3 Making the strange familiar – reflexivity and language awareness in the EMI classroom / By Virginia Suter Reich and Andrea Müller

3.1 Introduction[3]

The introduction of English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in the classroom of third-level education signifies certain changes. Lecturing in another language, commonly a non-native language, disrupts habitual communicative activities in the classroom (see Studer, this publication). Moreover, it challenges teaching practices and established role conceptions of lecturers and students. In any case, the change of the communicative medium creates a new situation in the classroom. It makes the familiar strange. Accordingly, teaching routines and practices that seemed to work cannot be taken for granted anymore. These disruptions provoke a feeling of strangeness among lecturers and students. They feel as if they are acting in an artificial situation.

In this paper we focus on lecturers who are experiencing this strangeness when they teach through English and we ask how they can best deal with these challenging circumstances. With reference to an ethnographic perspective, it will be argued that the experience of strangeness gives a natural opportunity to reflect on teaching and learning performances. Therefore, we put forward the suggestion to integrate observation practices and reflexive approaches into didactic interventions for lecturers who have to cope with the new situation EMI creates for them. In other words, the lecturers who teach through English should profit from the chance that an unfamiliar classroom setting offers for self-evaluation and self-development.

The paper starts with a theoretical introduction to ethnography. Different approaches to reflexive didactics will then be compared and combined with ethnographic methods, especially with self-observation. Both self-observation and reflexivity will be proposed as instruments to gain knowledge of classroom performance in situations of strangeness and as catalysts for developing language awareness. Finally, it will be shown how these instruments can be integrated in EMI teacher training, while referring to our own experiences from a workshop for EMI-lecturers.

3.2 Learning from the unfamiliar

How can we deal with unfamiliarity? How can we understand it and make it useful for our tasks? A research approach that traditionally deals with alienation and unfamiliarity is ethnography. Ethnography means two things. On the one hand, it describes a specific research approach with its proper methods and

[3] This paper has been revised and stylistically edited by Paul Kelly.

instruments. On the other hand, the term refers to the research findings as such, to the written account in a narrative form.

In contrast to other qualitative approaches, ethnography introduces the quasi-unguided participant observation as a specific method for collecting data. During participant observation, the researcher takes part in people's everyday life. At the same time, he or she ought to observe and to analyse practices and shared (or even disputed) cultural knowledge with a certain distance. The researcher takes part in activities, is involved in discussions and spends a lot of time being present in everyday routine situations and in moments without explicit relevance. Through engaging in participant observation, the researcher accumulates what Clifford Geertz (1973) termed a "thick description". The term contrasts with any superficial account of behaviour or belief systems. The thickness thus relates to the exploration of the layers of meaning to be found in the subjective lifeworld.

In the late 19th century, Social Anthropologists established this branch of research and used its approach especially for investigations among members of non-written societies in former colonial regions. Today, social scientists from very different disciplines working with a qualitative research focus on the micro level use ethnographic research designs for their projects. Nevertheless, the basic benefit of the approach has not much changed. It goes for the simple credo: *making the strange familiar*. In other words, the researcher spends a large amount of his or her time in the research field in interaction with a local cultural group to gain familiarity with the ordinary, everyday life of the members of that culture. By getting inside the meanings of others' cultural selves, researchers also reflect on the meaning of their own cultural identity.

Reflexivity is a key principle of ethnography. The researcher's subjective involvement and interpretations have to be reflected in the ethnography as a written account. This includes recognition on the part of the researcher that he or she belongs to the social world he or she studies, and that he or she is also culture-bound. In other words, ethnographers should challenge their position in the field and in the research process. They should rethink their theoretical, methodological, social, political or cultural perspective and bring it in line with the research findings. Thus, researchers continuously distance themselves from the familiar by not taking anything for granted. They ought to critically and reflectively integrate themselves into the ethnographic contribution. Reflexivity thus means questioning one's habitual ways of thinking and the assumptions about how others think. It is a specific strategy of gaining knowledge.

