} (3) because i did that in my (1) erm third form last week that's why i thought about it. (.) erm underground? right. but in england you can also say subway but it's not the means of transport what is it? (1) it is a sandwich restaurant of course (.) you know that. (5) okay i try to draw it (23) {Tf draws on board} it's not a very good drawing @ (.) what is it? [S11].
S11: <L1de> unterführung? </L1de>
Tf: <L1de> eine unterführung </L1de> right. that's a subway. a way that is beneath the normal way. below. that's why SUBway. okay? good. erm (.) planes trains ship boats cars. (.) alright. they all produce a lot of exhaust fumes erm (1) i want you to read through the little box long distance travel on your own (.) and (.) summarize the information in only one sentence. (1) only one sentence. read through it and you only write one sentence where everything is in there.
{SS start reading quietly}
Tf: you can write the sentence directly into the book.
{SS keep reading}
Tf: only one sentence. (.) how can you pack as many things (.) as many th- as much as (.) as many. @ how can you pack a lot of information in one sentence? (.) how can you do that? (1) what do you do with the sentence? (1) when you make it want to make it very long. put a lot of information in it. [S11].
S11: because and.
Tf: because and. so sentence connectors right? (.) what else?
SX-f: although.
Tf: yeah so you have a sub-clause and a main clause although something. (.) or on the one hand on the other hand. (1) while. what else? (.) so sentence connectors, a main clause subordinate clause and there is a third (1) opportunity. (4) which word do you need?
S15: but or and.
Tf: yeah that's what [S11] said already. (3) you all do that all the time. (.) where who which. (1) what are these words?
S13: relative pronouns?
Tf: yes. relative clauses you're right relative clauses. you can refer to something in the main clause (.) several times. which (.) what ah which who where how (1) okay good. who can tell me in a sentence what the little text is about? (2) or the most important details. [S11].

S11: erm for distances of less than five hundred miles trades should be taken because they are less polluting than air erm airplanes and from five hundred miles on you can take erm airplanes.

Tf: alright. (1) yes. good. that's one way to do it. [S16].

S16: erm for longer trips wa- walking or cycling are options this is why the number of long trips increases but if you fire up vehicles more <pvc> efficiently </pvc>? =

Tf: = efficiently yeah.

S16: erm we can make transport more eco-friendly.

Tf: right good. that's good way of summarizing it. so (.) you pick out the most important things and (.) put them in one sentence with different (.) clauses. the most important thing here is that we want to minimize <spel> c o </spel> two emissions erm (.) be environmentally friendly with different means of transport (.) especially for long distances and erm (.) thos more environmentally friendly modes of transport are increasing (.) now because people want to (.) erm minimize <spel> c o </spel> two emission. good. erm can we do the editing task quickly? and then we'll do something creative. (5) editing you know one erm there is mistakes in the sentence (.) there are mistakes in the sentences (.) and some of the lines are correct and you tick them in number two.

{SS start working}

Tf: five minutes for that.

{Tf writes on board: "Check-up next WED: - p. 91 working with words, - list unit 10, - additional words global warming"}

{SS continue working}

{[S13] has a question - T helps her (not understandable)}

{S11 raises his hand}

S11: erm can i take two words also because=

Tf: = no. (.) only one word. only one word per line. (.) if you feel that the grammar in the sentence is wrong somehow or there is something that doesn't fit together there is surely one word that's (.) that shouldn't be in there. (1) remember the editing is not to correct the text from a grammatical point of view but to make (.) it right by crossing out (.) words.

{SS keep working}

Tf: at the test never leave out (.) erm one line. just try it. if you don't know it either tick it (.) or try any word instead of leaving it because it might be that you have a chance that it's the right answer. (3) then just guess.

Tf: one minute left. try to finish.

min?

Tf: alright let's do it together because some of you have some difficulties. (1) who can start reading (.) while leaving out the words? (.) [S12] please.

S12: have you ever looked out of the window of passenger plane for for three (.) thirty thousand feet at the best expansion of empty ocean and un (.) on <L1de> oiso des on gheat weg <> @ uninherited@ land and wondered how people can have any major effect on the earth.

Tf: good. so that is the word you crossed out right? (.) [S15] can you go on?

S15: it is now becoming pretty clear that we are causing a great deal of (.) damage to the natural environment.

Tf: mhm.

S15: <L1de> weiter? </L1de>

Tf: yeah. go on please.

S15: and planes which rush us in comfort to destinations around the globe contribute (.) in one of the biggest environmental problems that we face today.

Tf: global=

S15: = global warming.

Tf: yeah good. everything was fine but in erm line four there was a mistake (2) [S5]?

S5: erm contribute to.

Tf: yeah. you cross out the in because it's always to contribute to something. (.)

okay? that's why the in doesn't fit here. contribute to something. (2) global warming.

for those who can go on? (2) for those (.) [S16].

S16: for those of us lucky enough to have money to spend and free time to spend it (.) to spend it there are a huge numbers of fascinating places to explore.

Tf: okay. i have something else here. (.) what do you have something else as well? [S17].

S17: <coughs> erm i have the. fascinating places the the.

Tf: the the. (.) yeah right. to spend it in there are huge numbers of fascinating places to explore. (.) good (.) next. (3) [S5] can you go on?

S5: the cost of air transport has decreased rapidly over (.) over latest years. and for many people especially in rich countries it is now possible to fly around the world little more (.) little more than a weekly pay (packet).

Tf: hmm (4) the cost of air transport has dis decreased rapidly over (1) either it would the correct sentence would either over the last years but it doesn't say that (.) so? [S11].

S11: over the years.

Tf: over the years only. you could there is no over the latest years. doesn't work. over the years and (.) the next two lines are correct (.) okay? nine and ten are correct. (.) who can go on? (1) [S10] can you go on?

S10: <pvc> unfortunately </pvc> planes produce far more carbon dioxide than any other form of public transport and <spel> c c o </spel> (.) <L1de> zwei? </L1de> = Tf: two.

S10: two@ is now known to be a grea- greenhouse gas (.) a gas which traps under the heat of the sun causing the temperature of the earth to rise.

Tf: alright. well done [S10] but (.) in thirteen it's a very tricky one i haven't seen that either first. erm (.) because what does it say? (1) erm <spel> c o </spel> two is now known to be a greenhouse gas a gas which traps (.) under the heat of the sun. (.) which traps the heat of the sun. because that's content now. that's about the content there is a difference if something is trapped under or if it traps. (.) passive or active okay? (.) so which traps the heat of the sun. (2) causing temperature of earth to rise. alright? (.) who can go on? (.) for the last bit. (4) [S6] can you go on?

S6: scientists predict that in near future the climate in britain will resemble that of the med- <pvc> mediterranean {mediterranean} </pvc> ironically a popular destination for british holiday makers flying off to seek the sun.

Tf: good. (.) fourteen is correct though. (1) i don't know if you're oh i have the (.) sorry. good. so it's i go through with you. number one that. (.) two is correct. (.) three do. four in. five are. (.) six correct. (.) seven the. eight latest. nine correct. ten correct. (.) eleven many. (.) twelve not. thirteen under. fourteen correct. fifteen funny. sixteen correct. (.) anyone who has everything right? (2) very difficult. (.) fifteen out of sixteen. good [S5].

S5: no i just want to ask@ something.

Tf: oh yeah please do @.

S5: erm in in line fourteen (.) <4> erm </4> (.) erm isn't it just of earth to rise?

