Lang. Teach. (2014), **47.3**, 332–348 © Cambridge University Press 2012
doi:10.1017/S0261444811000498 First published online 12 January 2012

Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring

Glenn S. Levine University of California, Irvine
glevine@uci.edu

The social and cultural 'turn' in language education of recent years has helped move language teaching and curriculum design away from many of the more rigid dogmas of earlier generations, but the issue of the roles of the learners' first language (L1) in language pedagogy and classroom interaction is far from settled. Some follow a strict 'exclusive target language' pedagogy, while others 'resort to' the use of the L1 for a variety of purposes (see ACTFL 2008). Underlying these competing views is the perspective of the L1 as an impediment to second language learning. Following sociocultural theory and ecological perspectives of language and learning and based on the findings of research on classroom code-switching and code choice, this paper lays out an approach to the language classroom as a multilingual social space in which learners and teacher study, negotiate, and co-construct code choice norms toward the dynamic, creative, and pedagogically effective use of both the target language and the learners' L1(s). Learner use of the L1 for the purpose of grammatical or lexical learning is also considered, and some examples for instruction are offered.

1. Introduction

The use of the learner's L1 in the second language (L2) classroom is a topic about which many teachers hold explicit opinions. It is also an under-studied topic in the SLA literature, compared with the acknowledged core objects of investigation. The L1 in the classroom could be compared to the elephant in the room, the thing everyone knows is there but consciously, or unconsciously, ignores (Levine 2011). Another version of the analogy would have us share the room with an 800-pound gorilla, which may be better for thinking about code choice in this context, for in the popular conception gorillas are often considered more dangerous than elephants; the status quo in language teaching has similarly approached the L1 as if it were something, if not dangerous, then at least undesirable and stigmatized. In this article I would like to convince you otherwise. I would like to show that the L1 already has a natural place in the language classroom, that the L1 serves many pedagogical, discursive and social functions, and that our pedagogy – and by pedagogy I mean curriculum design and teaching

Revised version of an address given as part of the University of Wisconsin's Language Institute lecture series, 'Immersion in Language Learning', Madison, Wisconsin, 8 February 2011.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

practice in one – would benefit from assigning the L1 a principled, sanctioned place in the L2 classroom.[1]

Before the reader concludes that I am advocating the conversion of the language classroom into a haven for L1 rather than L2 use, let us establish the baseline aim of any language classroom: to use the L2 as much and as richly as possible. To be more specific: to have the students do this. Any use of the L1 or the learners' other languages should serve a pedagogical, discursive, or social purpose in the classroom, just as any use of the L2 does. How much conscious control the curriculum designer or teacher can exert over uses of the L1 or the L2 is still an open question, but here I will also attempt to show that it's not about cause and effect, but about creating affordances for rich communication and learning.

A disclosure at the outset: this article represents in part a digest version of my book, *Code choice in the language classroom* (Levine 2011); the book, of course, delves into much more depth, but the central arguments and proposals here are the same as those in the book. However, this article also moves the discussion of L1 use in the classroom in a new direction: here I will link code choice to a specific area of L2 learning, namely raising awareness about grammar and lexicon. In Levine (2009) I focused on L2 learner 'talk about language' as a component of L2 socialization while abroad. I proposed that learners' frequent talk ABOUT language in their daily interactions with both native and non-native speakers of German appeared to play a role in their development as 'legitimate peripheral participants' in German society (Lave & Wenger 1991). In the present article it is proposed that legitimating the L1 as part of learner 'talk about language' within the curriculum can support or enrich L2 learning overall; and the approach necessitates viewing grammar as a dynamic rather than a static entity.

In the following I first establish briefly why a principled approach to code choice is desirable and important. In part 3 I focus on the categories or uses of the L1 in typical foreign language classrooms as evidenced through a review of some of the research on the topic. Part 4 establishes ways to view the intersection of L1 use and grammaring as part of pedagogical communication. Part 5 briefly sketches out a pedagogy, which I call a 'curricular architecture', in which explicit attention is paid to training learners in the concepts of a multilingual classroom community of practice, co-constructing code choice norms, exploring multilingual situations in the target culture, and reflecting upon code choice not only in the classroom, but in the L2 culture. Here, too, particular attention is given to the ways the L1 can be used for engaging with grammar as a dynamic process.

2. Why should the first language be part of foreign language pedagogy?

There are several reasons why the L1 should have a sanctioned place in the L2 curriculum and in classroom communication. The first has to do with considering the foreign language

[1] This discussion of the L1 in the language classroom is based for the most part on the US university foreign-language context, in which the students and the instructor have English as a common language, though many may have different L1s. There are, of course, many classroom situations in which students do not have a common or dominant language (see Heugh, Siegrühn & Plüddemann 1995). Yet here I foreground one of the premises of this paper: even in the situation of multiple L1s in a given classroom, learners still make use of the L1 for language learning and other purposes, to be detailed in part 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

classroom as a multilingual social space. Many researchers, like many classroom teachers, would not regard the language classroom as a 'real' multilingual social setting. This is understandable, as the classroom, while surely a component of society, is not a speech community in its own right, as speech communities are usually defined and understood. Nor is the range of domains and registers of communication identical to those in a bilingual community. But there are several ways in which the language classroom does have affinities with bilingual speech communities. The first is the most obvious: two or more languages are routinely used by all members of the group. Second, speakers in interaction regularly alternate between their languages, mix their languages, play with their languages, for different discursive and conversational purposes, and in a range of social contexts (Myers-Scotton 1995; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2004; Garafanga 2007). Third, despite the more limited pedagogical context of the classroom, compared with the more expansive social settings of bilingual speech communities, in the language classroom discursive and social norms obtain that guide and constrain the ways students and teachers make meaning (van Lier 1996), including norms for code-switching, or the alternating use of more than one language in a given utterance or conversation. Of all known situations in which two or more languages are in play, only the language classroom routinely and explicitly eschews the use of multiple languages. For this reason alone, it would be reasonable to determine the ways that language pedagogy could regard the classroom, like a societal bilingual situation, as a basically multilingual social space; from this perspective the L1 and learners' other languages have the potential to be a resource for communication and learning, rather than simply an impediment to L2 acquisition (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain 2004).