While there is a clear vision of ethnography as explaining or interpreting cultural and social practices of others, the use of ethnographic approaches in a practical and policy-making context at home – such as the higher education environment – normally requires a different conceptualisation of ethnography. Accordingly, the social psychologist Dan Goodley (2007) suggests inverting the aim of ethnography if it is introduced by practitioners for evaluating or reflecting on their own practices and cultural dynamics. The aim would then be to *render the*

familiar strange. In this sense, ethnography for practitioners is about challenging practices, roles, dynamics and policies within a familiar context. It is about turning social contexts into research contexts. The same is true for every ethnographic research in a familiar societal setting. Hammersley & Atkinson (1995) ask therefore for a certain self-reflection and naivety, what they call "anthropological strangeness":

> Even where he or she is researching a familiar group or setting, the participant observer is required to treat it as "anthropologically strange" in an effort to make explicit the assumptions he or she takes for granted as a culture member. Hammersley & Atkinson 1995: 9

Making strange, which involves consciously distancing oneself from the familiar and not taking anything for granted, is essential for the ethnographic process of gaining knowledge. It asks for a certain reflexivity and "bestrangement" (Amann & Hirschauer 1997: 12).

Bringing such a perspective together with our main interest, the introduction of EMI in higher education, it can be stated that EMI renders the familiar classroom situation 'anthropologically strange', because habitual communicative and didactic practices are challenged and fixed role conceptions between lecturers and students have to be mutually re-negotiated. In other words, through the change of the communicative medium, lecturers can more easily distance themselves from the familiar and unquestioned teaching routine and situation. EMI thus offers lecturers who teach through English for the first time a good opportunity to critically reflect on their own teaching practices or attitudes and to integrate reflexive activities into their didactic and teaching development.

In the following sections these thoughts will be integrated in the existing discourse of reflexivity in didactics. Moreover, reflexivity will be discussed from a more practical point of view. Firstly, we approach the introduction of reflective practices to teacher training in general. Secondly, it will be shown how reflexivity can be integrated into EMI teacher training.

3.3 Reflexivity and reflective practice in didactics

With reference to Adler (1991), Matthews & Jessel (1998) have identified three broad approaches to reflective practice in higher education. The first approach stems from Cruikshank (1987) and defines "reflective teaching" as a specific method of self-evaluation with which one assesses teaching practices in relation to a predefined repository of good teaching behaviours (Matthews & Jessel 1998: 231). Unlike the reliance upon a corpus of prescribed good teaching practices, the second approach deals more with a tacit form of knowledge that practitioners reproduce in their everyday teaching performances without making it explicit. This form of practical knowledge is not easily described or fixed, but contextually

dependent (Matthews & Jessel 1998: 232). Self-reflection then should help to make such knowledge more explicit so that it can be applied with more control and be mediated to others. Schön (1983) calls this process "reflection-in-action". Matthews & Jessel identify a third approach which concerns reflection that should go beyond the concrete situation in the classroom. Factors such as social, historical or institutional conditions that can affect or determine certain teaching practices also have to be considered. This specific conception of reflection has the aim to challenge existing assumptions underlying the everyday teaching practice and the (broader) context in which teaching takes place (see Zeichner 1981, Zeichner & Liston 1987).

Matthew & Jessel (1998: 234) take this third approach as a starting point for their own understanding of the term. Their conception then focuses more on reflection about the self, including beliefs, values and attitudes. They ask for an ethic of reflective practice that encourages lecturers to evaluate their own concepts (Matthew & Jessel 1998: 233). Similarly, the range of work being done under the banner of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices deals with the situated selves of teachers, "as if it were a text to be critically interrogated and interpreted within the broader social, political, and historical contexts that shape our thoughts and actions and constitute our world" (Pithouse, Mitchell & Weber 2009: 45). In contrast, Burke & Dunn's definition of reflexive didactics corresponds to the power relations within educational institutions and within wider society (Burke & Dunn 2006: 228) and therefore bears a strong relation to the tradition of reflexive sociology (see e.g. Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). It includes not only the teacher's self-reflection about his subjectivity and positionality on the subject of study, but also encourages students to examine the contextuality of learning and knowledge (Burke & Dunn 2006: 219–221).

The linguist Antonie Hornung, who published different papers on the introduction of Content and Language integrated Learning (CLIL) in second level education, (see, for example, Hornung 2004, Hornung 2006) could also be situated in this third approach to reflective practice. She argues for a model of reflexive didactics that balances between the self and the determining institutional environment. Principally, she defines the process of reflection in a sociological perspective: Just as social scientists have to reflect their own position in their field of research, so teachers should scrutinise their position and interests in their institution or even beyond it (Hornung 2004: 439). Moreover, Hornung defines the classroom community – including lecturers and students – as a social world, within which a shared understanding of social and communicative behaviours is constantly negotiated. Such negotiations are not arbitrary, but framed by societal conditions. In the case of third-level education, these are for example institutional factors like political interests or competition between disciplines, educational planning and targets, forms of organisation or established role conceptions of lecturers and students. Within this realm, the classroom community can negotiate about specific forms of didactics and teaching methods, about the focus in the teaching subject or role perceptions.