Tf: <4> yeah? </4> hmm.

S5: or is the article

Tf: causing the temperature of (1) erm no. because the earth when you spell it with a capital is like the name sowie so (.) erm as if you were saying the netherlands you always need the article with it. (.) you know what i mean?

S5: mhm.

Tf: then in this case when you talk about earth in general (.) in general terms then you spell it with a erm a small letter and then you don't need a the. but here it is like a name. the earth. (.) okay? (1) alright. anyone who has fourteen of sixteen? (2) alright. good [SX-f] @ alright she looks happy. @ (.) good no. everything above ten eleven is good. (.) it is really difficult because you need to pay attention it's not always about grammar and spelling only (.) it's sometimes about content as well so that the content doesn't make sense with the word. (.) it's really really difficult (1) erm and not a very great task but it's part of matura (.) so. good. something creative. in pairs you choose a color. (2) [SX] and [SX]. any color it doesn't matter. you need to write on it. (.) green. (.) good. i choose color for you. (.) orange. (2) you divide the sheet in half. either with your scissors or =

SX-f: <L1de> frau fessor </L1de> (.) what is additional=

Tf: = vocabulary.

SX-f: vocabulary. that=

Tf: = about the global warming text. we read the global warming text and wro wrote down words. (.) it's in the book on page (.) it was the double page and then we wrote down some words. so additional vocabulary to unit erm (5) divide it. [S11] which color do you want? <5> blue yellow </5> orange?

S11: <5> erm </5> blue.

Tf: blue (.) just divide it in half.

S11: thank you.

{SS get a bit noisy}

Tf: good. so erm (3) you divide it in half everybody gets a a five piece (.) and (.) in your book (.) in your book on page (.) ninety-seven (.) there are two pictures and it says (2) is it so difficult to divide the sheet in half? (2) it's because you're musicians and not artists right? @ (2) good. so maybe we should sing about environment not write and draw things. (.) erm you have two pictures given (.) and here it says you should write a diary entry about those pictures. (.) i want you to do something creative write something creative but it doesn't have to be a diary entry. if you like to write a poem you can do that (.) if you want to write a story you can do that. if you want to write a diary entry do it. (.) choose one of these two pictures (.) erm (.) and i also don't mind the words. the one hundred fifty doesn't matter for me. (.) erm choose one of these scenarios (.) obviously happening in the year twent (2) two thousand one hundred twenty-one. erm (.) how the earth is (.) will look like. like this or this choose one scenario and write something creative. (.) anything. (.) and you can draw with it and i want you to write it nicely so we can put it up on the wall.

SX-f: should we draw something too?

Tf: you can. (.) or take different colors. okay? (.) [SXf]?

SXf: <un> xxx </un>

Tf: everybody on his own. (2) i just let you (.) choose the color because of dividing it @. (1) everybody on his her own. (.) be happy to write something creative usually we always do boring texts. (.) articles reports (.) some of you are really good writers. (2) [S11]?

S11: <L1de> was is ein lockbuchseintrag? </L1de>

Tf: sorry?

S11: <L1de> lockbuch? </L1de>

Tf: <L1de> lockbuch? </L1de>

S11: <L1de> ja. </L1de>

Tf: it's a diary as well. (8) right. you start today and we have more time next (.) to finish.

SX: <un> xxxx </un>

Tf: this is ice (.) a frozen world and this one is a flood. (1) a disaster and this one is ice. (2) okay? so the left one is a flood and d (.) disaster and the right one is ice (.) for those of you who haven't recognized that yet. (.) @

{S start writing}

Tf: you can also write a song (.) about it for example. (2) [S2] you can write a song (.) as well.

{S keep writing}

Tf: yeah and write down the check-up. (1) [SXf] knows it all. it all. (.) so just ask her (.) what to study @.

{S write quietly}

{the bell rings}

Tf: alright. homework is to finish that (.) at home in a creative phase of yours. (.) sitting in a dark room depressed by the pictures. (.) okay? @ right. finish it at home next time we'll have a look at it. it really doesn't matter what it is. (2) you can draw. you can (2) do whatever you want with it. (3) see you on (1) monday.

<end 181018_0005_48:05>

Appendix I: Sample interview

Transcript – Interview T2

<beg 190115_0008_00:00>

S1: okay. (.) ja danke dass sie sich zeit genommen haben für für das interview. erm zuallererst ein paar förmlichkeiten und zwar erm (.) sind sie einverstanden dass dieses interview mit (.) mit dem audiogerät aufgenommen wird?

S2: ja.

S1: und diese daten dann eben für meine diplomarbeit verwendet werden dürfen?

S2: ja natürlich.

S1: genau. (.) die daten werden natürlich mit vorsicht behandelt und sind wie sie schon wissen anonym das heißt ihr name und auch von den observationen von den schülern und von der schule im generellen wird nicht verwendet werden. (.) genau. zum interview selbst. es ist ein semi-strukturiertes interview und der ablauf ist so (.) ich stelle eine frage und es sind meist offene antworten also sie können so lange überlegen wie sie wollen und so viel dazu sagen wie sie wollen. (.) und falls sie eine frage nicht beantworten möchten wird dies natürlich auch akzeptiert. (1) erm der aufbau ist in drei themenkreisen und zwar (.) sprachverwendung im englischunterricht generell (.) dann die sprachverwendung im bezug auf vokabellernen und -lehen und das dritte ist die levelabhängigkeit vom sprachgebrauch. (.) okay.

S2: mhm.

S1: und genau die fragen sind eben nach ihren einstellungen und die praktiken im unterricht und dann die beispiele die mir in den observationen aufgefallen sind. genau. (.) okay also der erste themenkreis sprachverwendung im englischunterricht. erste frage. glauben sie dass deutsch im englischunterricht eine rolle haben soll?

S2: ja. (.) ich denke schon vor allem bei den (.) erm jüngeren lernern die deutsch als muttersprache haben. es kommt natürlich auch auf darauf an ob (.) ob es schüler sind die deutsch als muttersprache haben. wenn es (.) im städtischen raum erm viele verschiedene schüler mit anderen erm hintergrund (.) kulturellen hintergrund und sprachlichen hintergrund gibt dann erm ist es natürlich schwieriger. (.) erm in meiner situation hat deutsch schon eine rolle im englischunterricht. (.) gerade beim grammatikverständnis.

S1: mhm.

S2: hauptsächlich bei grammatik ja.

S1: genau also das bringt mich (.) sie bringen schon zum nächsten punkt. in welchen situationen glauben sie macht die verwendung der erstsprache ihrer meinung nach sinn?

S2: ja also grammatikregeln (.) gr grund die grundregeln der grammatik erklären erste zweite klasse. (.) erm wenn sie etwas noch nie vorher gehört haben. (.) wenn ihr englisch erm ihre die englische sprache noch nicht so (.) erm (1) so entwickelt ist dass sie einfach die regeln verstehen würden dann macht die muttersprache sehr wohl einen sinn.

S1: mhm.

S2: genau hauptsächlich dafür.

S1: also hauptsächlich für?

S2: erm (.) wenn es nur um sprachen geht (.) also grundsätzlich auch für classroom management sachen die jetzt nichts mit sprachlichen dingen zu tun haben aber um schüler zu disziplinieren hilft es oft in die muttersprache zu wechseln (.) <1> weil </1> sie sich mehr angesprochen fühlen. genau.

