LESLLA Symposium Proceedings

About the Organization

LESLLA aims to support adults who are learning to read and write for the first time in their lives in a new language. We promote, on a worldwide, multidisciplinary basis, the sharing of research findings, effective pedagogical practices, and information on policy.

LESLLA Symposium Proceedings
https://lesllasp.journals.publicknowledgeproject.org

Website
https://www.leslla.org/

VIDEO-BASED TEACHER TRAINING MATERIAL FOR GERMAN-AS-A-SECOND-LANGUAGE LITERACY TEACHERS[1]

Karen Schramm, Herder-Institute, Leipzig University
Diana Feick, Herder-Institute, Leipzig University

1   Introduction

Teacher training for LESLLA classrooms has been identified as one of the major priorities by members of the EU-Speak project that aims to "capture, celebrate and share local best practice in provision of second language (L2) teaching and professional training of tutors to immigrant adults at Basic User Level" (see EU-Speak 2010-2011).[2] The number of MA programs and in-service teacher training programs in Europe explicitly addressing L2 literacy teaching to immigrant adults seems low compared to the educational challenges we are facing in this domain. The authors of this paper perceive not only the need to expand L2 literacy teacher training to meet the great demand of teachers in this field, but also to discuss on an international scale how such programs can best support professionals in their attempt to acquire and improve the teaching skills needed for their complex work. The question that we would therefore like to address in this paper with regard to German as a second language (GSL) is how video-based tasks can support literacy teacher training. As a starting point, we give a brief overview of literacy-oriented German integration courses in section 2 in order to show the urgent need for teacher training in the field of GSL literacy. Section 3 introduces major characteristics of an in-service teacher training program established at Leipzig University for GSL teachers in literacy classes because it provides the background for our attempts at developing video-based teacher training material. After brief reflections on the general functions of video use in teacher training and the particular challenges of videography in literacy classrooms, section 4 outlines and illustrates the four-step procedure "Watch – Describe – Reflect – Construct Teaching Maxims" that we use in video-observation and transcript-analysis tasks for GSL literacy teacher training.

2   *Demands of GSL literacy education and GSL literacy teacher training*

In 2005, a new immigration law came into effect that has great impact on language learning programs for adult immigrants who either want to live or already live in Germany (Gesetz über den Aufenthalt, die Erwerbstätigkeit und die Integration von Ausländern im Bundesgebiet Aufenthaltsgesetz – AufenthG 2004). For legal entry of immigrant spouses, the law – with some exceptions[3] – requires a certificate of basic oral and written German skills at the A1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference (see Council of Europe 2001).[4] It also obliges immigrant residents with oral or written German skills below the B1 level who receive public welfare or who have been classified as being in special need of integration to participate in a so-called integration course; and it entitles other immigrants with German language skills below the B1 level to the right to participate in these federally subsidized courses at the price of 1€ (euro) per lesson. Integration courses usually comprise 600 lessons of language learning and 45 lessons of so-called (political and cultural) orientation. They aim at oral and written language skills at the B1 level, certified on the basis of a scaled A2-B1 language test that is compulsory for obliged participants. According to the figures of the *Federal Office for Migration and Refugees* (BAMF 2011: 10, 2011: 13), in 2010 83.818 people completed their integration course and 51.791 of those (including 2.570 who repeated the test) passed the test at the B1 level.[5]

After 2005, the number of learners in literacy-oriented integration courses sharply increased and made the urgent need for concepts for LESLLA learners more apparent than ever before in German history. As Table 1 shows, the percentage of learners in GSL literacy classes rose from 4.1 % in 2005 and 2006 to 14.1 % and 13.6 % of all participants in integration courses in 2009 and 2010. Altogether, more than 68.000 learners have attended GSL literacy classes since the establishment of the integration course system (see Table 1). The responsible *Federal Office for Migration and Refugees* (*BAMF*) reacted to this development with a "preliminary framework for integration courses including GSL literacy acquisition" in 2007 (Feldmeier, 2007) and, after two more years of experience and discussion, with the "framework for integration courses including GSL literacy acquisition" in 2009 (Feldmeier, 2009). It allows for 945 to 1245 subsidized lessons for GSL literacy learners (for combined training in literacy, oral language, and language learning autonomy) and provides general methodical and curricular guidelines for teachers in such classes.[6]

---

[3] Exceptions are EU citizens and their spouses, mentally, physically or psychologically challenged persons, persons with a university degree and a so-called discernable lower need of integration, persons who only want to live in Germany temporarily as well as spouses of so-called highly qualified persons, of researchers, of company founders, of persons entitled to political asylum, of refugees, of permanent residents of another EU-state or from Australia, Israel, Japan, Canada, the Republic of Korea, New Zealand or the United States.
[4] For a critical review of the political development, see Krumm's position in Goethe Institut (2009) who argues that the current immigration laws may constitute a violation of the human right of families to be together.
[5] Learners who pass the test at the B1 level within two years of completion of their integration course receive a refund of 50% of their integration course fees; the B1 level also entitles them to permanent residency one year earlier than the regular requirement of 8 years.
[6] For a critical review of the GSL literacy course system, see Schramm (2011).