Yet, the introduction of EMI or CLIL challenges the established understanding of social and communicative behaviours within the classroom community (Hornung 2004: 439). It raises different questions and uncertainties that have to be re-negotiated (Hornung 2007: 438). Hornung suggests that lecturers who switch to English or another non-native language should reflect on their motivations and communicative-didactic behaviour, since they are involved in more complex social and communicative relations than they are while teaching in their (and the students') mother tongue. Reflections thus should help to evaluate one's teaching practice and be realised by self-observation. Self-observation should focus both on subjectivity and communicative behaviour in the classroom (Hornung 2004: 441). For the evaluation of the communicative behaviour, Hornung refers to Karl Bühler's 1934 model of communication (Auer 1999) that establishes three communication functions: the expressive, the referential and the conative function.

Hornung thus describes the central elements of communicative behaviour in the bilingual classroom that should be reflected through self-observation. However, she does not give any further methodological explanations as to how to cope with self-observation in the EMI-classroom. Therefore, we suggest adding to Hornung's model an ethnographic perspective and focusing more on the act of observing as a moment of creativity and knowledge development.

In the following sections, we will show how Hornung's reflexive teaching model can be combined with ethnographic methods and illustrate the integration of such an approach in EMI teacher training. For this purpose, insights from the teacher training workshops that were held in the context of our pilot project will be discussed.

3.4 Reflexivity in EMI teacher training

Most of the lecturers who were involved in the pilot project participated in further teacher training, more precisely, half-day workshops in groups of around ten lecturers, coached by the authors. One of the key aims of these workshops was to raise the lecturers' awareness of reflexive practices in the classroom. For this purpose, reflexivity was introduced in two different ways. First, reflexivity as a practice was stimulated in the workshop itself, when lecturers were asked to systematically think about their teaching and share their experiences in discussion with colleagues and trainers. Second, reflexive practices such as focused self-observation and the use of a lecture diary were introduced as practices for the individual evaluation of their performance and further development of their teaching practices.

Considering the important role that language plays when lectures are given through a foreign language, the superordinate aim of these instruments for reflection is to enhance lecturers' language awareness (Pinho et al. 2011; Roberts

et al. 2001). By language awareness we mean lecturers' knowledge about what the foreign language is 'doing' in the classroom, and about the influence the new medium of communication has on their routine practices. Similar to Roberts et al.'s "language learners as ethnographers" approach (Roberts et al. 2001), lecturers in EMI could also profit from acting as ethnographers. By analysing their own performance, they come to understand the meanings of interactions and how specific ways of speaking are linked to them. As they are themselves involved in these interactions, they at the same time participate, challenge and analyse these interactions (Roberts et al. 2001: 10). This concept of language awareness, moreover, recognises the different roles EMI lecturers play: they are speakers, learners and lecturers all at the same time (Pinho et al. 2011: 43).

In the workshops, an attempt was made to introduce reflexivity in a way that lecturers come to understand it as a useful process with a favourable effect on their teaching practices. Providing exercises, input, and concrete analytical tools to initiate the reflective process was considered important for this purpose.

3.4.1 Coaching reflexivity

Integrating reflexivity exercises in teacher training is a very common approach in recent literature on reflective teaching and teacher training (Brandt 2008; Hillier 2002; Gün 2011; Stanley 2012; Wallace 1996). It is widely accepted that lecturers should receive training in reflexive practices where they acquire skills to become "critically reflective teachers" (Brookfield 1995). It is argued that teacher trainers cannot just tell teachers to reflect and expect that this will automatically lead to a change in their lecturing practices (Russel 2005: 203). On the contrary, "[…] 'reflection' can become more effective through systematic training and practice. When reflection is only preached, it is more likely that it will not be embraced and subsequently pursued by the participants" (Gün 2011: 126). Hence, according to Hillier's understanding, the ability to reflect on your own professional practices must be seen as a "journey" for which you "have to be kitted up" (2002: 25).