Following from the areas of similarity or affinity between societal bilingual situations and the language classroom, a second reason for a principled place for the L1 is that the learners' L1 already is part of communication and cognition, from the beginning to the advanced stages of L2 learning. This will be addressed in part 3, but the question to emphasize is that if the L1 is indeed a regular feature of interaction in the language classroom, would it not be the responsibility of language professionals to establish theoretically motivated, viable principles with respect to which curriculum designers and teachers can think about and approach the issue of L1 use (Blyth 1995; Macaro 2001)?

A third reason for a principled role of the L1 in the L2 classroom has to do with the aim of instructed L2 acquisition overall. That many language professionals currently do not view the language classroom from a multilingual perspective is perhaps rooted in the sad reality that most students never become bilingual users of the L2 and their L1, and this despite calls at the national level in the US for more advanced L2 users, and increased scholarly attention to the development of advanced L2 capacities (Byrnes 2006; MLA 2007). In fact, most students will not even reach levels of competence that would allow them to function in the L2 culture as 'bilingual outsiders' (Kramsch 1998: 23). Yet just as many classrooms ostensibly aim to function as facsimiles of a monolingual L2 environment, so too it is appropriate to frame our pedagogy toward the goal of learners' development as bilingual users of the L2 and the L1, even if many will not ultimately reach that place.

There are, of course, other reasons in favor of assigning the L1 a sanctioned place in language pedagogy, such as anxiety reduction or simple validation of learners' identity in their dominant language. But the overriding reasons have to do with ways of regarding the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language classroom as a multilingual social space, with the imperative to integrate into our pedagogy the reality of L1 use and orientation toward bilingual development.

3. Toward establishing a 'status quo' of L1 use in the language classroom

If one accepts that the L1 does or should have a principled place in our pedagogy, two questions of interest arise: how much of the L1 is generally used in classrooms, and what functions does it typically serve for teachers and students? The following brief look at some of the research will help us sketch out what we might call a 'status quo' for classroom code choice.

3.1. How much L1 is used in the language classroom?

Several studies, such as those by Wing (1980), Guthrie (1984), and Duff & Polio (1990) quantified the amounts of each language used in the classroom. Overall, these studies found great variability, with L2 use ranging from 10% to 100% of the time, depending on the teacher and what was going on in the classroom! At first glance this might cause us to conclude the impossibility of generalizing and end consideration of amounts of L2 and L1 use right there. However, other studies, such as Macaro (2001), Nzwanga (2000) and my own studies published in 2003 and 2011, showed that by and large the amount of L2 in most communicative approach classrooms appears to be quite high, with the L2 used around 80% of the time overall. In other words, in straight-up amount of time spent using L2 or L1, the L2 appears to be used most of the time in many language classes.

In a study quantifying the amounts and purposes of L1 use in an introductory Spanish class and an intermediate French class (Levine 2011), while I found similar overall variation in the amounts of L1 and L2 use as earlier studies, an interesting pattern emerged that allowed for a more nuanced conclusion about the amounts of L1 or L2 use in these university classes: teachers used the L2 more than students overall, students used the L2 more when talking to the teacher or to the whole class, less when talking with each other for classroom activities (which I call 'scripted' contexts), and still less when talking with each other in unscripted contexts.[2] Now, seasoned language teachers would likely report the same from classroom experience, but these initial findings are encouraging in moving us closer to an empirically-based understanding of classroom norms.

In sum, the L1 was present in every class ever studied for amounts of L1 and L2 use, though the tendency appears to be that the teacher uses the L2 most of the time; students appear to use the L2 less of the time than the teacher overall, and the least when they are

[2] The issue of the impact of whether the teacher is a native speaker of the target language is not unimportant, but discussion of this would exceed the scope of this article. Some studies have indicated that teachers who are native speakers of the target language tend to use more of the learners' L1 than those who are native speakers of the learners' L1 (Polio & Duff 1994; Suby & Asencion-Delaney 2009; Hobbs, Matsuo & Payne 2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speaking with each other. All of this, however, points toward the equally important need to understand not just HOW MUCH of each language is used, but WHAT FUNCTIONS the L1 serves.

3.2. Functions of the L1 in the language classroom

In this section we consider who is using the L1, in what contexts, and for what purposes, in order to move toward qualitative pedagogical decisions for curriculum design and classroom practice. On this topic we have a relatively small but insightful body of research identifying the functions of L1 use in language classrooms. What emerges is not the variation but the commonality across studies. Macaro (2001) studied L1 use by six student teachers in the UK, who overall used very little of the L1 during the sessions recorded. The author identified the several functions of L1 use among the teachers, most notably for procedural instructions, teaching grammar, and keeping control of the class.

