



12-2019

## **Entry-Level Instruction: High-Frequency Vocabulary and Classroom Interaction in German Textbooks**

Andrew Graves

*University of Tennessee, [agrave17@vols.utk.edu](mailto:agrave17@vols.utk.edu)*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Graves, Andrew, "Entry-Level Instruction: High-Frequency Vocabulary and Classroom Interaction in German Textbooks. " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2019.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes/5561](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/5561)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Andrew Graves entitled "Entry-Level Instruction: High-Frequency Vocabulary and Classroom Interaction in German Textbooks." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in German.

Thorsten Huth, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Stephanie Ohnesorg, Maria Stehle, Bernard Issa

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**Entry-Level Instruction: High-Frequency Vocabulary and  
Classroom Interaction in German Textbooks**

**A Thesis Presented for the  
Master of Arts  
Degree  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

**Andrew Garrick Graves  
December 2019**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

For my friends and family, and the endlessly supportive faculty of Modern Foreign Languages at the University of Tennessee Knoxville.

## ABSTRACT

In elementary second language teaching, it can be difficult to decide which language materials to cover. Drawing from the insights of High-Frequency Vocabulary, Classroom Interaction, and teaching methodologies such as Communicative Language Teaching and CREED, I wish to suggest moving toward criteria for elementary language teaching that takes into account the current research as it relates to high-frequency vocabulary, the development of communicative skills in face-to-face interaction, and the more common customs of interaction as informed by the field of pragmatics. My main argument is that we should move toward writing textbooks which emphasize high-frequency terms which are relevant to the classroom and circumlocution skills in lower-division language instruction. To that end, I first review current literature on the topics of high-frequency vocabulary, then I move onto classroom interaction, then I make connections to task-based instruction, and their effectiveness in the first two years of undergrad German language courses; finally I perform an analysis of three introductory chapters in common entry-level textbooks of German: *Treffpunkt*, *Deutsch, Na Klar!* and *Sag Mal*.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Section 1: Second Language Acquisition.....	5
Section 2: High-Frequency Vocabulary Research.....	15
Section 3: Classroom Interaction.....	26
<b>Chapter 2: TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
Section 1: Deutsch: Na Klar!.....	33
Section 2: Sag Mal.....	37
Section 3: Treffpunkt.....	42
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>VITA.....</b>	<b>54</b>

# INTRODUCTION

What are the goals of language teaching? In order to provide an overview of the current structure of standards and goals in the U.S. I will review the political institutions which create and review these standards. In the United States, recommendations for what language teaching should accomplish exist on a national level and on the state level. In year 2007, the Modern Language Association (MLA) issued the report *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*. This report was meant to address language teaching in higher education and provides a series of language teaching goals. These goals are summarized as translingual and transcultural competence. The notion of Translingual Competence describes: (a) a learner's ability to view themselves through the lens of another culture (b) their social sensibility (c) their historical and political consciousness. Translingual Competence does not mean educating students to the level of native speakers, but as speakers who can operate between their L1 (native language), and their L2 (second language or L+), including being able to have metalinguistic conversations, talking about the language itself.<sup>1</sup> It focuses primarily on interdisciplinary skills, rather than on knowledge of vocabulary or literature, because a capable and critically thinking interlocutor can operate across a broader area of skills. The notion of transcultural competence in learners as a goal for instruction describes the ability to understand and analyze content across every media including poems, film, literature, etc., and these skills are viewed as a critical part of the language classroom because they are thought to

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World>, accessed 4/7/2019

create relevance for the learner across a broader range of cultural and social situations.

Transcultural competence as a goal for second language also means that the learner develops an awareness of themselves as an individual that is culturally different to others.

In sum, the MLA report places heavy emphasis on learning the norms of the culture of the L2, including using diverse media to challenge a learner's assumptions about the culture. Institutionally, the 2007 report also recommends providing alternate paths to a major in a foreign language, meaning that the goals of language instructions, beyond the historical emphasis on literature, now also includes a variety of topics such as film, culture, etc.<sup>2</sup> The report furthermore makes recommendations on what language programs in the US should do structurally to keep students enrolled, to keep foreign languages competitive alongside other subject areas in higher education, and consequently places the focus on translingual/transcultural competences rather than on perfecting sentence level grammar as a tool and gateway to understanding literary texts alone.

But what ways and means are there to accomplish these MLA report's objectives? The American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and American Association for the Teaching of German (AATG) mirror the MLA report and provide a framework for achieving these goals at the national level. These organizations serve as the national umbrella organizations for a host of commonly taught foreign languages, and they provide proficiency scales and assessment frameworks. ACTFL lists the goals of teaching as being divided into the 5

---

<sup>2</sup> Modern Language Association, *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*, 2007, <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World>, accessed 6/25/2019



“C” goal areas or (Cornerstones): Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. These 5 “C” goal areas demonstrate that linguistic competence is viewed as embedded in social, cultural, national, and ultimately global contexts. Languages do not exist in a vacuum, they are imbedded in social structures.<sup>3</sup> Beyond the 5 “C” goal areas, linguistic ability in terms of proficiency is subdivided into 4 levels with 3 sublevels each, i.e., (intermediate low/mid/high) and each of these sublevels have associated proficiency descriptors. Additionally, language proficiency is understood in terms of 4 skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Thus, the language learner is treated, taught, and assessed in terms of language production (speaking, writing) and language comprehension (listening, reading).