S1: <1> mhm. </1> genau das wär auch schon die nächste frage zu welchen zwecken und in welchen situationen sie in ihren englischstunden deutsch verwenden (.) also wir haben gehabt grammatik <2> in den unteren </2> klassen und=

S2: <2> genau. </2> =in den unteren klassen genau (.) fast nur erste zweite. dritte kaum mehr ausser wenn ich sehe sie verstehen etwas gar nicht. genau.

S1: und fallen ihnen sonst noch situationen ein wo (.) wo deutsch (.) sinn machen würde?

S2: hm (.) manchmal um (1) einen spaß oder witz mit ihnen zu machen oder humor in die klasse zu bringen wenn sie auf englisch oft diese die d- (.) es ist schwierig einen witz oder einen sarkasmus oder (.) humor in einer anderen sprache zu verstehen wenn sie nicht die muttersprache ist dann wird das oft verwenden. (.) wenn es passt. <3> genau. </3>

S1: <3> mhm. </3> mhm. genau. erm (.) dazu kommen wir dann auch noch bei den beispielen.

S2: ja. mhm.

S1: erm (.) zuerst wäre noch die frage (.) würden sie sagen dass sie generell auf deutsch im englischunterricht verzichten wollen?

S2: ich kann darauf verzichten. (.) wenn ich muss. (.) wenn ich müsste könnte ich alles auf englisch machen und es würde wahrscheinlich auch halbwegs funktionieren. da ich nicht gezwungen bin (.) das zu tun (1) mach ich es auch nicht.

S1: mhm. (.) okay. (.) und warum nicht?

S2: hm (.) gute frage. (.) weil ich finde erm also (.) man lernt ja immer man soll englisch am meisten sprechen das stimmt auch. das ist richtig. aber weil ich finde dass den schülern es nicht weiterhilft wenn sie grundsätzliche dinge nicht verstehen. (.) also eine struktur zum beispiel wie (.) present perfect tense nicht verstehen wofür sie sie verwenden sollen oder wie die aufgebaut ist. und ich ihnen das dann noch in einer sprache vermittle (.) die sie auch schwer verstehen. vor allem die schwächeren

schüler. (.) <4> deshalb </4> ist es mir mal wichtig dass sie überhaupt grundlegendes verstehen was sie erm machen sollen oder wofür das da ist und dann kann man auf die sprache noch aufbauen. (.) genau.

S1: <4> mhm </4> mhm. das is erm ein gutes beispiel gewesen weil die present perfect tense genau in der stunde die ich beobachtet habe ein thema gewesen ist. da(.) war die frage warum has taken also die form ist die man in diesen satz einfügen muss der gerade besprochen wurde und sie haben gesagt you can tell me in german as well. (.) und (.) der schüler hat gesagt weil es noch andauert. (1) ja genau und was heißt das so far haben sie gesagt und der schüler bis jetzt. <5> genau </5> und dann haben sie eben noch weiter erklärt und weil es bis jetzt dauert (.) gehört <6> has taken. </6> also das wär so eine typische <7> grammatik </7> erklärung?

S2: <5> mhm. </5> <6> genau </6> <7> richtig. </7> genau das ist wirklich isolierte grammatik weil (.) erm wir schreiben natürlich auch auf auf englisch so far und a duration und a result until now. aber erm gerade present perfect ist zum beispiel eine (.) eine zeit die sehr sehr schwierig ist für die schüler zu verstehen und da greife ich dann schon auf deutsch zurück und erklär ihnen das nochmal auf deutsch dass es nochmal (.) erm automatisiert wird. das würd ich in der oberstufe nicht mehr machen zum beispiel.

S1: mhm. okay. dann kommen wir zu den beispielen noch weiter von der unterstufe also sie haben auch disziplin angesprochen das ist zweimal vorgekommen in der in der dritten klasse. (.) da haben sie zuerst gesagt where are you coming from wie ein schüler zu spät gekommen ist. <8> (.) erm </8> und er hat geantwortet bewegte pause. (.) und sie haben gesagt bewegte pause? das ist aber seit fünf minuten schon vorbei. </9> und das zweite war ganz am schluss die klasse räumt zusammen auf <10> weil's quasi </10> schon wieder so ausschaut <11> genau. </11> (.) und (.) vier mal (.) auch was sie schon angesprochen der <12> humor. </12> (.) da haben sie auch (.) auf deutsch (.) geswitched dann quasi. da haben die schüler auf englisch noch von einer schwierigen matheschularbeit erzählt und sie haben gesagt jetzt konzentriert's euch so auf latein weil ihr so eine tolle lateinlehrerin habt und (.) da haben die schüler dann (.) den humor auch verstanden oder? <13> das war ihre erklärung vorher. </13> weil eben schüler (.) dass eben besser dann in der muttersprache verstehen.

S2: <8> mhm </8> <9> mhm </9> <10> mhm </10> <11> mhm. </11> <12> mhm. </12> <13> mhm. genau </13> genau. (.) richtig. auch emotional besser (.) die emotionale eben dabei mehr gegeben ist mit der muttersprache als mit einer sprache die ich nicht so beherrsche noch.

S1: mhm.

S2: mhm.

S1: genau ein weiteres beispiel war vom water jug da ist um's vokabel gegangen. da haben sie gesagt kein bierfass weil das ein schüler gesagt hat. und einer hat so viel (1) erm kleber verwendet zum einkleben da haben sie dann weißt du eigentlich wie grauslich das ist wenn ich das aufmach und korrigieren muss und so weiter (.) und ja. das war eben dann auch zum auflockern. also das war schon das war die letzte konversation der stunde deswegen haben sie's glaube ich dann so (.) humorvoll herum (.) herübergebracht.

S2: genau also zwischenmenschliche dinge. ja. ja genau. mhm.

S1: also (.) genau sie würden schon sagen dass disziplin und humor dass das beobachtete in dieser dritten klasse vor allem typische <14> situationen </14> (.) sind in denen sie deutsch verwenden?

S2: <14> ja. mhm. </14> mhm. nicht immer aber oftmals schon ja.

S1: es war dann in der sechsten klasse im vergleich (.) eigentlich kein einziges mal für disziplin humor oder ähnliches oder auch nicht zur erklärung (.) deutsch also (.) erkennt man da auch schon einen (.) einen unterschied vom vom level her. in der sechsten hab ich nur beispiele von von schülern. (.) eine hat beim vorlesen zum beispiel gesagt eine schülerin. oiso des on ghört da weg. in muttersprache und sie haben nur zugestimmt weil sie den satz schon richtig vorgelesen hat. (.) und oder c o zwei hat jemand gesagt bei c o zwei und sie haben auf two eben ausgebessert und ein schüler hat gefragt soll i das jetzt mit dem felix machen bei einer (.) bei einer partnerarbeit. (.) das war organisatorisch aber sie haben auch auf englisch geantwortet.

S2: ja also das machen die schüler sonst. sie probieren natürlich auf deutsch auch in der sechsten noch zu fragen.

S1: aber es war auch sehr also es waren wirklich nur <> diese drei (.) was mir aufgefallen sind und (.) wahrscheinlich wenn das nicht der fokus gewesen wär der observation wäre das nicht mal so aufgefallen dass da wirklich deutsch verwendet worden ist. <15> genau </15> zu diesem thema gibt's dann noch eine frage. und zwar. in welchen situationen dürfen ihre schülerinnen deutsch verwenden? (.) oder gibt's situationen wo sie sagen (.) das verbieten sie dann oder machen sie darauf aufmerksam?