Polio & Duff (1994) identified three main factors influencing L1 use: (1) function of item/utterance produced; (2) difficulty of language being used; and (3) interactive effect involving students' use of English. In the first category, function of item, the authors listed the functions of L1 as 'a) for administrative vocabulary items, b) for grammar instruction, c) classroom management, d) to index a stance of empathy/solidarity, e) for English practice by the teacher with tutoring from the students' (p. 317). This resonates with Macaro's (2001) findings.

Swain & Lapkin (2000) studied dyads of adolescent learners of French in Canada. They observed many instances of peer scaffolding, or assistance received by the learner from a mentor or more knowledgeable peer in performing a range of tasks. They arrived at three main categories of classroom L1 use: (1) moving the task along, (2) focusing attention, and (3) interpersonal interaction (pp. 257–258). In the 'focusing attention' category, L1 use is about 'vocabulary search' and 'focus on form; explanation; framing; retrieving grammatical information' (p. 258). The latter category corresponds well with the idea of grammaring, to be addressed shortly. So, interestingly, when working together in pairs, students' use of L1 appears to serve functions similar to those we see in other studies by the teacher with the whole class, namely to facilitate communication, clarify meaning, structure and organize communication, and foster interpersonal dynamics in some way.

Antón & DiCamilla (1999), in analyzing the functions of L1 use, focused in particular on scaffolding in a sociocultural framework. The authors analyzed numerous conversational excerpts from students carrying out language tasks in pairs. These show how students used the L1 to 'enlist and maintain each other's interest in the task . . ., develop strategies for making the task manageable, maintain their focus on the goal of the task, foreground important elements of the task, discuss what needs to be done to solve specific problems, and explicate and build on each other's partial solutions to specific problems. . .' (p. 237). Like the students in Swain & Lapkin's study, the students thus also used the L1 for 'accessing L2 linguistic forms, making sense of the form or meaning of a text and evaluating a text in L2' (p. 237).

Liebscher & Dailey O'Cain (2004) analyzed learner and teacher discourse in classrooms and took the analysis deeper than previous studies. They identified code-switches (uses of the L1 and L2 in the same utterance or interaction) as either participant-related or discourse-related. Participant-related switches relate to the person speaking, such as appeals

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for assistance, or they originate in lexical or other linguistic gaps. Discourse-related switches are those intended to structure or steer the conversation in a particular way. This is a useful framework for thinking about why learners and teachers use the L1 in turns at talk, including in the categories of purposes of L1 use described earlier, because it forces the observer to consider the dynamics of interaction as it happens. In their recent study of classroom discourse involving L1, Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher (2009) also showed that switches to the L1 in the language classroom can, in fact, mean different things depending on whether the teacher or the student is doing the switching. This speaks to the dynamic, inherently social dimension of language learning and language use; even the same sorts of code-switches can mean different things when used by different people.

From this brief look at the literature, the primary functions of the L1 emerge: L1 is used in dynamic ways for procedural communication, for establishing or maintaining control of the group, for reducing anxiety, for developing or maintaining intersubjectivity, and, of course, for explicit focus on grammatical forms or vocabulary for comprehension and/or learning. The identification of these common functions of the L1 allows us to conclude that the L1 may be the UNMARKED language of communication in many arguably crucial moments of communication in the classroom. The aim of our pedagogy should thus be to optimize L2 use through a principled approach to L1 use.

This assertion raises the question, however, of whether it is POSSIBLE to explicitly control code choice in the classroom. In their analysis of teacher and learner use of L1, Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher (2009) emphasize the fact that code-switching is a normal and expected part of talk whenever speakers in interaction have more than one language in common, which is certainly the case in North American foreign language classrooms. But the authors also assert that one cannot exert control over who code-switches, when, or for what purposes (Chavez 2003 makes a similar assertion). I would counter that in light of the research findings regarding the undeniable role of the L1 in the classroom, just as our pedagogy should be oriented toward learners as developing bilinguals whether or not we believe they will all actually become bilinguals, so too must we orient our pedagogy toward the idea that we can exert conscious control over code choices, even if this ends up not being universally the case. Ultimately it's about AWARENESS, as defined and analyzed by van Lier (1995), Schmidt (1993), and others. A principled approach to code choice in the language classroom provides a vehicle for learner awareness of aspects of communication that relate to L1 use, of course, but also of many other aspects of their status as developing bilingual users of the L2 and their first or other languages. In the next section I focus on this aspect of language classroom code choice.

4. Awareness, grammaring and L1 use

One of the arguably central functions of communication in the L2 classroom is explicit communication about language forms. All of the studies that have examined functions of the L1 in the classroom found communication about grammar to be a common, unmarked context for L1 use. In the literature dealing with how adult learners develop grammatical knowledge of the L2, there has been some disagreement about the relative importance of implicit vs. explicit learning of grammatical forms and patterns (see N. Ellis 2005), but

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

there is overall agreement that explicit learning is important. Rod Ellis (2009: 3) asserts that when learners learn forms explicitly, they 'are aware that they have learned something and can verbalize what they have learned' (see also Robinson 2003). At the same time, explicit attention to forms does not necessarily lead to acquisition. Schmidt (1993: 219) points out that

> learners may look for rules even when told not to, fail to notice highlighted words in a text, fail to understand grammar explanations, or fail to see how such explanations apply. Learners may also notice target language features that have not been made artificially salient and may form accurate or inaccurate hypotheses in the absence of instruction, or as alternatives to instruction that is not understood.