A survey study conducted in a representative sample of 60 integration courses by the *Federal Office for Migration and Refugees* (Rother, 2010) provides detailed information on the participants of these GSL literacy classes. According to this study, 72.2 % of the learners in GSL literacy classes are women (as opposed to 63.6 % in other integration courses, see Rother, 2010: 17). The average age of the learners is 41.6 years (as opposed to roughly 8 years younger in other integration courses); the age in this survey ranged from 16 to 82 (Rother, 2010: 17). The learners' most frequent first languages are Kurdish (22.4%), Arabic (14.1%), Turkish (11.0%), Russian (9.8%), Albanian (6.1%) and Farsi (4.7%) (Rother, 2010: 23; also see Table 2 on the countries/regions of birth of the learners).

Table 1: Development of absolute numbers and relative percentages of learners in GSL literacy classes

	2005 and 2006[7]	2007[8]	2008[9]	2009[10]	2010[11]
Number of learners in literacy-oriented integration courses	10.215	12.546	16.905	16.338	12.093
Percentage of learners in literacy-oriented integration courses compared to all learners in integration courses	4.1	11.0	13.9	14.1	13.6

Table 2: Countries/regions of birth of the questioned learners according to sex and age (translated from Rother, 2010: 20)

	Number	Percentage total	Percentage male	Percentage female	Mean age
Turkey	112	22.7 %	8.8 %	27.7 %	42.9
West, Central and South Asia (without Iraq)	85	17.2 %	25.0 %	14.4 %	41.0
Iraq	66	13.4 %	25.7 %	8.6 %	31.6
States of the Commonwealth of Independent States	58	11.7 %	19.1 %	8.9 %	47.1
Ex-Yugoslavia and Albania	41	8.3 %	5.1 %	9.5 %	43.2
East and Southeast Asia	36	7.3 %	2.2 %	9.5 %	45.3
Africa (without North Africa)	36	7.3 %	2.2 %	9.5 %	40.3
North Africa	30	6.1 %	2.9 %	6.9 %	43.8
EU-15	13	2.6 %	5.1 %	1.7 %	50.7
EU-12	6	1.2 %	1.5 %	0.9 %	44.2
Middle/South America	6	1.2 %	0.7 %	1.4 %	38.6
Germany	5	1.0 %	1.5 %	0.9 %	27.4

---

[7] See BAMF (2008: 5).
[8] See BAMF (2008: 5).
[9] See BAMF (2009: 3).
[10] See BAMF (2011: 5).
[11] See BAMF (2011: 5).

| Total | 494 | 100.0 % | 100.0 % | 100.0 % | 41.6 |

Unfortunately, the information on learners' level of literacy provided by Rother (see Table 3) is somewhat skewed by a problematic use of terminology; against the background of a total lack of studies in this field, it nevertheless provides helpful hints about course structure. Her report is based on double-checked teacher- and learner-reports. Learners who were able to do so, filled out their written questionnaire in their first language. Other learners were questioned by their teachers orally – if necessary with the help of a translator – who marked the written questionnaires for the learners. Teachers were also asked to complete a written questionnaire concerning their observations of each individual student and concerning themselves and the whole class. In the case of a contradiction between learner and teacher report, Rother (2010) relied on the teacher information; in the case of a missing report, Rother (2010) relied on the single source of information.

On this basis, she considers the percentage of *primarily illiterate learners* to be 37 (also see footnote 13). *Functional illiteracy* in the first language, operationalized by Rother (2010: 28) as reading and writing skills below the B2 level,[12] is reported for another 19% of learners with a non-Roman alphabet in their first language and another 16% of learners using the Roman alphabet to write their first language. Yet another 6.6% of learners have originally acquired writing skills using the Roman alphabet at the B2 level or higher levels, but are now nevertheless considered to be *somewhat functionally illiterate* in their first language (also see footnote 14). Finally, the percentage of so-called *second script learners* with reading and writing skills in a non-Roman alphabet at the B2 level and higher was established as 21.4 % (also see footnote 15).