S2: <15> wenig. </15> v- (.) also verbieten (2) es wird dann verboten wenn (.) der fokus wirklich auf speaking exercise ist. also wenn ich sage erm (.) speak with a partner about (.) your holidays und ich möchte dass sie wirklich miteinander englisch sprechen oder wenn es eine typische speaking exercise ist (.) dann wird es auf jeden fall verboten. in der oberstufe ist es so dass grundsätzlich die grundsätzliche konversation in der stunde auf englisch stattfinden sollte. (.) es ist jedoch schon auch manchmal dass sie an einem projekt arbeiten das jetzt nicht nur über speaking geht. ein literaturprojekt oder sie arbeiten an einem buch wo sie zu viert in einer gruppe zusammenarbeiten und die zwischenmenschlichen dinge dann natürlich auf (.) oft auf deutsch besprochen werden. ich geh zwar immer wieder durch und sag english please. (.) das hilft für ein paar minuten (.) aber dann fallen sie sehr leicht wieder ins deutsche zurück (.) was in dem fall für mich nicht so ein problem ist weil sie an einer anderen aufgabe arbeiten weil die aufgabe ist zum beispiel ein plakats zu erstellen. (.) und das machen sie ja auf englisch. (.) und sie diskutieren ja auch zwar auf deutsch aber über englische wörter. welches wort nehmen wir? erm (.) was sollma da jetzt verwenden. sie suchen wör also sie sind ja trotzdem mit der englischen sprache (.) erm beschäftigt. <16> aber ich </16> verbiete es dann wenn es wirklich um eine speaking exercise geht. zwei bilder zum beispiel und sie müssen die beschreiben gemeinsam und darüber diskutieren.

S1: <16> mhm </16> genau. bei so einer gruppenarbeit das hört sich auch verständlich an wenn man an die eigene schulzeit denkt (.) weil man ist mit leuten zusammen mit denen man immer <17> eigentlich auf deutsch </17> redet oder sogar mundart <18> also das </18> is einfach irgendwie gewohnheitssache dann auch

S2: <17> genau. </17> <18> ja. richtig. </18> genau das ist gewohnheitssache und auch es ist oft ah bisserl a gruppen (.) eine gruppensdynamik auch. wenn man gute schüler hat die würden gerne englisch sprechen aber dann sind sie oft in einer gruppe mit nicht so guten dann wollen sie oft (.) erm (.) nicht die angeber sein oder nicht die streber sein das ist noch immer auch in der oberstufe ein thema und dann(.) ist es uncool wenn sie auf englisch sprechen die ganze zeit weil das will ja die lehrerin. (.) genau.

S1: okay mhm. okay dann haben wir diesen themenkreis soweit abgeschlossen. das nächste is sprachgebrauch und vokabellehren und -lernen. (.) erm (.) glauben sie

dass das lernen einer fremdsprache durch andere sprachen die man schon kann erleichtert wird?

S2: ja. (.) auf jeden fall.

S1: genau. erm warum glauben sie?

S2: weil man auf das vorwissen zurückgreifen kann weil man verbindungen herstellen kann. (.) erm je mehr sprachen man natürlich hat im repertoire desto leichter ist es (.) viele wörter die sind lehnwörter aus anderen sprachen (.) erm wenn man zum beispiel französisch kann hat man sehr viele wörter die im englischen genau so sind oder ähnlich sind nur die aussprache anders.

S1: mhm könnten sie ein beispiel geben ad hoc?

S2: erm was hab ich letztens gesagt? (.) erm da hab ich letztens erst eines <19> gegeben. </19> (1) erm resume zum beispiel ist ein französisches wort (.) und <20> to resume </20> hat eine ähnliche bedeutung auf auf englisch.

S1: <19> mhm </19> <20> mhm to resume </20> ja es gibt ja diese theorie (.) oder diesen begriff des translanguaging. (.) wenn sie das schon mal gehört haben das bedeutet eben genau das was sie gerade (.) erm quasi erklärt haben dass man beim lernen einer neuen fremdsprache (.) dass es definitiv hilft auf andere sprachen oder auf alles dass man schon mal gehört hat oder gelernt hat. (.) ein beispiel wäre auch zum beispiel obwohl es eine tote sprache ist. latein. <21> wenn man </21> das mal im gymnasium gelernt hat und nachher nie wieder braucht greift man trotzdem zurück wenn man (.) wenn man etwas etwas neues lernt oder auch ein neues englisches wort (.) wort <22> lernt </22> (.) genau also da würden sie zustimmen mit dieser (.) mit diesem ansatz?

S2: <21> latein genau. </21> <22> mhm genau </22> ja.

S1: genau. erm und wenn sie an die vermittlung von neuen vokabeln im englischunterricht denken wie sollte das idealerweise passieren?

S2: hm schwieriges thema vokabelvermittlung. (.) erm (2) auf verschiedenste methoden auf jeden fall. erm nicht immer nur deutsch englisch listen oder muttersprache englisch listen sondern auch einmal bilder oder (.) erm im satz verwendete wörter. wörter die im satz verwendet werden. (.) ich geb gerne wortgruppen dass ich das noun das adjective und das verb gebe wenn es gibt dass sie den stamm erkennen und dann da mit einem wort quasi drei oder vier bilden können. (.) das brauchen sie auch in der oberstufe dann. (.) das übe ich aber schon mit der unterstufe. <23> genau also zum beispiel </23> wenn agreement da steht frage ich mal was das heißt und dann was könnte das negative sein? <24> und dann </24> is disagreement (.) genau. und to agree. also ich gebe wortgruppen gerne erm (.) bei thematischen (.) also vokabeln sammeln zu einem bestimmten thema zum beispiel clothes. (.) hilft sehr oft ein brainstorming oder ein mind map für die geordnet- also für (.) schüler die eher chaotisch sind ein mind map weil man automatisch ordnet. (.) um einfach nur zu sammeln reicht oft ein brainstorming (.) mit zeichnungen ich zeichne dann öfter was auf die tafel dazu. bilder helfen wirklich gut. memory. (.) zur wiederholung aber eher. memory zum beispiel spielen. nicht zum neu erlernen (.) weil sie müssen's vorher mal lernen dass sie das finden können aber das hilft sehr gut dass sie sich's merken.

S1: <23> in der unterstufe auch schon </23> <24> mhm. </24> also bei memory dass man zuordnen kann <25> irgendwie </25> wenn man zwei =

S2: <25> genau </25> = mhm. (.) richtig. also (.) man sollte versuchen verschiedenste methoden (.) erm zu verwenden um auch verschiedene lerntypen anzusprechen.

S1: mhm. dann wär die nächste frage welche methoden (.) sie haben jetzt schon einige beschrieben sie persönlich oder ihrer erfahrung nach als besonders effektiv empfinden?

S2: also ja das brainstorming finde ich wirklich als sehr effektiv bei so groß topics die man bespricht beim sammeln von=

S1: =also dass man's nach themen ordnet?