This resonates with a central observation of Lave & Wenger (1991), namely that learning is not caused by instruction, it is a response to it. In van Lier's (1996, 2004) work on ecological approaches to L2 curriculum and teaching, the core idea is that curriculum creates affordances for learning and helps learners become aware of these affordances. In line with a sociocultural perspective on how learning and development happen, through social activity – such as classroom instruction and language use – learners recognize opportunities for learning and may or may not take advantage of them, or be able to. From the teacher's perspective, it's about creating as many such affordances as possible for learning to take place, and accepting that it may or may not happen as the teacher intended or desired. Conscious attention to forms can be part of this, but it should not be expected that simply calling learners' attention to forms or lexical items will lead to their acquisition. It's about the frequency of such affordances, and about their quality. And here is where the L1 comes into play.

The research on L1 use in the L2 classroom has shown us that learners carrying out language tasks routinely use the L1 to focus conscious attention on grammatical forms and lexical items. Consider the following example, recorded by Swain & Lapkin (2000: 259–260), of learners interacting about grammatical forms:

D1: But why is there an 'e'?
D2: Because there's an 'e' on *suite*.
D1: I have a perfect verb *réfléchi*. OK.
Maintenant c'est six heures un et elle s'endormit.
D1: Is it *la réveil* or *le réveil*?
J1: *Dans une maison, dans une* . . . is *maison* masculine or feminine?

Polio & Duff (1994) also offer this example of L1 use by a teacher:

> T: *Yotermei* [More than] is the comparative. The E R. SmarTER, quiCKER. It's the er thing. This is *yoter mei*. [more than] *Hayom anaxnu lomdim et ha* [Today we're learning the] superlative.
> (Polio & Duff 1994: 317)

These examples should strike any experienced language teacher as fairly common uses of the L1 by students and teachers. As the discourse analyst would have us do, one can ask whether or how the interactions from which these examples are taken would have proceeded if the use of the L1 had been expressly forbidden. These uses of the L1 are typical, or perhaps even prototypical, examples of what Larsen-Freeman (2003) describes as 'grammaring'. For our purposes (of formulating norms for curriculum design and classroom practice), this is a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

productive way to understand how explicit communication of linguistic forms and L1 use intersect. Larsen-Freeman defines grammaring as a skill or dynamic process, rather than as a static body of 'rules, norms, parts of speech, and verb paradigms' (2003: 24). As a dynamic process, it means that forms, lexicon, context, and, of course, the people interacting as part of the context, all make up what we understand as grammar. Language in this conception is not a closed system, rather a 'process of pattern formation by which humans use linguistic forms to make meaning in context-appropriate ways' (2003: 142). Larsen-Freeman stresses that grammar 'is much more about humanness than some static list of rules and exceptions suggests. Grammar allows us to choose how we present ourselves to the world, sometimes conforming to social norms yet all the while establishing our individual identities' (p. 142). In pedagogical terms, grammar is not something learners swallow like a pill and then have for use, rather it emerges over time. Much more than just a component of the learner's interlanguage at any one moment in development, grammar is a part of who the learner IS (see also Kramsch 2009). As we will see in sample activity 2, a speaker's grammar is as bound up with identity as accent or other more conspicuous aspects of language in use.

This discussion of the complex of activities, interactions, and processes that make up grammatical and lexical learning, especially in instructed L2 contexts, naturally includes ALL of what the people interacting know and are inclined to make use of, including their L1 and other languages, whether between the people in the classroom, or in the head of the individual learner as private speech (Vygotsky 1978; Antón & DiCamilla 1999). Following from this, classroom teaching should be oriented toward (1) affording a sanctioned role of the L1, and (2) facilitating learner talk about language by studying aspects of the L2 language and culture and reflecting upon aspects of their own grammatical knowledge and development. In the final section I therefore offer a brief sketch of a 'curricular architecture' for principled L1 use involving grammaring as conscious reflection about aspects of language knowledge, use, and identity.

5. A curricular architecture for classroom code choice: Focus on grammaring

Based on these arguments and evidence in favor of integrating a formal place for the L1 in the language classroom, and the discussion of the central role of awareness and attention in L2 learning, in particular of grammatical forms and patterns, in this section I detail briefly what I call a 'curricular architecture' for classroom code choice, with the aim of creating affordances for the development of grammatical and lexical knowledge, and reflecting critically on what grammar is and how non-native speakers learn and use it (Lave & Wenger 1991; van Lier 1996). The design of this learning space is based on Chapter 5 of my book, where the reader can also find numerous sample activities designed to help learners become aware of aspects of language use and code choices, co-construct code-choice norms for the classroom, learn about speakers and communities that use the L2 and other languages, and reflect critically on their own multilingual classroom community of practice. Through these sorts of activities and tasks, learners should begin to see themselves, in real-world ways, as nascent bilinguals and legitimate peripheral participants in the L2 communities of practice. The sample activities can be integrated into the curriculum, or conducted as a separate set of workshop-type sessions.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Due to space limitations, in the following I offer just two new sample activities, intended to augment those in Levine (2011). They focus on creating affordances for grammatical and lexical development and helping learners to think about code choices, and overtly manage code choice practices. More specifically, their aim is to help learners reflect on what role the grammar of the L2 user might play in who the L2 user IS. The point is, as always, not to increase the amount of L1 use per se, rather to optimize the use of the L2 for learning and meaning-making (Macaro 2009) and raise learner awareness of the intersection of code choice and grammatical learning. This may mean the students use (some) English for these activities, but this use of English should contribute to more opportunities to use the L2 in ways that invest autonomy in the learner, and lead to greater awareness of the learner's own status as a potential legitimate peripheral participant in the L2 culture. The four components of this curricular architecture are learner training, co-construction of code-choice norms, multilingual content instruction, and critical reflection.