The challenge of teaching groups of learners who are that heterogeneous in terms of age, language background, and literacy experience is further aggravated by the fact that the oral GSL skills of many participants are very basic; according to teacher-reports, the listening skills of more than 55% of learners are below the A1 level and those of more than 85% of learners are below the A2 level (see Rother, 2010: 32).

Teachers of these heterogeneous GSL literacy classes are certified and experienced in teaching German as a second language, but usually have no formal and little practical background in fostering literacy acquisition: Rother states that "33.3% of them have little or almost no experience in literacy classes, 13.0% have more than 6 months, 24.1 % more than one year, 14.8 % more than three years and another 14.8 % more than five years of experience in literacy classes" (translated from Rother 2010: 16).

To summarize, the recent increase in GSL literacy learner numbers, the challenges posed by learner heterogeneity and low orals skills combined with the fact that integration course teachers from a GSL background usually lack formal education and practical experience in the literacy domain establish an urgent need for teacher training in the field of GSL literacy.

---

[12] The approach taken by Rother (2010) to use the levels of the Common European Framework of Reference to determine functional literacy appears questionable in terms of validity to the authors of this paper.

Table 3: Literacy levels of the questioned learners according to sex and age (translated from Rother, 2010: 29)

	Number	Percentage total	Percentage male	Percentage female	Mean age
Primarily illiterate[13] persons in L1	185	37.0 %	27.2 %	41.4 %	41.2
Functionally illiterate persons in L1 with... a non-Roman alphabet in L1 and an A1, A2 or B1 reading and writing ability in L1	95	19.0 %	25.7 %	15.9 %	41.7
... a Roman alphabet in L1 and an A1, A2 or B1 reading & writing ability in L1	80	16.0 %	11.0 %	18.1 %	43.7
... a Roman alphabet in L1 and a B2, C1 or C2 reading & writing ability in L1[14]	33	6.6 %	2.9 %	7.4 %	42.2
Second-script learners[15] (with B2, C1 or C2 level writing ability in an L1 using a non-Roman alphabet)	107	21.4 %	33.1 %	17.3 %	40.6
Total	500	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	41.6

---

[13] In her study, Rother (2010: 28) defined *primary illiteracy* as being without reading and writing skills. As far as can be reconstructed from the questionnaires used in her study, this concept was operationalized by the following learner and teacher reports: The learner answered that he or she can neither write in his or her mother tongue nor in any other language. The teacher answered that the learner has "no" reading and "no" writing ability in his or her mother tongue (as opposed to "below A1 level", see Rother 2010: 61). The authors of this paper consider the term *total illiteracy* to be more suitable in this case because this operationalization concerns the skills level, not the temporal aspect of whether the students learned how to read and write in school (see Linde 2008).

[14] Rother notes that it is problematic to claim that this group is *functionally illiterate* and therefore calls them "somewhat functionally illiterate" (translated from Rother, 2010: 28). It is not clear from her study whether these learners are *secondarily illiterate* or not.

[15] Using the term *second-script learners* only for learners who have attained at least B2 writing ability in their first language, Rother (2010) considers learners with first language writing ability at a lower level to be *functionally illiterate*. The authors of this paper not only have doubts concerning the teachers' abilities to reliably assess the various L1 reading and writing skills of their learners, but also question Rother's use of terminology that does not distinguish between non-Roman alphabets and non-alphabetic scripts. Problematically, she defines *second-script learners* as learners "who have attained functional literacy in a non-Roman alphabet" and "who thus focus on learning a second script in the integration course" (translated from Rother, 2010: 28) – thereby simply overlooking the fact that non-alphabetic writing systems exist.

3   The Leipzig teacher training program for GSL teachers in literacy classes

To address the aforementioned reasons, we established the Leipzig program for in-service GSL literacy teachers at the Herder Institute of Leipzig University in 2008 (see Heintze & Schramm, 2010). It consists of 16 modules of five 45-minutes lessons usually offered on eight weekends (Friday afternoon and Saturday morning) over the span of nearly one year. Figure 1 shows the titles of the modules that are closely related to the relevant standards set by the *Federal Office for Migration and Refugees* (*BAMF*) for GSL literacy teacher training and that therefore allow for a certification by the *Federal Office for Migration and Refugees*. Despite their usually high workload caused by their employment as rather low-paid freelancers[16], more than 120 teachers have completed this ambitious program that particularly aims at a strong interrelatedness of practical and theoretical issues. In one direction, the practical experiences and particularly the challenges faced by teacher participants generate the research agenda on GSL literacy at the Herder-Institute, and in the other direction we use case studies, learner data etc. from published and ongoing research in the teacher training program. This fruitful exchange has also led us to team-teach most of our modules in pairs of an experienced GSL literacy classroom teacher and a GSL literacy researcher. Using a moodle platform, an open source community-based e-learning environment, the program aims at building sustainable networks of teachers who continue to discuss classroom problems and to exchange ideas and material for their daily teaching after they have completed the 16 modules.