S2: nach themen genau. das geht natürlich nicht mit allen vokabeln (.) das ist klar. erm (.) ja deutsch englisch listen helfen den schülern meistens noch immer sehr gut (.) weil sie einfach erst ab einem gewissen alter lernen dinge nicht dauernd zu übersetzen aber das können sie mit zwölf dreizehn noch <26> nicht. </26> (.) erm (3) ja ich geb auch in der oberstufe (.) definitions und dann ein wort. das funktioniert nicht immer gut <27> muss ich auch </27> sagen. das ist eigentlich nur damit ma das englische erm (.) einbaut wieder. was gut funktioniert sind synonyme. (.) <28> also englische </28> synonyme für ein wort ein anderes (.) zu geben zum beispiel dispute hatte ich letzts und ich habe gesagt okay was gib't's für ein anderes word. (.) argument. (.) oder punishment penalty. (.) <29> ähnliche wörter </29> das funktioniert sehr gut.

S1: <26> mhm. </26> <27> mhm. </27> <28> mhm. </28> <29> mhm. </29> synonyme mhm. okay erm (.) bei den observationen waren (.) waren auch einige methoden also einige englische erklärungen wie sie gesagt haben also vor allem mündlich <30> und deutsche </30> übersetzungen und zum beispiel eine geste ist mir aufgefallen beim water jug auch <31> da </31> haben sie das erm (.) so gemacht. <32> (1) genau. </32> aber aber wenn's mitgeht unterstützt es wahrscheinlich sicher. und in der sechsten auch englische erklärungen und drei deutsche übersetzungen und sie haben auch ein bild an die tafel gemalt und erm bilder im bu (.) bilder im buch verwendet. die means of transport waren das. genau und sie haben auch definitionen an die tafel geschrieben (.) zusätzlich zu übersetzung und mündlicher erklärungen.

S2: <30> mhm genau </30> <31> ah ja. </31> <32> eher unterbewusst. </32> genau.

S1: genau. (1) und (.) erm wenn sie im unterricht neue englische vokabeln vermitteln versuchen sie beziehungsweise wie versuchen sie deutsch aktiv einzubinden?

S2: hm (.) dann wenn ich eine (.) also wie wir vorher schon gesagt haben ah so eine parallele herstellen möchte dass ich sag okay das deutsche wort ist ähnlich oder es ist sogar das gleiche. (.) empathy ist immer so ein beispiel das finden sie sehr schwierig. dann sag ich okay auf deutsch gib't's das auch (.) empathie was heißt das auf deutsch? (.) genau dann verwend ich wirklich aktiv weil ich möchte dass sie diese verbindungen finden. (.) erm (1) und dann auch (.) wenn (1) wenn das wort ein sehr schwieriges komplexes wort ist und erm (.) das deutsche schon ein schwieriges wort ist auch dann übersetz ich es auf deutsch weil's dann oft leichter ist. genau.

S1: genau (.) also es waren oft in den zwei stunden die ich beobachtet habe erm (.) so (.) ein-wort-übersetzungen damit <33> damit man </33> (.) in dieser in der dritten klasse habt ihr so ein pre-reading gemacht <34> erm und </34> da ist (.) da war's meistens deutsche übersetzung plus eine englische erklärungen. <>da war das erste da haben sie gesagt (.) a difficult word do you know what that is in german? (.) rheumatism war das also für die dritte klasse sehr schwer (.) und dann habt ihr das gemeinsam besprochen und war so ein eine mischung (.) aus deutsch und englisch dann. ein schüler hat gesagt wenn die gelenke einrosten und sie haben dann genau die werden ganz steif und man kann sich nicht gut bewegen und dann wieder auf englisch weitergeredet.

S2: <33> genau. meistens ein-wort-übersetzungen. </33> <34> mhm </34> genau das sind halt (.) konzepte die auch auf deutsch schon schwierig zu verstehen sind oft. (.) <35> das bedarf </35> oft auch einer deutschen erklärungen dann.

S1: <35> mhm genau </35> genau. oder what is eye sight und eine schüler sagt die augensicht und sie das augenlicht. genau. (1) und (1) ja. (1) das war zwei vier (.) sie-

ben mal da habt ihr (.) habt ihr die (.) also das war alles in einer reihe bei der pre-reading und da war jeweils immer das deutsch wort und und eine englische erklärung. nur bei opportunity (.) da haben sie nur möglichkeit gesagt erm weil (.) weil keiner von den schülern glaub ich erm (.) etwas anfangen=

S2: = nein sie kennen auch possibility noch nicht in dem alter. und darum (1) in der oberstufe würd ich geben possibility <36> genau </36> oder option.

S1: <36> ja das synonym dann mhm </36> genau.

S2: richtig

S1: und (.) zweimal war dann unter (.) also unter dem text den sie gelesen haben war (.) haben sie schüler gefragt what's syphilis und sie haben's dann jeweils auf englisch erklärt also an infectious disease a sickness und <37> dann haben sie </37> es verstanden. und einer hat gefragt what is pain? <38> (1) und </38> if your neighbor hits you you feel pain <39> haben </39> sie gesagt. (.) also=

S2: <37> mhm </37> <38> mhm </38> <39> mhm </39>. =genau mit ex- (.) beispielsätze hilft auch sehr oft.

S1: genau. würden sie sagen dass das (.) typisch ist wenn wenn schüler sie was fragen (.) genau und der schüler eben hat dann gesagt schmerz und sie haben genickt. erm (.) dass das typisch ist dass sie dann trotzdem auf englisch <40> antworten </40> wenn =

S2: <40> mhm </40> =ich versuche es wenn ich weiß es ist was was wir schon gemacht (.) wie pain. (.) das kennen sie eigentlich. (.) und es lässt sich leicht erklären mit einem beispiel dann versuch ich's (.) versuch ich es immer auf englisch ja aber eben bei möglichkeit ist es einfach schwierig gewesen zum beispiel.

S1: genau. also es kommt immer auf die <41> schwierigkeit an </41>

S2: <41> es kommt auf die art des wortes auf die schwierigkeit an </41> und ob sie schon (.) ob ich weiß sie haben schon vorwissen. oder es lässt sich ein gutes beispiel finden. (.) das oft schwierig ist.

S1: genau und auch diese pre-reading. (.) würden sie sagen dass das (.) typisch ist für die dritte klasse dass sie erm (.) quasi da (.) auf wörter noch vorm text lesen oder oder <42> vorm </42> listening noch

S2: <42> ja. </42> wenn ich wenn es wirklich ein text is. erm es gibt texte die les ich zuerst und dann besprechen wir die wörter. <43> wenn es </43> nicht (.) so wichtige wörter für's verständnis sind. (.) sondern wenn's einfach wichtige vokabel sind oder interessante vokabel die man aber nachher auch besprechen kann. aber in dem fall waren das wirklich schwierige wörter und es is um den text erm (.) es is um diese krankheiten gegangen und wenn sie sie vorher nicht verstehen oder vorher diese wörter nicht kennen dann würden sie den ganzen text verstehen. und deshalb (.) es kommt immer auf die art des textes an <44> und das </44> ziel.

S1: <43> mhm </43> <44> mhm okay </44> mhm. (.) und da ist es auch typisch dass sie dann die deutsch definition <45> (.) also übersetzung geben </45> und eine englische erklärung?

S2: <45> ja. ja </45> oft ja. mhm.