5.1. Learner training

The foregoing was intended to make the case for a principled approach to L1 use in the classroom, but not in terms of the teacher articulating her or his 'policies' for code choice, rather of the classroom developing those norms as part of the normal process of language learning and communication in the classroom. We have seen in the studies cited earlier that the L1 appears to serve particular unmarked functions, such as explicit grammar-learning, or scaffolded assistance in the completion of L2 tasks. But the evidence also suggests that there is often no conscious awareness of the roles the L1 plays in the classroom, except perhaps the explicit stigmatization of 'resorting' to the L1 rather than 'staying' in the L2. Hence a first step toward approaching the classroom as a potential multilingual community of practice is to train the students in what it means to use both the L1 and L2, and to choose between two or more languages in given contexts. Learner training overlaps with the well-documented area of strategies instruction (Cohen 1998; Chamot 2001), for it is about teaching students how to think about and approach code choice as one strategy among many. In essence, the curriculum should include activities and tasks that let students in on basic terms and ideas, so they can talk about this issue as a normal part of pedagogical activity. Sample activity 1 is an example of 'learner training', though it also has elements of critical reflection, and it certainly helps lay the ground for co-construction of multilingual norms.

Sample activity 1: A tale of two languages

Have you ever switched to English when your teacher asked you to work with others to complete a language task? The fact is that most people do so routinely. The purpose of this activity is to get you thinking about the ways you use English to help you complete activities in German.

(1) Your teacher has selected an activity in your textbook, one that has a communicative function (such as planning an event, making a decision about something, or narrating an experience) but also requires you to use or review particular grammatical forms and/or vocabulary. Everyone should have this activity ready to go.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2) The class should split into two halves, Group 1 and Group 2. Each of the two groups should then split up into pairs or groups of three. Group 1 (we'll call them the German-Only Group) should complete the activity using no English at all, not even to clarify instructions the teacher gave or to ask what a particular word means. In short, Group 1 should aim to do everything completely in German, beginning to end.

Group 2 (let's call them the English-OK Group) may, of course, use only German, but this group may also use English for any reason the participants deem appropriate, as long as they remain focused on completing the task at hand to the best of their ability.

(3) After completing the activity, each pair should discuss the following questions:

A. How well did the activity go? Did each person benefit from it, that is, did each person succeed at doing what the instructions had indicated? Judge the success of the activity for each person on a scale of 5 (best) to 1 (worst). If it was a success, please state explicitly what you learned or how you benefited from the activity. If you feel it was unsuccessful, please state why you think this was so.

B. How helpful or difficult was your language-choice restriction?

For the German-Only Group (Group 1), how difficult was it to stay all in German? Rate this on a scale of 5 (very difficult to stay in German) to 1 (very easy to stay in German). If one or more of you did switch to English after all, what was the switch? Why did you switch?

For the English-OK Group (Group 2), how much of the time do you estimate you used English? What did you use English for? To clarify instructions? To understand a point of grammar? To translate vocabulary? etc. List the ways that you used English. Also, decide whether you think your use of English was necessary, and in any case, how much you think English helped you complete the task in German, or not.

(4) Whole-class discussion. Discuss all together which groups had a more successful time with the activity, and why. Share and compare some of your scores and judgments. Decide as a group which mode – German-Only or English-OK – is a better or more successful way of doing activities, and why.

This activity should raise learner awareness of what it means to try to 'stay' in the L2, and it also should point up the ways the L1 often makes getting things done more efficient, and possibly contributes to richer learning. Conversely, it may highlight ways that 'too much' of the L1 interferes with communication or learning. In terms of the process and dynamic activity of grammaring in Larsen-Freeman's conceptualization, this activity is aimed at making part of classroom discourse not just conscious awareness of language rules or vocabulary, but also sensitivity to the role of code choices.

5.2. Co-construction of multilingual norms

This important phase of fostering a multilingual classroom community of practice is the one that will likely vary the most from class to class. But it is also the one that bestows on students the greatest amount of autonomy, or 'empowers' them, if you will, to exert explicit control over what the group finds acceptable or unacceptable in classroom communication. It includes first discussing and analyzing current classroom conventions, and then establishing code-choice conventions for the class: what language is acceptable to the group, by whom, and in what situations (Levine 2011: 151–152). These are, of course, norms that develop

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

organically in societal bilingual situations, which would be often opaque to language class members, including the teacher. Establishing code-choice norms is thus about bringing the issue to students' and teachers' awareness, whether or not the norms are followed or flouted. In terms of grammatical and lexical development, the focus of discussions and activities can and should be on how establishing explicit norms can be brought to bear in facilitating grammar or lexical learning.

5.3. Multilingual content instruction

Much of what we do in language classes is to help students develop declarative knowledge about aspects of the new language and culture. In approaching the classroom as a multilingual community of practice that should have some connection to the target culture(s), one way of broadening students' understanding of what it means for them to be nascent bilinguals is for them to study bilinguals or bilingual communities, in which the usual 'monolingual' norms of the target culture may not apply. For instance, in German we can study various contact varieties of German, such as South Tirolian German, Russia German, Pennsylvania German, or even urban varieties in immigrant communities within Germany. The point is that students begin to see themselves as potential members of a linguistic minority in the L2 community, but 'legitimate' members nonetheless. Sample activity 2, which I present in the next section on critical reflection, also has students learn about a well-known non-native-speaker of German, former Bayern-München soccer coach, Giovanni Trapattoni.