Module 1:	Target groups and goals of L2 literacy programs
Module 2:	Socio-cultural aspects and learner biographies
Module 3:	Linguistic aspects of literacy acquisition
Module 4:	Teaching methods for the literacy classroom
Module 5:	Placement, counselling, and learner evaluation
Module 6:	Learning difficulties / dyslexia
Module 7:	Phonological awareness
Module 8:	Contrastive elements in L2 literacy programs
Module 9:	Learner autonomy
Module 10:	Activity-orientation / literacy as social practice
Module 11:	Building (oral) vocabulary and grammar
Module 12:	Visual material in the L2 literacy classroom
Module 13:	Teaching material (development)
Module 14:	Digital media in the L2 literacy classroom
Module 15:	Transferable teaching skills
Module 16:	Transitions from literacy classrooms to regular integration courses

Figure 1:   Modules of the Leipzig in-service teacher training program for GSL literacy teachers

[16] According to figures of the Ministry of the Interior, payment varies between less than 10 € to 25 € per lesson (Bundesministerium des Inneren 2006: 158.)

Constant evaluation by the teacher participants helps us to maintain and improve the quality of the program. A particular focus of quality improvement in 2010 and 2011 has been the integration of video material into several modules. We were able to reach this goal in a joint project with the Goethe Institute München that funded the development of video-based teacher training material for German-as-a-foreign-language teachers preparing spouses to pass the A1 level test (see Feick, Heintze & Schramm, 2010 and also Feick, Heintze & Schramm, in progress). The next section therefore outlines functions of video use in teacher training (section 4.1) and highlights aspects that are particular to videography in the L2 literacy classroom (section 4.2). We then make a suggestion on how to structure video observation (section 4.3) and transcript-analysis tasks (section 4.4).

4   Video-based GSL literacy teacher training

4.1   General functions of video use in teacher training

Since the TIMSS[17]-studies in 1995 and 1999 "have elicited a world-wide boom of video-based classroom studies" (translated from Pauli & Reusser, 2006: 775), the field of foreign language teaching has increasingly inquired into the particular research potential of videos and multimedia transcriptions for analyzing foreign language lessons (e.g., see Chavez, 2007; DESI-Konsortium, 2006; Dufficy, 2004; Mackey, 2006; Mempel, 2010; Morgan, 2007; Ricart Brede, 2011) and for teacher training (e.g., see Gregersen, 2007; Helmke et al., 2007; Mackey, Polio & McDonough, 2004; Osam & Balbay, 2004). In their review of video-based research on language teaching and learning, Schramm & Aguado (2010) conclude that video use holds high potential for language teacher training:

> Of particular interest for teacher training seems to be the video-based, co-operative, multi-perspective co-construction of professionally relevant knowledge and the joint development of alternative ways of action; these require critical, respectful as well as appreciative observations of lessons taught by others or by oneself. Detailed discussions of "cases" – be they one's own or those of colleagues –, serve (a) to heighten self-perception, (b) to detect habits and patterns, (c) to identify action-directing cognitions and finally (d) to develop alternative behavior and action patterns.
> (translated from Schramm & Aguado 2010: 209)

An important advantage of using videos as opposed to the observation of ongoing lessons is that they provide opportunities for collaborative reflection that is free from the time and action constraints in the classroom, and that they still allow for practically oriented, easily transferable, inductive learning from real lesson incidences. As Pauli & Reusser (2006: 792) have pointed out, they can also serve as reference objects for the development of a professional language.

[17] TIMSS = Third International Mathematics and Science Study.

4.2 *Videography in the L2 literacy classroom*

In order to be able to use these advantages for teacher training in the field of GSL literacy, we need videos taken in such classrooms. In our videographic documentation of so far 42 GSL literacy lessons, several decisions were related to the specific nature of these classrooms. In the pre-production phase, access to learner groups was of special concern to us because we expected reluctance to videography on the side of the learners either related to an Islamic background or possibly due to shame concerning weak reading and writing skills. Ex-participants of the teacher training program outlined in section 3 and partner institutions for L2 literacy training from the EU-Speak project proved to be helpful gatekeepers in our attempts at winning the informed consent of learners to a videographic data collection. Written consent forms were explained to the students in detail by their teachers, and a payment of 30.00 € (in 2010) or 40.00 € (in 2011) was offered to them. The teacher received a payment of 50.00 € in 2010 and 100.00 € in 2011 for the additional effort of preparing and coordinating the videography with the camera team. Using a digital hand-held camera, two external microphones and no artificial illumination, a documentary film team of only two was to focus particularly on individual learning processes, partner and group interaction, but also to capture relevant teacher activities.