S1: mhm. (1) okay (.) ja in der sechsten klasse haben sie auch auf deutsch zwei das waren auch jeweils so ein-wort-erklärungen. also (.) sie haben versucht das in englisch erklären zu lassen von den schülern. what is drought und dann haben sie gesagt dürre und auch die englische definition aber dazu aufgeschrieben und auch dazu gesagt a dry hot condition for example in the desert. (.) und das zweite war (1) erm genau da is um the american word for underground gegangen. (.) subway. und da hat keiner gewusst was das (.) was das heißt und dann haben sie unterführung gesagt und das auf die tafel gemalt. also da war (.) da waren eigentlich viele methoden vorhanden. bei food miles zum beispiel war nur eine englische erklärung the dis-

tance our food travels from where it grows or is produced. (.) also wird in der sechsten auch generell typischerweise deutsch so (.) verwendet? (.) für für die beschreibung eines vokabels oder zur übersetzung?

S2: erm eher weniger.

S1: mhm also es ist auch nur zweimal vorgekommen.

S2: zum beispiel mit ja. (.) das mit drought wär jetzt im nachhinein nicht notwendig gewesen da das deutsche herzuschreiben weil das sollten sie so auch erkennen. also (.) das (.) war einfach manchmal ergibt es sich. (.) aber es wär nicht notwendig gewesen. also man hätte das auch ohne deutsch lösen können leicht. und erm (.) genau bei der unterführung ist es weil es immer sehr verwirrend ist underground subway geb ich dazu das deutsch wort. da damit diese verwirrung aufgelöst wird was jetzt was wirklich ist weil wir in deutsch ja wirklich zwei ganz unterschiedliche wörter gott sei dank haben.

S1: mhm genau.

S2: genau. in dem fall hilft die deutsche sprache.

S1: ist auf jeden fall sinnvoll. (1) mhm.

S2: mhm. (.) sonst ist es hauptsächlich englisch in der sechsten klasse. sie versuchen immer das deutsche zu erfragen. (.) <46> manchmal </46> hilft's @. ja.

S1: <46> mhm </46> ja. (2) also sie glauben schon dass es dass es sinn macht das auch manchmal dann dazu zu sagen und=

S2: =ja manchmal macht es sinn. wir haben jetzt zum beispiel also um ein beispiel zu nennen violence and crime. und da gibt es sehr viele schwierige wörter (.) wie (.) urkundenfälschung <47> und </47> und (.) erm (.) diese ganzen gerichtswörter da geb ich das deutsche bei diesen schwierigen (.) weil das zu schwierig wäre zu erklären was urkundenfälschung auf englisch jetzt (.) was ich damit meine. genau.

S1: <47> mhm </47> mhm. okay also (.) kommt's auf auf die komplexität auch an des wortes?

S2: ja.

S1: okay. (.) erm (2) wie sollten sich schülerinnen neue englische vokabeln im unterricht notieren?

S2: vokabelheft. (.) ist das was für mich noch immer das sinnvollste ist. aufschreiben heft rausnehmen und davon lernen.

S1: mhm und=

S2: =oder in einer oberstufe (.) wo wir laptopklassen haben auch eine vokabelliste am computer. und dann könnten sie bilder dazu das ist aber eher in der oberstufe schon mehr ihnen überlassen wie sie das lernen wollen. <48> viele schreiben </48> sich alles zusammen auf eigene zetteln. manche schreiben's am computer mit das machen sie schon recht selbstständig. unterstufe ist vokabeheft.

S1: <48> mhm okay </48> und gibt es in ihrem unterricht erm bestimmte regeln in dieser hinsicht?

S2: sie müssen die (.) erm unit vokabeln in der unterstufe einschreiben. vom workbook ins heft das ist eine hausübung (1) erm die kontrollier ich auch ob sie eingeschrieben sind. ob sie dann davon lernen kann ich ja nicht kontrollieren ob sie vom buch lernen oder vom heft. wir schreiben zusätzliche vokabeln auch ins heft und da sag ich ganz klar sie müssen ins heft geschrieben werden und die übersetzung oder die erklärung dazu und von dem wird gelernt.

S1: mhm. weil sie sagen die übersetzung oder die erklärung. (.) erm kann das der schülerin oder die schülerin machen (.) wie sie wollen oder=

S2: = ja die haben zwei spalten.

S1: genau aber wird die deutsche übersetzung oder die englische erklärung aufgeschrieben meistens?

S2: je nach dem was ich aufschreibe auf die tafel.
S1: okay.
S2: also <49> ich geb vor </49> was im heft stehen soll.
S1: <49> und im buch? </49> okay.
S2: im buch ist es deutsch englisch weil die bücher so sind.
S1: genau also das wird <50> davon abgeschrieben? </50>
S2: <50> genau </50> das wird einfach abgeschrieben.
S1: mhm (.) aber wenn sie (.) also unter der stunde quasi is=
S2: =so wie ich es auf die tafel schreibe haben sie es auch ins heft zu schreiben. (.)
und wenn ein wort dabei ist das ich nicht erm (.) haben muss weil das nur so vor-
kommt und es nicht wichtig dann sag ich okay das braucht ihr nicht aufschreiben. (.)
aber im prinzip sollte bei jedem genau das gleiche drinnen stehen ja.
S1: mhm okay. das nächste thema. halten sie die verwendung von wörterbüchern im
unterricht für sinnvoll?
S2: auch online oder normale bücher?
S1: ja. ganz egal.
S2: egal? also welche art beides. ja. sehr sinnvoll.
S1: und welche? (.) also im sinn von mono oder bilingual? <51> dürfen </51> die
schüler verwenden?
S2: <51> hm </51> unterstufe bilingual. (.) weil sie die monolingualen also oxford
zum beispiel ist zu schwierig für die unterstufe. sie würden vieles nicht verstehen.
oberstufe sollten sie monolingual hauptsächlich verwenden und ich halte sie auch
dazu an (.) in dem ich oft erm (.) activities konzipiere wo sie dann eine definition auf
englisch schreiben müssen die sie nur so im wörterbuch finden wenn sie auf's mono-
lingual (.) aber wenn sie jetzt zum beispiel wieder an einer gruppenarbeit arbeiten
und wörter suchen gehen sie immer auf das bilinguale von sich selbst. auch wenn ich
ihnen sage schaut's bitte nochmal (.) weil warum? weil sie wörter suchen in ihrer
muttersprache die sie auf englisch dann brauchen. (.) da bringt ihnen ein monolingu-
ales wörterbuch nix. wenn ihnen das wort fehlt das englische.
S1: also sie glauben dass die schüler auch in der oberstufe natürlicherweise (.) öfters
auf das bilinguale zurückgreifen?
S2: ja.
S1: die nächste frage wär nämlich gewesen was schlagen sie schülerinnen für den
individuellen gebrauch von wörterbüchern für zuhause vor? (.) zum vokabellernen
und englischlernen.
S2: sowohl monolingual als bilingual je nach dem was sie dafür (2) erm was sie
brauchen.
S1: mhm. (.) okay (.) also (1) nach nach eigenem geschmack oder was sie selbst
glauben das für sie am besten ist.
S2: was sinnvoll für die aufgabe ist. (.) also zum beispiel in der oberstufe markier ich
schularb ah hausübungen nur mehr mit das (.) wo ein fehler ist. (.) wenn ich das wort
unterstreiche und wrong word auf der seite schreibe (.) erm (1) dann müssen sie das
richtige wort finden aber ich geb's ihnen nicht an. und da hilft ihnen das monolinguale
oft weil sie das (.) das falsche eingeben und sehen dann das ist eine ganz andere
bedeutung auf englisch als sie geglaubt haben und dann müssen natürlich ein syno-
ein synonym wörterbuch finden zum beispiel. (.) also i geb ihnen auch synonym wör-
terbücher (.) an.
S1: erm das wollte ich auch noch nachfragen (.) schlagen sie in der stunde dann zum
beispiel dass sie an die tafel schreiben die links zu den wörterbüchern die sie persön-
lich empfehlen würden? (.) zum beispiel das oxford haben sie angesprochen.