5.4. Critical reflection

A significant aspect of both the 2007 MLA ad hoc committee report (MLA 2007) and the ACTFL *Standards* (2010) is their implications for critical awareness as part of language teaching and learning, which echoes European discussions of intercultural communicative competence (Byram 1997; Roberts et al. 2001). The foregoing arguments for a principled approach to the L1 in the L2 classroom depend on integrating critical reflection, from the introductory through the advanced levels. In 'real-world' terms, this reflection can and should bring learners to new understandings not only of the language and the cultures of its speakers, but also of themselves as learners and nascent bilinguals. Sample activity 2 links consideration of the role of the L1 in L2 knowledge more specifically, through the question of how the L1 relates to WHO ONE IS in a new language, and crucially, to issues of what grammar is or is not. This set of tasks asks students to analyze and discuss aspects of non-native grammar and usage, based on a well-known speech, widely available online, by former Bayern-München soccer coach Giovanni Trapattoni. The focus throughout the activities is on both grammar and identity. Though likely inappropriate for an introductory course in which the students' explicit knowledge of German grammar would be insufficient, in an intermediate course communication would probably be mostly in English, and at advanced levels could be mostly or completely in German.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sample Activity 2: 'Flasche leer' – Trapattoni's grammar and the role of the native language

Often we view 'grammar' as a static entity, like a pill to be swallowed: Once you swallow it, you've got it. But a lot of linguists have found that grammar is different for each individual, even for native speakers of that language. For foreign-language students, the variation in what constitutes 'grammar' is even greater. Think of it as a cloud, or a flock of birds: the grammar and vocabulary of the language is recognizable as such, with a core form that lets you recognize what is and isn't a grammatical form or a particular word or phrase, but there is also a constantly changing shape that the whole takes on. For example, in English there are varying ways people use past tense forms in everyday conversation. When does one say 'I wrote', 'I have written' or 'I was writing', and why doesn't one usually say things like 'I was wrote'? What about 'I have swam' versus 'I have swum'? Which is grammatical? Have you heard people use both? What about the prepositional phrase 'between you and me' versus 'between you and I'? Which one is 'correct' English, and which one do people use in conversation? Or what do you make of the language used by the fictional character, Yoda, in the Star Wars films? What does he do with English syntax (word order patterns)? His syntax is quite idiosyncratic, but also very regular (he always follows the same rules for word order). Why is this OK for English speakers listening to him? What effect does it have on the listener, in terms of how Yoda comes across to the audience?

Regarding how second-language users make use of the grammar of their new language, here is an example, taken from a radio talk show, in which a native speaker of Egyptian Arabic, who had been living in the US for 30 years, is telling the talk-show host about an evening with his friends discussing politics:

> They was argue with me the other day in café. We argue till two clock in the morning.

What do you notice about the grammar here? How does the man indicate the past tense? One could say he is not using 'grammatical' English, but we would also have to note that the way he marks the past tense, even in just these two sentences, is 'regular'. We could also ask whether this particular way of indicating past tense is surprising or unusual. In other words, do you think he is the first non-native speaker of English ever to produce past tense in this way? And finally – and crucially – we should ask two more questions: (1) Does his way of expressing events in the past interfere with our comprehension of what he is saying? and (2) In what ways do you think that his particular grammar of English is part of the man's identity or personality not just as a man who originally came from Egypt, but as an Egyptian-American? All of these questions speak to the validity of ways that non-native speakers use their second language; and this would include YOU using German when talking with Germans!

The purpose of this activity is thus to help you view the whole idea of grammar in some new ways, keeping track of the overall 'flock' without worrying overly much about the variations in the shape of the flock, or in this case the variations in grammar or vocabulary between you and, say, monolingual native speakers of German.

For this task, you are asked to, in essence, 'rewrite' the following text in order to make it 'grammatical' in modern standard German. The text is the transcript of a well-known speech by Giovanni Trapattoni, former coach of the Bayern-München soccer team. The speech, delivered in a press statement on March 10, 1998, has been widely circulated on YouTube and elsewhere on the Internet (search 'Trapattoni' and 'Flasche leer' and it should come up), and has popularized the phrases 'Flasche leer' and 'ich habe fertig'. As you will see, in this press statement the coach berated players on his own team for their poor performance. Trapattoni, a native speaker of Italian, appears to be wholly unconcerned with the grammatical details of his German, rather he appears focused only on the message.

(1) *Watching and reflecting on the video*. Before engaging with the transcript, watch the video of the press statement in class. Make notes on things you observe, such as Trapattoni's gestures, body language, tone of voice, and of course particular features of his German. Discuss these in pairs or small groups.

(2) *'Correcting' Trapattoni*. Your task here is to convert the text into standard German, doing your best to make it 'grammatical'. You can break the text into parts, giving a part to each group in the class, or

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

each group can work on the whole thing and then compare versions afterwards. Either way, consider the following 'big-picture' questions:

A. What aspects of Trapattoni's grammar are in fact 'grammatical', i.e. they follow the rules for standard German that you have learned in your German classes?
B. In what ways is Trapattoni's particular grammar of German 'regular,' in that it follows (its own) recurring patterns or rules? (or not)
C. For those in the class who know Italian, Spanish or another Romance language, can you identify areas where Trapattoni may be influenced by his first language in formulating German sentences?

You may do this activity in German, English, or a combination of the two.

NOTE: One detail you would you need to know in advance: Zickler, Mehmet, Basler, Strunz, Hamann, and Nerlinger are the names of Bayern-München players.