In the production phase, the deployment of a young cameraman with an immigration background may have increased the learners' confidence. He followed learner actions intuitively (e.g., gestures, dialogues) and used a combination of close-ups, medium shots and long shots to capture learning and classroom interaction conflicts in an audiovisually aesthetic way. A focus on close-ups of individual learners, especially their hands and working material, helped to capture the difficulties of LESLLA learners in (pre)writing and (pre)reading activities.

In the post-production phase, the cameraman cut and edited the material following dramaturgic principles (e.g., lesson phases and conflicts). Second language literacy experts used these videos to produce screening protocols concerning the chronological organization of the lesson and particularly the thematic relevance for specific teacher training modules. The chosen sequences retain their original order and synchronic sound, yet are narrated through the montage of shots of classroom scenes. In many cases, the combination of audible learner-teacher dialogues and visible close-ups of hands working with the material reveal problem solution processes generated by a task.

Without doubt, it is time-consuming and thus costly to produce such professional video material. For a two-day shooting of a class with eight to ten lessons, we needed about 70 hours of pre- and post-production including the selection of material for task development. The ratio of video material selected for the teacher trainer tasks to the edited material was 1:3.[18] This selected video material then served as the basis for the production of video-observation tasks (see section 4.3) and of transcript-analysis tasks (see section 4.4).

4.3 *Video-observation tasks*

The video-observation tasks we developed usually follow a four-step procedure outlined in Figure 2. In the first step, teacher participants are asked to watch the

---

[18] The ratio of selected material to filmed raw material was 1: 4,5.

sequence at least once. The video material might show a longer classroom sequence (e.g., a lesson of 45 minutes) that has been reduced to a video sequence of about 10 minutes by focusing on the lesson's transitions between phases and/or representative pieces of each lesson phase so that the macro-structure of the lesson becomes apparent. Such macro-structural video sequences lend themselves to a reconstruction of the learning goals in step 2 and a critical appraisal concerning their sequential arrangement in step 3. Such critical appraisal can, for example, be based on a comparison with a theoretical sequence model and can include suggestions for improvement such as re-organizing the order of the lesson phases, changing, or enriching them. Step 3 also includes the responsible group's selection of a video segment for presentation to the whole class and its critical appraisal by the expert groups that serves as the basis for discussion in the whole group. This discussion does not necessarily have to lead to a group consensus concerning teaching maxims for each participant's own professional action. Instead, teacher participants are encouraged to construct autonomous teaching maxims and to share these with the group.

Step 1:	Watch	Watching the video 1-3 times
Step 2:	Describe	Describing the sequence
Step 3:	Reflect	Critical appraisal of colleague's work
Step 4:	Construct	Constructing maxims on own future teaching
		Sharing of individual teaching maxims

Figure 2:   Four-step procedure "WaDeReCon"

Alternatively, the video-observation task sequence might be a short sequence of typically only 1 to 5 minutes with a focus on the micro-level; such video sequences allow for contrasting methodic procedures or for observing individual learning processes.

4.4 *Transcript-analysis tasks*

In addition to the video-observation tasks, we developed transcript analysis tasks that require a closer analysis of teacher-learner or learner-learner interactions. The basic structure of the four-step procedure of WaDeReCon remains, but with these tasks, teacher participants are encouraged to watch the video first and then follow the exact details in the transcript when they re-start the video sequence for a second time. Figure 3 shows an example of a transcript produced with the software EXMARaLDA (see Rehbein et al., 2004) using basic HIAT conventions (see Ehlich, 1992). The transcript provides information on simultaneous actions like a musical score does. One line documents the verbal actions of the teacher with the pseudonym L; another line shows the verbal action of a student with the pseudonyms ALMI. The five score areas numbered 8 to 12 show part of a student-teacher interaction on the German definite plural "die" (English: "the"). The two-page transcript that we work on with teacher participants is longer than the excerpt shown in Figure 3.

For the second step of describing the video sequence, we consider scaffolds like the one shown in Figure 4 to be helpful. On the left, the excerpt from an exemplary table lists the German student and teacher utterances which have been translated into English for the purpose of this paper. On the right hand side, the teacher participants

are expected to reconstruct the linguistic action steps realized by these utterances. Figure 4 shows four scaffolded examples of reconstructions on the right hand side. Likewise, teacher participants are expected to reconstruct the action steps at other points in the transcript that seem especially noteworthy in order to gain insights into this particular video sequence. The gray areas provide a segmentation at a higher grain-size level; the teacher participants are encouraged to find headings for these larger segments and thus reconstruct the interaction of students and teachers in the videotaped and transcribed sequence at a macro-level after they have finished the micro-level analysis of linguistic action steps.