S2: ja es wird vorgeschlagen. (.) also jetzt nicht jede stunde aber ich sag ihnen wenn sie zum beispiel jetzt wieder einen vokabelzettel bekommen den sie selbst zuhause ausfüllen müssen mit neuen vokabeln dann sag ich wisst's (.) wisst's eh die und die und die links könnt's verwenden die sollt ihr. ja nicht das oder ja nicht das weil das ist eher schlecht. (.) eher die. (1) bücher selbst also richtige b werden leider sehr wenig verwendet ich find's sinnvoll. (.) aber wir haben auch hier keine mehr (.) kaum. es ist halt einfach online. aber es wär nicht schlecht wenn sie das suchen auch lernen in einem buch wenn sie mal was nicht haben. (.) aber sie dürfen es auch bei der matura nicht verwenden das wörterbuch (.) deshalb wird das einfach nicht mehr geübt.

S1: mhm mhm. (.) also es wird auch (.) kein buch mehr (.) den schülern ausgeteilt? (.) weil ich <52> glaub ich hab's </52> im gymnasium noch gehabt.

S2: <52> nein sie bekommen keine </52> ja ich auch. aber sie bekommen keine wörterbücher mehr. in englisch zumindest nicht.

S1: mhm. (.) okay die nächste frage wie überprüfen sie den fortschritt der schülerinnen beim vokabellernen?

S2: erm schriftliche und mündliche vokabelwiederholungen.

S1: mhm. (.) und wie oft?

S2: erm mündliche vokabelwiederholungen in der unterstufe (.) so oft es möglich ist jede stunde. außer sie haben schularbeitszeit oder tests oder es ist zu viel los (.) erm fast jede stunde zwei leute freiwillig (.) und alle zehn tage (.) alle zwei wochen je nach klasse (.) wie lang die units nach einer einheit die fertig ist einer unit wird schriftlich ein vokabelcheck ein angekündigter ein progress check nennen wir das.

S1: und der zeitraum pro unit ist circa? =

S2: =kommt drauf an also erste zweite klasse sind die units kürzer. da sind's ungefähr zehn tage. (.) bei der dritten klasse sind die units schon länger da sind's zwei bis drei wochen. (2) also einmal im monat ist sicher einer.

S1: mhm schriftlich? und=

S2: =schriftlich genau.

S1: wie (.) werden zum beispiel schriftlich jetzt erm (.) die vokabeln dann abgefragt? (.) durch übersetzen oder einfügen?

S2: manchmal übersetzen manchmal einfügen manchmal synonyme je nach dem so wie's wir auch gelernt haben. wenn sie das synonym auch im wörterbuch stehen haben ah im vokabelheft stehen haben (.) dann wird auch das synonym abgefragt. <53> wenn die deu- </53> (.) wenn wir nur die deutsche übersetzung gemacht haben dann wird deutsch englisch genau.

S1: <53> mhm </53> mhm. also eine Mischung auch?

S2: eine Mischung auch genau. oder <54> manchmal sätze damit schreiben. </54>

S1: <54> und bei (.) bei mündlichen auch? </54>

S2: bei mündlichen versuch ich's auch eine Mischung zu machen. (.) erm wobei da schon mehr deutsch englisch übersetzung weil das oft relative schnelle <55> (.) erm (.) abprüfungen sind </55> ganz schnell genau. und da das schneller geht. aber ich versuch natürlich schon ich geb ihnen das synonym und sie geben mir das andere wort oder ich v- (.) versuch ein beispiel zu finden und sie müssen mir dann das wort dazu sagen. (.) genau. und in der oberstufe gibt's keine mündlichen aufgrund von zeit einfach. (.) fehlt die zeit. (.) da gibt's schriftliche jede woche. (.) dafür immer nur zehn vokabeln (.) und ein kleiner teil. also das haben sich die schüler selbst ausgewählt ich hab erm (.) eine achte klasse da machma's nach jedem kapitel das ist ungefähr alle sechs wochen. und in der sechsten klasse ist ihnen das zu lange gewesen und zu viele vokabeln auf einmal und jetzt hamma ausgemacht jede woche einen kurzen dafür nur. <> (.) und sie bekommen nur eine kleine seite zu lernen und nicht vier oder fünf.

S1: <55> okay. (.) so am anfang der stunde </55> okay und in der oberstufe ist auch so eine mischung wie in der unterstufe mit übersetzung und synonym und erklärung?

S2: kaum deutsche wörter. in der oberstufe sind kaum deutsche wörter. in der oberstufe kommt auch oft diese language in use übungen dann (.) werden eingebaut wenn's geht. bei word formation geht's ganz gut. <56> erm (.) genau. </56> manchmal auch so multiple choice die ich dann mache selber mit wörtern die ma aber gemacht haben. (.) da versuch ich manchmal nicht immer aber diese matura formate einzubauen. (2) genau.

S1: <56> word formation zum beispiel genau. </56> ja. (.) sie haben die nächste frage schon größtenteils beantwortet. was müssen ihre schülerinnen dafür lernen? (1) beim also aus dem vokabelheft und (.) und=

S2: =genau. es wird genau gesagt was sie lernen sollen. (.) genau besprochen.

S1: okay dann kommen wir zum nächsten themenkreis und zwar die levelabhängigkeit. die ist uns jetzt (.) im laufe des interviews auch schon oft untergekommen. erm die erste generelle frage denken sie dass ältere (.) schülerinnen was meist in unserem kontext ein höheres sprachniveau bedeutet weniger auf deutsch im unterricht angewiesen sind als jüngere schülerinnen?

S2: ja. (1) mhm.

S1: mhm. warum?

S2: weil sie einfach schon längere zeit englisch lernen (.) und ihr level einfach größer ist auf mehr andere sprachen auch zurückgreifen können wie latein oder französisch oder spanisch zum beispiel (1) erm

S1: mhm. also es geht um (1) um das wissen <57> auf das man </57> schon zurückgreifen kann <58> und </58> deswegen brauchen es ältere schüler quasi weniger <59> das deutsche. </59>

S2: <57> genau. </57> <58> richtig. </58> <59> weniger ja. </59>

S1: erm (.) würden sie meinen dass sie in der unterstufe persönlich mehr deutsch verwenden als in der oberstufe?

S2: ja. (.) sicher.

S1: mhm.

S2: mhm.

S1: und (.) im bezug auf das vokabellehren (.) macht das jeweilige sprachniveau einen unterschied?

S2: erm (1) lehren?

S1: auf das vokabellehren genau.

S2: erm (2) auch ja. (.) die art wie die vokabeln <60> (1) vermittelt </60> werden ja.

S1: <60> mhm </60> also (2) in welcher hinsicht würden sie auch sagen dass (.) dass auf jeden fall in der unterstufe dann noch mehr deutsch gebraucht wird? (.) das haben wir im laufe des interviews <61> auch schon </61> (.) haben sie auch schon erwähnt.

S2: <61> mhm. </61> ja.