Trapattoni's Press Conference, March 10, 1998[3]

Es gibt im Moment in diese Mannschaft, oh, einige Spieler vergessen ihnen Profi was sie sind. Ich lese nicht sehr viele Zeitungen, aber ich habe gehört viele Situationen:

[3] This translation of the Trapattoni speech is as close an approximation of the coach's words as I was able to achieve. It cannot faithfully capture the grammatical and expressive aspects of the speech, which are the core elements of the students' analysis as they 'convert' the text into standard German. For instance, Trapattoni frequently omits pronouns, particularly nominative pronouns, as well as clitics and complementizers. Including all of these language 'errors' in my English translation would move the text too far from the original, and might come across as mocking the speech, which is not my intention. I have therefore inserted some of these omitted elements here for ease of reading, where feasible, but my translation had to portray some of the idiosyncrasies of Trapattoni's speech.

At the moment in this team, oh, there are a few players who forget they are professionals that they are. I do not read many newspapers, but I have heard many situations:

First: we did not play offensively. There is no German team that plays offense and the name offense like Bavaria. Last game we were in third place top players: Elber, Jancker and then Zickler. We must not forget Zickler. Zickler is a top player more than Mehmet and more than Basler. Is clear these words, is it possible to understand was I said? Thank you. Offense, offense is like how you do it on the field.

Second: I explained with these two players: After Dortmund need perhaps a mid-game break. I also saw other teams in Europe after this Wednesday. I saw also two days of training. A trainer is not an idiot! A trainer sees what happens on the field. In this game it was two, three or four players, they were weak like an empty bottle!

Did you see Wednesday, which team played Wednesday? Has played Mehmet, or played Basler, or played Trapattoni? These players complain more than play! You know why the Italy team doesn't buy these players? Because we saw many times dumb games. They said, these are not players for the Italian champions.

Strunz! Strunz has been here two years, has played ten games, is always injured. How dare Strunz? Last year became champion with Hamann eh… Nerlinger. These players were always players and became champions. Always injured! Played 25 games in this team, in this league! Has to respect the other colleagues! Have many nice colleagues, you go ask the colleagues that question! (You) have no courage of words, but I know what you think about these players!

(They) show now, I want, Saturday, these players must show me and their fans, have to win the game alone. I am tired now of being father to these players, eh, always defending these players! I always have the blame for these players. One is Mario, one, another is Mehmet! Strunz doesn't matter, only played 25 percent of the games!

I am finished!

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Erstens: Wir haben nicht offensiv gespielt. Es gibt keine deutsche Mannschaft spielt offensiv und die Namen offensiv wie Bayern. Letzte Spiel hatten wir in Platz drei Spitzen: Elber, Jancker und dann Zickler. Wir mussen nicht vergessen Zickler. Zickler ist eine Spitzen mehr Mehmet e mehr Basler. Ist klar diese Wörter, ist möglich verstehen, was ich hab' gesagt? Dann. Offensiv, offensiv ist wie machen in Platz.

Zweite: Ich habe erklärt mit diese zwei Spieler: Nach Dortmund brauchen vielleicht Halbzeit Pause. Ich habe auch andere Mannschaften gesehen in Europa nach diese Mittwoch. Ich habe gesehen auch zwei Tage de Training. Ein Trainer ist nicht ein Idiot! Ein Trainer sei seht was passieret in Platz. In diese Spiel es waren zwei, drei oder vier Spieler, die waren schwach wie eine Flasche leer!

Haben Sie gesehen Mittwoch, welche Mannschaft hat gespielt Mittwoch? Hat gespielt Mehmet, oder gespielt Basler, oder gespielt Trapattoni? Diese Spieler beklagen mehr als spielen! Wissen Sie, warum die Italien-Mannschaften kaufen nicht diese Spieler? Weil wir haben gesehen viele Male dumme Spiel. Haben gesagt, sind nicht Spieler für die italienisch Meisters.

Strunz! Strunz ist zwei Jahre hier, hat gespielt zehn Spiele, ist immer verletzt. Was erlauben Strunz? Letzte Jahre Meister geworden mit Hamann eh. . . Nerlinger. Diese Spieler waren Spieler und waren Meister geworden. Ist immer verletzt! Hat gespielt 25 Spiele in diese Mannschaft, in diesem Verein! Muss respektieren die andere Kollegen! Haben viel nette Kollegen, stellen sie die Kollegen in Frage! Haben keinen Mut an Worten, aber ich weiss, was denken über diese Spieler!

Mussen zeigen jetzt, ich will, Samstag, diese Spieler mussen zeigen mich e seine Fans, mussen allein die Spiel gewinnen. Ich bin müde jetzt der Vater diese Spieler, eh, Verteidiger diese Spieler! Ich habe immer die Schulde über diese Spieler. Einer ist Mario, einer, ein anderer ist Mehmet! Strunz dagegen egal, hat nur gespielt 25 Prozent de Spiel!

Ich habe fertig!

(3) *Reflecting on what it all means*. Now that you have completed your analysis and gone about 'correcting' Trapattoni's speech by re-writing it in standard German, please discuss/reflect upon the following question in groups or with the whole class:

A. How successful was your group at correcting Trapattoni's German? What proved easy to correct? What was most difficult? Or impossible? Why do you think that is?
B. Would you be able to devise a 'grammar' of Trapattoni's German? Write down a few of the 'rules' or patterns this grammar would have.
C. What part does Italian (Trapattoni's native language) play in your thinking about the speech, or the activity of correcting it so that it matches grammatical German?
D. In light of the video you have watched, can you imagine Trapattoni reading/speaking your corrected version? Why or why not?
E. Moving away from Trapattoni and back to YOU now, discuss how you think you and your German, at your current stage of German proficiency, would be perceived by native-speaking Germans. Can you identify specific features of your own German that would be considered 'off' or 'incorrect' or even comical by Germans? Why are these features a problem?