On this "journey", it is considered important that lecturers start to elaborate a language that helps them to describe reflection and also to think about how to improve lecturing (McAlpine & Weston 2000: 364). This type of language, elaborated by McAlpine & Weston, is what from a perspective of discourse analysis would be called an "interpretative repertoire" (Wetherell & Potter 1988). Interpretative repertoires are "[…] building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes, and other phenomena. Any particular repertoire is constituted out of a restricted range of terms used in a specific stylistic and grammatical fashion" (Wetherell & Potter 1988: 172). The concept of the interpretative repertoire thus takes into account the fact that people use language in a variety of ways, creating their own interpretations and visions of the social world. Consequently, any utterance is understood as an act with a meaning that is "not a straightforward matter of external reference but depends

on the local and broader discursive systems in which the utterance is embedded" (Wetherell & Potter 1988: 169). Accordingly, when lecturers think or speak about their experiences in EMI, they will be using interpretative repertoires that help them to categorise and analyse their experiences. These repertoires contain the broader discourses in which the reflection about lecturing through English is embedded and they uncover lecturers' perceptions and attitudes towards EMI. With this idea of the interpretative repertoire in mind, the workshops with EMI lecturers were not only revealing for the lecturers' professional development, but also provided insight for the trainers into prevalent discourses among lecturers who were speaking about their experiences, concerns and expectations when they teach through English (see Studer, this publication). These insights are helpful for the planning of further teacher training sessions and for individual coaching sessions with lecturers.

3.4.2 The training sessions with EMI lecturers: procedure and insights

As mentioned initially, the first method we used to raise the awareness of reflexivity in the teacher training workshops was based on reflexive exercises. There are many different ways to start the process of reflection. It can be initiated individually or in group-work; it can be stimulated by video-recorded observation (Gün 2011) or through reflective conversations with colleagues and feedback (Brandt 2008). Firstly, we stimulated reflection by asking the participants open questions in the workshops. The following two questions were posed at the beginning of the workshop: 'What do you consider a good lecture?' and 'In what ways does EMI disturb the positive course of your lectures?' The participants had time to think about these questions and after a few minutes, the results were written down and discussed in the plenum.

What do you consider a good lecture?
According to workshop participants a good lecture should

- include humour
- provoke interaction among students and between students and teacher
- have a good structure; a plan that works out in the end
- create enthusiasm for the subject among students
- create an ambiance where participants feel free to interact
- be characterised by smooth communication; eloquence of the lecturer; explaining things well; using visual support like graphics, pictures; also functioning through paraverbal and nonverbal communication.

In what ways does EMI disturb the positive course of your lecture?
Some of the results of the second question are the following:

- the use of humour is difficult/problematic when teaching through English
- little interaction; students may not ask questions

- time management is difficult; feeling of losing time; fear of not reaching learning targets; fear that lectures lose content
- the lecturer is less spontaneous; follows the script more tightly
- the lecturer doesn't feel comfortable when teaching through English
- lecturers fear that they lose their authenticity.

Looking at these answers we can see clearly that some of the conditions the lecturers set for a good lecture are reappearing in the answers to the second question. Consequently, with these initial questions, lecturers have already localised some domains in which further reflection could be effective in the development of EMI lecturing practices. Three of the domains that lecturers are concerned with and in which they recognised difficulties are humour, interaction and time management.

1) Humour is considered important but also difficult in EMI. How can lecturers deal with humour when they teach through a foreign language?
2) Interaction is considered important but can be disrupted through the new language. How can lecturers elicit interaction? Elicit questions?
   a. Options like allowing students to ask questions in German were openly discussed.
3) Time management and structure. Lecturers are aware that they need to allot more time to the structuring and organisation of lecturers. How can lecturers ensure that they reach the learning targets?
   a. The linking of new content to content the students already know from previous semesters/lectures was considered helpful. The lecturers became aware that the lectures in English mean a double effort for students.

Secondly, the workshop dealt with methods lecturers could learn to self-evaluate their lectures during the course of the semester. Before presenting them with concrete analytical tools for self-evaluation, a first reflective exercise, based on a question about personal experiences, was conducted: 'What comes to your mind if you think about your last lecture?' As in the case of the first two questions, the answers were written down and discussed in the plenum.

What comes to your mind if you think about your last lecture?