S1: genau. (.) und (.) von schülerseite (.) lassen sie in einer bestimmten altersklasse neue vokabel häufiger (.) auf deutsch übersetzen?

S2: hm. (3) ja auch die jüngeren lass ich eher übersetzen. in der oberen st (.) oberen also in den älteren (.) klassen. (.) höheren klassen frage ich dann okay wenn sie mir das deutsch geben (.) sag ich okay kannst du mir aber ein englisches synonym geben <62> oder </62> kannst du mir eine englische erklärung geben. ich ver- schau schon eher dass sie das engl- (.) auf englisch übersetzen können <63> oder </63> (.) sich erklären können auf englisch

S1: <62> mhm. </62> <63> mhm. </63> in der oberstufe?

S2: in der oberstufe.

S1: und <64> in der unterstufe (.) </64> wird's eher akzeptiert wenn? okay.

S2: <64> in der unterstufe reicht's wenn </64> ja.

S1: dann zur zu den observationen da ist in beiden klassen wie schon besprochen aufgefallen (.) dass oft eine mischung aus deutschen übersetzungen und englischen erklärungen (.) auftritt erm (.) aber insgesamt natürliche mehr deutsche übersetzungen von der lehrperson und auch von den schülern <65> (1) zugelassen </65> werden. genau. (2) und (.) das was aufgefallen ist wo ich sie noch fragen möchte ob das auch typisch ist für ihren unterricht dass in der unterstufe mehr deutsch in sequenzen die nicht den inhalt betreffen also zur disziplin oder (.) humor um die stunde aufzulockern. (.) erm ob das (.) typisch ist dass das (.) viel mehr in der unterstufe <66> gemacht wird </66> als in der sechsten klasse zum beispiel.

S2: <65> mhm. mhm. </65> <66> ja. mhm. </66> ja.

S1: okay.

S3: widerschauen.

S1: widerschauen. (1) dann (.) erm (2) wären wir mit den themenkreisen fertig und (.) es gibt noch zwei <67> allgemeine </67> fragen. (.) die erste. wieviele jahre unterrichten sie bereits englisch?

S2: <67> mhm. </67> das (2) dritte.

S1: das dritte jahr mhm. und warum haben sie sich dazu entschieden englisch zu studieren? (.) und (.) dann zu unterrichten?

S2: erm (.) unterrichten war kein problem weil ich immer lehrerin werden wollte. <68> es war </68> immer nur halt welche frage welche fächer. (.) erm (.) und (1) englisch deshalb weil ich (1) selber sehr gut in englisch war weil ich immer mich gerne mit englisch beschäftigt habe. <69> weil ich eine </69> tolle englischlehrerin hatte selbst in der schule. (.) erm (.) von der ich sehr viel (.) sprachlich aber auch erm was literatur und so weiter betrifft sehr viel gelernt habe <70> sehr viel kultur </70> und geschichte englische. (.) erm (2) jo. (.) weil weil's mir immer leicht gefallen ist irgendwie. englisch war nie schwierig für mich. (1) genau.

S1: <68> mhm. </68> <69> mhm. mhm. </69> <70> mhm. </70> okay dann kommen wir von meiner seite (.) zum ende (.) des interviews. (.) wollen sie noch letzte kommentare zum thema loswerden? (.) wenn ihnen noch was einfällt?

S2: ich glaub wir haben alles gut besprochen. @

S1: glaub ich auch. dann danke auf jeden fall (.) für die zeit.

S2: gerne.

<end 190115_0008_38:06>

Appendix J: Abstract

Abstract

The aim of this diploma thesis is to gain insights into the practices and attitudes of Austrian EFL teachers and their learners with its thematic foci on vocabulary teaching and learning, the role of the shared first language (L1), German, and the influence of the learners' language proficiency level on the former issues.

For this purpose, contemporary and relevant literature is reviewed in the theoretical part, focusing on the main didactic approach in Austria, Communicative language teaching (CLT), and the implications of research on the addressed issues. The empirical investigation collects data in the form of in-class observations with audio recordings, questionnaires for all learners and interviews with the teachers. Three teachers of Austrian AHS-schools participated with one 3rd form and one 6th form each. The analyzed data are interpreted, compared and contrasted with the reviewed literature.

The findings suggest that Austrian EFL teachers and learners recognize the role of the L1 in the EFL classroom and ascribe certain functions to it, even though teachers rather aim to adhere to target language use, with differing success. The most common investigated purposes of integrating German into the Austrian EFL classroom are vocabulary teaching and learning and the communication of important organizational issues both by teachers and learners.

Austrian EFL teachers use a wide range of vocabulary teaching strategies, German translations, English explanations and the methodological use of the blackboard being the most frequent ones, the former two being approved by the learners' perceptions. German is an integral part of vocabulary learning for learners of both proficiency levels. In sum, teachers and learners deliberately use more German in lower proficiency level classes in general and for the purpose of vocabulary teaching, unambiguously, which is confirmed by their attitudes. Further, it is suggested that lower-level students require more German vocabulary translations than higher-level students.

Appendix K: Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Zusammenfassung

Das Ziel der vorliegenden Diplomarbeit ist die Untersuchung konkreter Praktiken und Einstellungen von Englisch-Lehrkräften und deren Lernenden innerhalb der österreichischen Sekundarstufen 1 und 2. Konkret fokussieren sich diese Untersuchungen sowohl auf die Vermittlung von neuen Vokabeln und das generelle Vokabellernen als auch auf die diesbezügliche Bedeutung der Bildungssprache Deutsch und den potentiellen Einfluss eines unterschiedlichen Sprachniveaus auf diese Lehr- und Lernprozesse

Zunächst wird im theoretischen Teil ein Überblick über die aktuell relevante Fachliteratur mit den Schwerpunkten auf den derzeit dominanten didaktischen Ansatz im österreichischen Fremdsprachenlernen, dem „Communicative language teaching“ (CLT), gegeben. In der empirischen Untersuchung werden Daten mithilfe von während Unterrichtsobservationen gefertigten Audioaufnahmen, Fragebögen und Interviews gesammelt und folglich diskutiert beziehungsweise interpretiert.

Die Resultate indizieren, dass österreichische Englischlehrkräfte und deren SchülerInnen die Rolle der Bildungssprache anerkennen und diese in bestimmten Situationen verwenden, auch wenn Lehrkräfte versuchen, größtenteils in der Zielsprache zu bleiben. Am häufigsten findet die deutsche Sprache dabei im Kontext des Vokabellehrens und ebenso Vokabellernens sowie beim Besprechen organisatorischer Angelegenheiten Verwendung.

Die teilnehmenden Lehrpersonen integrieren eine Vielzahl an Strategien für die Vokabelvermittlung, wobei deutsche Übersetzungen, englische Erklärungen und die methodische Verwendung der Tafel die häufigsten sind und die beiden ersten Aspekte parallel dazu auch aus der Perspektive der Lernenden bestätigt werden. Die SchülerInnen beider Sprachniveaus nutzen die Erstsprache als Ressource zum Vokabellernen. Vor allem in Klassen mit niedrigerem Sprachniveau wird in den Klassen, im Allgemeinen und für die Vokabelvermittlung, gezielt ein höheres Ausmaß an Deutsch verwendet. Dies spiegelt sich außerdem aus der Erkenntnis wider, dass SchülerInnen mit niedrigerem Sprachlevel primär deutsche Vokabelübersetzungen von den Lehrkräften verlangen.