The third step (reflect) in this transcript-analysis task aims at a critical appraisal of the teacher's classroom interaction. The complete material of the example excerpts shown in Figures 3 and 4 document an interaction between an Arab student who is trying to test his hypothesis that "many [items]" (see Figure 3, score area 8) always take the German article *die* (English *the*, plural) and a teacher who uses the explanation that "[w]ith, with two items [it's] always *die*" (see Figure 3, score area 8). The German language does not morphologically differentiate between a dual and a plural; therefore the teacher's focus on two items seems to be motivated by having talked about body parts like hands, eyes and ears that come in pairs of two. The student, whose first language Arabic does differentiate between dual and plural morphemes, however,

[8]

L	Okay.	Bei, bei zwei Sachen immer "die".	
L [en]	Okay.	With, with two items always "die".	
ALMI	Bei viele immer "die"?		Immer
ALMI [en]	With many always "die"?		Always

[9]

L	Wenn Sie zwei...		Genau!
L [en]	If you have two...		Exactly!
ALMI	"die".	((unverständlich, 0,5s)) zwei oder viele.	
ALMI [en]	"die".	((incomprehensible, 0,5s)) two or many.	

[10]

L	Genau. Bei vielen, ne? Bei vielen.	Immer "die", ne? Also, *die*	
L [en]	Exactly. With many, right? With many.	Always "die", right? So, "*die*"	
ALMI	Bei viele.	Immer "die".	
ALMI [en]	With many.	Always "die".	

[11]

L	Ohren, *die* Hände, *die* Füße, *die* Beine...		*Die*
L [en]	ears, "*die*" hands,	"*die*" feet, "*die*" legs...	"*Die*" eyes.
ALMI	Die Füße, die Augen ((unverständlich, 1s)).		
ALMI [en]	"*Die*" feet, "*die*" eyes ((incomprehensible, 1s)).		

[12]

L	Augen. Genau.	Die Haare.	
L [en]	Exactly.	"*Die*" hair.	
ALMI	Die Haare.		
ALMI [en]	"*Die*" hair.		

Figure 3: Example of a transcript used in step 1 (with translations into English)

UTTERANCES		LINGUISTIC ACTION STEPS	
STUDENT(S)	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)	TEACHER
First round (transcript score area 8-9):			
Bei viele immer „die"? *With many always "die"?*	Bei, bei zwei Sachen immer „die". *With, with two items always "die".*	*Asks for confirmation of his rule hypothesis concerning "many".*	*Confirms the rule hypothesis concerning "two".*
Immer „die". *Always "die".*	Wenn Sie zwei... *If you have two...*	*Repeats the application part of the rule.*	*Repeats the condition for rule application.*
Second round (transcript score area 9-10):			

Figure 4:   Example of a reconstruction table used for description in step 2 (translated into English)

Singular	Dual	Plural
رقبة واحدة	رقبتان	خمس رقبات
(raqaba wāḥida)	(raqabatān)	(ḫams raqabat)
Literally: "neck–GENDER one–GENDER"	Literally: "neck–DUAL."	Literally: "five neck–PLURAL."
Meaning: "a neck"	Meaning: "two necks"	Meaning: "five necks"

Figure 5:   Example of linguistic input used for critical appraisal of colleague's work in step 3[19]

insists on testing his many-items-hypothesis by introducing the German plural *Haare* (English: *hair*, see Figure 3, score area 12). Before teacher participants discuss the videotaped and transcribed teacher's interaction with the Arab student, we introduce morphological information on the Arabic language as shown in Figure 5 as well as impulses to study this chart.

Finally, the fourth step involves the individual construction of action maxims by teacher participants for their own classrooms. In this particular example, the conclusions that we draw from the analysis and confront the teacher participants with after they have drawn their own conclusions are the following:

(a) When students initiate conversation about language (here: grammar), I support and encourage them in this affair by providing time to the issues raised by them and by highlighting conversation about language as highly desirable.

(b) To be able to understand L1-driven learner agendas, I listen very closely in order to understand learner concepts.

[19] Information that appears in English has been translated from German that appears in the original GSL teacher training material.

(c) If I do not speak the student's first language, I ask him or her for a comparison with the first language (contrastive approach).