- the students were not focussed, they were distracted from the topic
- a busy, noisy ambience/environment in the classroom
- The confrontation with unexpected reactions of students due to which the lecturer had to improvise
- a junior lecturer's feeling of insecurity in a new role of authority as evaluator; the challenge of giving feedback to students' work
- stress

The first thing that attracts attention is the fact that the answers bear upon experiences the lecturers consider negative or problematic, even though they

were not asked to think about something negative. This spontaneous, unplanned and unfocused reflection is problem-oriented. The aim of reflexivity, nevertheless, would be to come up also with experiences or situations they consider positive in order to evaluate the lessons in a more encompassing way. We argue that this can be reached when reflexivity is conducted continuously and with a systematised procedure.

As mentioned above, the aim of the workshop was to initiate the process of knowledge development about teaching. Following McAlpine & Weston (2000), this is reached through reflection on lived experience. Once this process was initiated and explained through the above-mentioned reflective exercises in the workshop, the lecturers were asked to continue this process individually during the course of the semester. In order to support them in this task, two tools for reflection were introduced: self-observation and a lecture diary.

There are many different ways to conceptualise self-observation and self-evaluation in lectures. In the workshops with EMI lecturers, a professional method of observation was proposed (Brosziewski & Mäder 2007: 33–35; Altrichter & Posch 2007: 128). This type of self-observation is characterised through its goal-orientation, systematisation and processuality (Ziebell 2002). Goal-orientation in the case of EMI lectures refers to the understanding of the new situation and the following evaluation and development of personal practices. For systematisation, mainly two types of observation are differentiated. We can either observe globally and undirected or in a prepared and focused way (Ziebell 2002). The latter was further discussed in the workshops. Prepared and focused observation means that the observer is prepared for the lecture and knows the content and the setting of the class. Moreover, the attention during observation is turned to specific, predetermined aspects of the lecture. The findings of observation should be registered, for example, in a lecture diary. Processuality means that the observation is a process that should be repeated constantly and that should run over a longer period of time (e.g. a semester).

In order to facilitate the self-observation process, lecturers were given a practical tool. We elaborated an analytical grid that should help the lecturers to identify their personal fields of action (see appendix). With reference to Hornung's model of reflective teaching and self-observation, the grid focused on different aspects of communicative behaviour in the classroom. In particular, the grid contained four functions of interactive communication that were adjusted to the context of bilingual education. Three factors are based on the communication functions formulated by Karl Bühler (in Auer 1999). These are the expressive, the referential and the conative functions. We added a fourth parameter, attitudes, because our research has shown that attitudes and role conceptions are important in EMI. While reflecting on their attitudes towards EMI and internationalisation, lecturers should become aware of their positions towards the EMI project as a whole and think about the influence these positions might have on the way they communicate with students. Moreover, input for further reflection in the form of key questions was given for each of the four functions. There were key questions

related to the organisation of the learning process, the degree of interaction in the class, the language use, turns of talk, spontaneity of lecturers, the way they cope with bilingualism, and the cognitive and emotive reactions from students.

This analytical grid is not only an instrument for focused self-observation but also a tool for the elaboration of a specific interpretative repertoire for self-evaluation of lectures. Concepts like teacher talk, native-speaker like, bilingualism, word lists, scientific language vs. everyday speech, standard language, interlingua, interference, and others, are part of the grid. Furthermore, as the grid is adjusted to EMI, many language and communication issues are integrated. We argue that lecturers can develop a greater language awareness while observing these issues and integrating these concepts. The language awareness, as was already mentioned, does not focus on the grammaticality of language use, but primarily on the language as social practice and aims at a functioning communication in the classroom.

In order to make the observation results fruitful for one's teaching development, they should be recorded. The method that we offered for this purpose was a lecture diary. The aims of such a diary are to generate new perspectives on individual practices, to recognise routinised practices and to elaborate a space that allows the implementation of new strategies. Writing a diary, or reflecting by writing, is a common method in the research tradition but is also often applied in teacher further education and evaluation (Altrichter & Posch 2007: 30–51). Lecturers are asked to keep a diary where they can write down their experiences, emotions, reactions, interpretations and so forth. Some input for this reflective instrument was given at the workshop. It was explained that it is considered important that entries be made regularly, even if they are very short, and that after a small number of entries, progress reports should be made (Altrichter & Posch 2007: 36). These progress reports would help lecturers to identify domains for further reflection and adjustments of their practices. To this aim, we provided a diary template where lecturers could write their notes in a structured form (see appendix).