The goal of the analysis and translation task is for the students not just to see connections between Trapattoni's L1 Italian grammar and the German he uses, but to reflect on his message and the way his grammar is part of the message. They should thus reflect on larger questions of the relationships between the L1, grammar, and identity. Students would hopefully come away from these tasks with an appreciation for the fact that there are all sorts of L2 users of their new language, including, importantly, themselves.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6. Conclusion

This treatment of the amount, roles and place of the L1 in the L2 classroom, focusing in part on the connections between the L1 and Larsen-Freeman's (2003) concept of grammaring, will hopefully lead language instructors at all levels, as well as researchers of instructed L2 learning, to focus their attention on this important issue. This gorilla in the room has been ignored for too long. The view of the L1 as 'resorting' to L1 is neither tenable nor advantageous to the learner. The learners' L1 is a valuable resource, just like the L2 grammar, the textbooks, the teacher, and the cultural production of the learners' new language. Just as it would be unthinkable to teach grammar or vocabulary without an explicit pedagogical approach or framework, so should it be unthinkable to articulate a pedagogy for language teaching and learning without considered attention to co-constructing norms and reflecting critically upon code choice in the language classroom.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to colleagues at the Language Institute at the University of Wisconsin, Madison for their wonderful hospitality, and for their insightful feedback on my presentation. I also thank the anonymous reviewers and Graeme Porte for their helpful comments and suggestions in revising this article for publication.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2008). Position statement on use of the target language in the classroom. www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=4368

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2010). National standards for foreign language learning. www.actfl.org/files/public/StandardsforFLLexecsumm_rev.pdf

Antón, M. & F. J. DiCamilla (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 83.2, 233–247.

Blyth, C. (1995). Redefining the boundaries of language use: The foreign language classroom as a multilingual speech community. In C. Kramsch (ed.), *Redefining the boundaries of language study*. Boston: Heinle, 145–183.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Byrnes, H. (2006). Locating the advanced learner in theory, research, and educational practice: An introduction. In H. Byrnes, H. D. Weger-Guntharp & K. Sprang (eds.), *Educating for advanced foreign language capacities: Constructs, curriculum, instruction, assessment*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1–16.

Chamot, A. U. (2001). The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition. In M. P. Breen (ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman, 25–43.

Chavez, M. (2003). The diglossic foreign language classroom. In C. Blyth (ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms: Contributions of the native, the near-native, and the non-native speaker*. Boston: Heinle, 163–208.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Dailey-O'Cain, J. & G. Liebscher (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 131–144.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Duff, P. A. & C. G. Polio (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal* 74.2, 154–166.
Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27.2, 305–352.
Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp & H. Reinders (eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1–26.
Garafanga, J. (2007). Code-switching as a conversational strategy. In P. Auer & L. Wei (eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 279–314.
Guthrie, E. M. L. (1984). Six cases in classroom communication: A study of teacher discourse in the foreign language classroom. In J. P. Lantolf & A. Labarca (eds.), *Research in second language learning: Focus on the classroom*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 173–194.
Heugh, K., A. Siegrühn & P. Plüddemann (1995). *Multilingual education for South Africa*. Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa, and National Language Project (South Africa). Johannesburg, South Africa: Heinemann.
Hobbs, V., A. Matsuo & M. Payne (2010). Code-switching in Japanese language classrooms: An exploratory investigation of native vs. non-native speaker teacher practice. *Linguistics and Education* 21.1, 44–59.
Kramsch, C. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspective: Approaches through drama and ethnography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16–31.
Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Thomson Heinle.
Lave, J. & E. Wenger (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87.3, 343–364.
Levine, G. S. (2009). Building meaning through code choice in second language learner interaction: A D/discourse analysis and proposals for curriculum design and teaching. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 145–162.
Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Liebscher, G. & J. Dailey-O'Cain (2004). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60.4, 501–525 (Reprinted 2005 in *The Modern Language Journal*, 89.2, 234–247).
Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85.4, 531–548.
Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 35–49.
Modern Language Association (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. www.mla.org/flreport
Myers-Scotton, C. (1995). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Nzwanga, M. A. (2000). *A study of French-English codeswitching in a foreign language college teaching environment*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.
Polio, C. G. & P. A. Duff (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78.3, 313–326.
Roberts, C., M. Byram, A. Barro, S. Jordan & B. Street (2001). *Language learners as ethnographers*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Robinson, P. (2003). Attention and memory during SLA. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 631–678.
Schmidt, R. R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13, 206–226.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Suby, J. & Y. Asencion-Delaney (2009). El uso del español del profesor en las clases de principiantes. *Hispania* 92.3, 593–607.
Swain, M. & S. Lapkin (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research* 4.3, 251–274.
van Lier, L. (1995). *Introducing language awareness*. London: Penguin
van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. London: Longman.
van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Boston: Kluwer.
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman (eds.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wing, B. H. (1980). *The languages of the foreign language classroom: A study of teacher use of the native and target languages for linguistics and communicative functions*. Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

GLENN S. LEVINE (Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin) is associate professor of German at the University of California, Irvine. His research areas include SLA and socialization and curriculum design and teaching. His publications address code choice in second language learning; constructivist, ecological, and critical approaches to curriculum design and teaching; and issues of language program direction. His recent books include *Code choice in the language classroom* (Multilingual Matters, 2011) and *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (co-edited with A. Phipps; Heinle, 2012). Professor Levine is co-editor (with C. Arnett) of the journal *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498 Published online by Cambridge University Press