(d) When such L1-related incidences occur, I try to learn about features of the student's first language from linguistic reference tools (e.g., see Buschfeld & Schöneberger, 2010) after class.

The suggested analysis and critical appraisal of an empirically documented teacher-student interaction on a linguistically informed basis is to serve as an example on how we envision the use of video-based transcript-analysis tasks in GSL literacy teacher training. It relies on the same pattern of watching, describing, reflecting, and constructing individual teaching maxims for use in the classroom as we suggested for video observation tasks in section 4.3.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we intended to show that in Germany, an urgent need for GSL literacy teacher instruction has arisen since the introduction of the integration course system in 2005. We briefly sketched the Leipzig teacher training program for GSL literacy teachers in order to describe video-based teacher training material that we developed for this context. Videography in the L2 literacy classroom is an ethically, financially, and artistically challenging endeavor that, if done well, can serve for the development of video-observation tasks and transcript-analysis tasks. With examples, we illustrated a four-step procedure (WaDeReCon) for working with such video-based tasks. Further action research and more encompassing research on teaching skills (see e.g., Seidel & Prenzel, 2007) needs to provide empirical evidence of how successful such video-based tasks are, if implemented on a larger scale or in blended learning concepts.

References

BAMF (Ed.) (2008). *Bericht zur Integrationskursgeschäftsstatistik für den Zeitraum 01.01.2008 bis 30.09.2008*. Online: http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/cln_160/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Integration/Downloads/Integrationskurse/Kurstraeger/Statistiken/001__2008__3__Quartale__integrationskursgeschaeftsstatistik__de,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/001_2008_3_Quartale_integrationskursgeschaeftsstatistik_de.pdf; retrieved on 20.07.2011.

BAMF (Ed.) (2009). *Bericht zur Integrationskursgeschäftsstatistik für das erste Halbjahr 2009*. Online: http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/cln_178/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Integration/Downloads/Integrationskurse/Kurstraeger/Statistiken/2009__integrationskursgeschaeftsstatistik__Halbjahr_201__de,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/2009_integrationskursgeschaeftsstatistik_Halbjahr%201_de.pdf; retrieved on 20.07.2011.

BAMF (Ed.) (2011). *Bericht zur Integrationskursgeschäftsstatisitk für das Jahr 2010*. Online: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Downloads/Infothek/Integrationskurse/Kurstraeger/Statistiken/2010-integrationskursgeschaeftsstatistik-de.pdf?__blob=publicationFile; retrieved on 21.07.2010.

Bundesministerium des Inneren (Ed.) (2006). *Evaluation der Integrationskurse nach dem Zuwanderungsgesetz. Abschlussbericht und Gutachten über Verbesserungspotenziale bei der Umsetzung der Integrationskurse*. Online: http://www.bmi.bund.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Veroeffentlichungen/evaluation_integrationskurse_de.pdf?__blob=publicationFile; retrieved on 09.08.2011.

Buschfeld, S., & Schöneberger, C. (2010). Kontrastive Alphabetisierung Deutsch-Arabisch: Linguistische und didaktische Überlegungen. In Roll, H. & Schramm, K. (Eds.). *Deutsch als Zweitsprache für analphabetische Lerner. Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachtheorie* 76: 61-73.

Chavez, M. M. (2007). The orientation of learner language use in peer work: teacher role, learner role and individual identity. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 2: 161- 188.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DESI-Konsortium (Ed.) (2006). *Unterricht und Kompetenzerwerb in Deutsch und Englisch. Zentrale Befunde der Studie Deutsch-Englisch-Schülerleistungen-International (DESI)*. Frankfurt a.M.: DIPF.

Dufficy, P. (2004). Predisposition to choose: the language of an information gap task in a multilingual primary classroom. *Language Teaching Research* 8, 3: 241- 261.

Ehlich, K. (1992). HIAT - a transcription system for discourse data. In: Edwards, J. & Lampert, M. (Eds.). *Talking data – Transcription and coding in discourse research*. (pp. 123-148). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

EU-Speak (2010-2011). Online: http://www.eu-speak.org; retrieved on 20.07.2011.

Feick, D., Heintze, A., & Schramm, K. (Eds.) (2010). *Fokus Alphabetisierung bei der Sprachförderung im Rahmen des Ehegattennachzugs. Für Lehrkräfte und Multiplikatoren der Goethe-Institute und ihrer Partner*. München / Leipzig: Goethe-Institut / Universität Leipzig, Herder-Institut.

Feick, D., Heintze, A., & Schramm, K. (Eds.) (in progress). *Alphabetisierung in Deutsch als Zweitsprache*. München: Langenscheidt.