3.5 Conclusion

This article has dealt with self-observation and reflexivity in EMI programmes. Following an ethnographic approach, a specific understanding of reflexivity has been proposed, one that goes beyond the context of the classroom and that integrates and questions institutional, social and historical issues. This encompassing concept of reflexivity, reached through ethnographic self-observation, takes into account that the introduction of EMI is a controversial issue whose successful implementation depends on various factors. Defining the EMI classroom situation as 'anthropologically strange' allows lecturers to identify and to understand some of these factors and their influence on their teaching practice. The paper proposed, moreover, how reflexivity can be stimulated in EMI

teacher training and how the process of knowledge development about teaching can be initiated. All in all, the aims of reflective practices in EMI didactics are threefold: First, to facilitate lecturers' professional development through guided reflexivity and self-observation. Second, to acquire relevant findings for the research, leading into the further development of a specific EMI didactic framework. And third, in recognition of the important role the foreign language plays in classroom interaction, reflexivity should ensure the development of a greater language awareness, a language awareness as guarantor for successful communication, a natural learning ambience, and, above all, a basis that ensures knowledge transfer in higher education.

References

Adler, Susan (1991): The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. In: Journal of Education for Teaching 17/2, 139–150.

Altrichter, Herbert / Posch, Peter (2007): Lehrerinnen und Lehrer erforschen ihren Unterricht. Unterrichtsentwicklung und Unterrichtsevaluation durch Aktionsforschung. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.

Amann, Klaus / Hirschauer, Stefan (1997): Die Befremdung der eigenen Kultur. Ein Programm. In: Amann, Klaus and Stefan Hirschauer (Eds.): Die Befremdung der eigenen Kultur zur ethnographischen Herausforderung soziologischer Empirie. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 7–52.

Auer, Peter (1999): Ausdruck – Appell – Darstellung (Karl Bühler). In: Auer, Peter (Ed.): Sprachliche Interaktion. Eine Einführung anhand von 22 Klassikern. Tübingen: Niemeyer,18–29.

Brandt, Caroline (2008): Integrating feedback and reflection in teacher preparation. In: ELT Journal 61/1, 37–46.

Brookfield, Stephen (1995); Becoming a critically reflective teacher. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brosziewski, Achim / Maeder, Christoph (2007): FOKUS UNTERRICHT. Unterrichtsentwicklung durch Beobachtung. Zürich: Seismo.

Bourdieu, Pierre / Wacquant, Loïc J. D. (1992): An invitation to reflexive sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burke, P. J. / Dunn, S. (2006): Communicating science: Exploring reflexive pedagogical approaches. Teaching in Higher Education 11, 219–231.

Cruikshank, Donald R. (1987): Reflective Teaching: the preparation of students of teaching. Reston: Association of Teacher Educators.

Geertz, Clifford (1973): The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. New York: Basic Books.

Goodly, Dan (2007): Ethnography: a teaching resource. Centre for Disability Studies: The Disability Archive UK. Available at www.http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/library/

Gün, Bahar (2011): Quality self-reflection through reflection training. In: ELT Journal 65/2,126–135.

Hammersley, Martyn / Atkinson, Paul (1995); Ethnography principles in practice. London: Routledge.

Hillier, Yvonne (2002): Reflective Teaching in Further and Adult Education. London/New York: Continuum.

Hornung, Antonie (2004): Die Bedeutung einer reflexiven Didaktik für den bilingualen Unterricht. In: Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Bildungswissenschaften 26/3, 435–449.

Hornung, Antonie (2006): Fehlerhafter Sprachgebrauch im Immersionsunterricht – "ein weites Feld!". In: Babylonia 2, 7–13.

Matthews, Brian / Jessel, John (1998): Reflective and Reflexive Practice in Initial Teacher Education: a critical case study. In: Teaching in Higher Education 3/2, 231–243.

McAlpine, Lynn / Weston, Cynthia (2000): Reflection: Issues related to improving professors' teaching and students' learning. In: Instructional Science 28, 363–385.

Pinho, Ana S. / Gonçalves, Lurdes / Andrade, Ana Isabel / Araújo e Sá, Maria Helena (2011): Engaging with diversity in teacher language awareness: teachers' thinking, enacting and transformation. In: Breidbach, Stephan et al. (Eds.): Language Awareness in Teacher Education. Cultural-Political and Social-Educational Perspectives. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 41–61.