Feldmeier, A. (2007). *Vorläufiges Konzept für einen bundesweiten Integrationskurs mit Alphabetisierung*. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.

Feldmeier, A. (2009). *Konzept für einen bundesweiten Alphabetisierungskurs*. Online: http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Downloads/Infothek/Integrationskurse/Kurstraeger/Konzeptel.eitfaeden/konz-f-bundesw-ik-mit-alphabet.pdf?__blob=publicationFile, retrieved on 21.07.2011.

Gesetz über den Aufenthalt, die Erwerbstätigkeit und die Integration von Ausländern im Bundesgebiet Aufenthaltsgesetz – AufenthG (2004). *Bundesgesetzblatt 2004*, 1, 41: 1950-1977.

Goethe-Institut e. V. (Ed.) (2009). Streitgespräch. Sprachförderung für nachziehende Ehepartner – Strategie zur Ausgrenzung oder Beitrag zur Integration? Goethe-Institut e.V. Zentrale. *Sprachen, Identitäten & Integration*. München, 21-23.

Gregersen, T. (2007). Breaking the code of silence: a study of teachers' nonverbal decoding accuracy of foreign language anxiety. *Language Teaching Research* 11, 2: 209-221.

Heintze, A., & Schramm, K. (2010). Der Leipziger Lehrgang für DaZ-Lehrkräfte in der Alphabetisierungsarbeit. *Deutsch als Zweitsprache*. 75-79.

Helmke, A., Helmke, T., Kleinbub, I., Nordheider, I., Schrader, F.-W. & Wagner, W. (2007). Die DESI-Videostudie. *Der fremdsprachliche Unterricht - Englisch*, 41, 90: 37-44.

Linde, A. (2008). *Literalität und Lernen. Eine Studie über das Lesen- und Schreibenlernen im Erwachsenenalter*. Münster: Waxmann.

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 27, 3: 405-430.

Mackey, A., Polio, C., & McDonough, K. (2004). The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 3: 301-327.

Mempel, C. (2010). Multimedia-Transkription nonverbaler Kommunikation am Beispiel der Bilderbuchbetrachtung im Deutsch-als-Zweitsprache-Unterricht. Aguado, K., Schramm, K., & Vollmer, H. J. (Eds.). *Fremdsprachliches Handeln beobachten, messen und evaluieren. Neue methodische Ansätze der Kompetenzforschung und Videographie* (pp. 231-255). Berlin u.a.: Peter Lang.

Morgan, A. (2007). Using video-stimulated recall to understand young children's perceptions of learning in classroom settings. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal* 15, 2: 213-226.

Osam, U. V., & Balbay, S. (2004). Investigating the decision-making skills of cooperating teachers and student teachers of English in a Turkish context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20:* 745-758.

Pauli, C. & Reusser, K. (2006). Von international vergleichenden Video Surveys zur videobasierten Unterrichtsforschung und -entwicklung. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 52, 6: 774-798.

Rehbein, J., Schmidt, T., Meyer, B., Watzke, F., & Herkenrath, A. (2004). Handbuch für das computergestützte Transkribieren nach HIAT. *Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit*, Folge B, 56. Online: http://www.exmaralda.org/files/azm_56.pdf; retrieved on 21.07.2011.

Ricart Brede, J. (2011). *Videobasierte Qualitätsanalyse vorschulischer Sprachfördersituationen*. Freiburg i. Br.: Fillibach.

Rother, N. (2010). *Das Integrationspanel. Ergebnisse einer Befragung von Teilnehmenden zu Beginn ihres Alphabetisierungskurses. Working Paper 29*. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.

Schramm, K., & Aguado, K. (2010). Videographie in den Fremdsprachendidaktiken – Ein Überblick. Aguado, K.; Schramm, K. & Vollmer, H. J. (Eds.). *Fremdsprachliches Handeln beobachten, messen und evaluieren. Neue methodische Ansätze der Kompetenzforschung und Videographie* (pp. 185-214). Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang,.

Schramm, K. (2011). Fünf Jahre Integrationskurse mit Alphabetisierung – Thesen zu einer kritischen Bilanz. Bundesverband Alphabetisierung und Grundbildung e.V., & Bothe, J. (Ed.) (2011). Funktionaler Analphabetismus im Kontext von Familie und Partnerschaft (pp. 223-228). Münster: Waxmann.

Seidel, T., & Prenzel, M. (2007). Wie Lehrpersonen Unterricht wahrnehmen und einschätzen – Erfassung pädagogisch-psychologischer Kompetenzen mit Videosequenzen. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 10/8 [Sonderheft *Kompetenzdiagnostik*]: 201-216.