Pithouse, K. / Mitchell, C. / Weber, S. (2009): Self-study in teaching and teacher development: a call to action. In: Educational Action Research 17/1, 43–62.

Roberts, C. / Byram, M. / Barro, A. / Jordan, S. / Street, B. (2001): Language Learners as Ethnographers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Russel, Tom (2005): Can reflective practice be taught? In: Reflective Practice 6/2, 199–204.

Schön, Donald A. (1983): The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in Action. New York: Basic Books.

Stanley, Claire (2012): A Framework for Teacher Reflectivity. In: TESOL Quarterly 32/3, 584–591.

Wallace, M. J. (1996): Structured reflection: The role of the professional project in training ESL teachers. In: Freeman, Donald and J. Richards (Eds.): Teacher learning in language teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press. 281–294.

Wetherell, Margaret / Potter, J. (1988): Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretive repertoires. In: Antaki, Charles (Ed.): Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 168–183.

Zeichner, Kenneth M. (1981): Reflective teaching and field based experience. In: Interchange 12/4, 1–22.

Zeichner, Kenneth M. / Liston, D. P. (1987): Teaching student teachers to reflect. In: Harvard Educational Review 57, 23–48.

Ziebell, Barbara (2002): Unterrichtsbeobachtung und Lehrerverhalten. Berlin: Langenscheidt

Appendix

Classroom diary template

Classroom diary of:		
Course:		
Date of event: Datum Eintrag:	No. of students:	Comments Analysis
Topic / subject:		

Progress report
Period
Problems/questions
Aims
Further steps

Self-evaluation guidelines

Zürcher Hochschule für Angewandte Wissenschaften

zh aw Angewandte Linguistik

LCC Language Competence Centre

Reflexive Didaktik
Raster für die Selbstbeurteilung des EMI- Fachunterrichts

1. Darstellung

Darstellung steht für den gesamten Stoff sowie für die Sprache, mit welcher der Stoff von der Lehrperson (oder den Lernenden) zum Unterrichtsgegenstand gemacht wird. Einige Fragen, die anhand des untenstehenden Rasters beantwortet werden können sind:

- Ist angesichts der Fremdsprache im Unterricht die Stoffauswahl angemessen?
- Muss die Semesterplanung aufgrund der Sprachensituation angepasst werden?
- Werden durch die Lernprozesse die Schreib- und Sprechfertigkeiten der Studierenden gefördert?
- Welche Form hat mein Unterricht? Sollte er interaktiver sein?
- Wie spreche ich wenn ich Stoff weitergebe auf Englisch? Benutze ich Hilfsmittel zur Unterstützung?

Stoffauswahl/ Einteilung	Stoffauswahl
	Stoffauteilung
	Semesterplanung
	Untergliederung in Unterrichtseinheiten
Organisation von Lernprozessen	Lesen und Schreiben anregen
	Hören und Sprechen anregen
	Lehrvortrag (Vorlesung)
	Interaktiver Unterricht
	Einzelarbeit
	Gruppenarbeit
	weitere Vermittlungsmethoden
Sprachgebrauch bei der Darstellung der Lehrgegenstände	Einsprachigkeit
	Übersetzen
	Sprache im Zusammenhang
	Wortlisten
	Texte
	Charts und Bilder
	Terminologie
	Alltägliche Wissenschaftssprache
	Korrektheit
	Kommunikativität
	Standardsprachgebrauch
	Varietäten
	Herkunftskulturorientierung
	Zielkulturorientierung
Lernzielkontrolle	Portfolio
	Lernjournale
Gestaltung von Prüfungen	

2. Ausdruck

Unter *Ausdruck* soll die einen Unterrichtsgegenstand darstellende Persönlichkeit, deren Stoff- und Sprachbeherrschung, Prosodie und Akzent, sowie ihren Umgang mit dem Unterrichtstoff und der Unterrichtssprache reflektiert werden. Dabei sollen sowohl verbale als auch nonverbale Mitteilungen beachtet werden. Für diese didaktische Reflexion des Kommunikationsverhaltens können wir uns folgende Fragen stellen:

- Wie ist meine Aussprache im Englisch? Spreche ich mit starkem Akzent und welche Reaktionen kann dieser beim Gegenüber auslösen?
- Wer spricht im Unterricht wieviel? Inwiefern beteiligen sich die Studierenden an der Wissensvermittlung?
- Wie gehe ich mit Formulierungen um, die von der Norm abweichen?
- Kann ich spontan reagieren, bin ich locker im Umgang mit der Bilingualität?
- Was ist mir wichtiger, Fachwissen oder Sprachnorm?

Aussprache und Prosodie	*Native-speaker like*
	Mit Akzent
	Natürliches Sprechen
	Teacher's talk
	Zusammenhängend
	Stichwortartig
Quantität der Redeanteile	Dominant
	Zürückhaltend
	Lehrpersonzentriert
	Materialergänzt (DVD, Internet, etc.)
Umgang mit der Normativität der Sprache	Spontaneität vs. Geplantheit
	Sicherheit vs. Unsicherheit
	Lockerheit im Umgang mit Normverstössen
	Vermeiden nicht beherrschter Formulierungen
Umgang mit der Bilingualität	Mischsprache (Interlingua)
	Strikte Sprachentrennung
	Interferenzen (Übetragungen aus der Muttersprache in die Fremdsprache)
	Explizite Unterscheidung
	Sprachkreationen
	Gelernte *chunks* (übliche Wortkombinationen)
Umgang mit der Fachgebundenheit des Fremd-sprachgebrauchs	Vorrangstellung des Fachwissens
	Übergewicht der Sprachnorm
	Terminologie
	Textualität
	Fachsprachliche Präzision
	Umschreibung
	Idiomatizität (=die Bedeutung des sprachl. Ausdruckes ist nicht durch seine Einzelteile erschliessbar)
	Näher an der Erstsprache der Lernenden orientierte und folglich leichter verständliche Formulierungen

3. Appell

Appell bezeichnet die Beziehung und die Wirkung, die das Zeichen auf den Empfänger ausübt. Didaktische Reflexion bezüglich des Appellcharakters der Sprache kann auf verschiedene Fragen eine Antwort bieten:

- Wie nehmen die Studierenden den Stoff auf? Können sie sich Wissen produktiv aneignen?
- Welche Signale (verbal, nonverbal) kommen von den Lernenden?
- Kann ich das Interesse für das Fach wecken?
- Nehmen die Studierenden am kommunikativen Handeln teil, indem sie Eigeninitiative zeigen?

Verständnis der Unterrichtsinhalte	Repetition
	Produktive Aneignung
	Verbale, paraverbale und nonverbale Signale der Lernenden
	Funktion von Nebenkommunikationen
kognitive und emotive Reaktionen	Aufmerksamkeit
	Ablenkbarkeit/Aufmerksamkeitsverweigerung
	fachliches Interesse vs. Desinteresse
	Motivation vs. Demotivation
	Solidarität
	Wettbewerb
Teilhabe am kommunikativen Handeln	Aktivität vs. Passitivität
	Eigeninitiative
	Aufgabenerfüllung
	Mut zum sprachlichen Handeln
	Sprechhemmung

4. Einstellungen

Einstellungen umschreibt die Wertevorstellungen, Positionen und Einstellungen der Dozierenden wie auch der Studierende Die *Einstellungen* sind selten direkt im Unterricht beobachtbar, können aber implizit im Verhalten wie auch in den Sprechhandlungen der Dozierenden bzw. der Studierenden verankert sein. Für die didaktische Reflexionen bezügl. der Einstellungen zur EMI-Unterrichtssituation sind folgende Fragen von Bedeutung:

- In welcher Rolle verstehe ich mich als Dozierender? Welche Rolle spreche ich den Studierenden zu?
- Was für eine Einstellung habe ich zum EMI-Unterricht?
- Akzeptieren die Studierenden meinen Unterricht und meinen Unterrichtsstil? Was fördert bzw. behindert diese Akzeptanz ?

Rollenverständnis	Autorität
	Coach
	Deklarative Wissensvermittlung
	Gemeinsame Produktion von Wissen
Einstellungen zu EMI	Skepsis gegenüber EMI-Unterricht
	Offenheit, Neugierde gegenüber EMI-Unterricht
	Kenntnisstand der Studierenden über die Zielsetzungen des EMI-Programms
	positive vs. negative Einstellung gegenüber der Internationalisierung an Hochschulen
Akzeptanz	Motivation
	Sympathie
	Gender
	Alter
	Unterrichtsstil
	Sprache und Herkunft