As we move from the national to the state level, guidelines for teaching assessment become more specific. In the state of Tennessee, the Tennessee World Language Standards is the reference document for the assessment of language teaching. The competencies in this document are sequenced according to the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and are divided into the 5 “C” goal areas. The Tennessee World Language Standards explicitly state that they do not say how the content should be taught, rather what students should be capable of at the end of a course.<sup>4</sup> It does however, state that teaching should move away from grammar and translation and toward effective communication, literacy, and cultural interaction.<sup>5</sup> It speaks to the change in teaching of foreign languages in saying: “The focus is no longer on what students

---

<sup>3</sup> ACTFL World Readiness Standards: <https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/publications/standards/World-ReadinessStandardsforLearningLanguages.pdf> accessed 11/09/2019

<sup>4</sup> Tennessee World Language Standards, 2017, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Tennessee World Language Standards, 2017, 5.

know, but what they can do with what they know.”<sup>6</sup> To provide a concrete example of these standards, the novice low section for communication reads: a) state one’s name, b) greet peers, c) answer a few basic questions. Again, these standards do not dictate how material is to be taught, but what outcome should be reached at a given level.

In sum, from the national to the state level we see learning outcomes focused primarily on translingual and transcultural competence which are highlighted as goals in educational institutions. However, there are no guidelines that mandate the pedagogy, the how of doing the teaching. So, where do practitioners receive guidance on how to deliver the content? If MLA/ACTFL/TN state standards say produce these outcomes, but do it as you want, standards supply the goals, but not the means, how do we teach? To get to the means, the what (content areas, particular grammatical structures or cultural artifacts) and how (types of interaction in the classroom, time spent on a given activity, methods of correction and scaffolding) of daily classroom delivery, it is relevant to turn towards current research on second language acquisition and pedagogy.

In this thesis I aim to find some answers to the what and how of teaching to bridge the gap between mandated institutional goals and the nuts and bolts of what exactly to teach and how to do the teaching. The source for finding these answers will be research in high-frequency vocabulary, classroom interaction, and task-based instruction, finally I examine some examples of what is being done in three introductory chapters in common entry-level textbooks of German: *Treffpunkt, Deutsch, Na Klar!* and *Sag Mal*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, 6.

# Chapter 1: BACKGROUND

## Section 1: Second Language Acquisition

In this section, I review Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research from a usage-based perspective and SLA research that emphasizes interaction as the goal of using human language. Both connect conceptually and are fields that have gained increasing attention in the past two decades. These two strands are central to my project as they both examine and emphasize the importance of interaction in the learning process. Second Language Acquisition is a multidisciplinary research field<sup>78</sup>. It includes cognitive and social perspectives on how languages are learned (Gass, Selinker, Nelson, Bowen). SLA investigates how second languages emerge in learners. Some SLA research is mostly concerned with SLA in its own right<sup>9</sup>, other SLA research is directly concerned with language teaching<sup>10</sup>. SLA research insights can be taken as a resource for language teaching inasmuch as what we know about language learning may inform language teaching.

The work of Nick Ellis is prominent in Second Language Acquisition as a field. In his article *Cognitive Perspectives on SLA: The Associative-Cognitive CREED*, he reviews the history of

---

<sup>7</sup> Larsen-Freeman, Diane., and Long, Michael H. "An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research". *Applied Linguistics and Language Study*. London ; New York: Longman, 1991.

<sup>8</sup> VanPatten, Bill., and Williams, Jessica. "Theories in Second Language Acquisition : An Introduction." *Second Language Acquisition Research*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Ellis, Nick, and Laura Collins. "Input and Second Language Acquisition: The Roles of Frequency, Form, and Function Introduction to the Special Issue." *The Modern Language Journal* 93, no. 3 2009: 329-36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264090>.

<sup>10</sup> Ellis, Rod. "Instructed Second Language Acquisition : Learning in the Classroom." *Applied Language Studies*, Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass., USA: B. Blackwell, 1990.

the cognitive approach to SLA. The cognitive approach, as the name suggests, is a view of SLA developed in tandem with psychologists and utilizes research in neuropsychology and related fields to inform its conclusions. A fundamental aspect of this approach is that language is acquired similarly to everything else humans learn. Skill acquisition as evidenced by associations and pattern-recognition govern language acquisition as well. CREED stands for Construction-Based, Rational, Exemplar-Driven, Emergent, and Dialectic. This model sees language acquisition as the result of the general cognitive and social abilities of humans, not as something that is cognitively special and apart from the rest of what humans do, it sees language learning as a skill. Under this model language learning is construction-based in that it is rooted in linguistic items and constructions as socially determined symbols, symbols are understood here as arbitrary signs for which humans have an agreed-upon meaning. CREED is rational in that humans will always assume the most probable meaning of a word given their previous experience, i.e. for the word “symbol” a given definition might be: “an act, sound, or object having cultural significance and the capacity to excite or objectify a response”.<sup>11</sup> However, if you hear the word “symbol” you will likely understand it in the context of “a symbol of prestige” rather than its related homonym “cymbal” as part of a drum set (unless you play in a band, of course).

The importance of prior usage through experience for language learning is visible in research surrounding high frequency vocabulary. “Frequency” as defined in the CREED model means most likely given the past experience of the listener, while “frequency” in vocabulary

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/symbol>, accessed 10.26.2019 10:46am

research is based on word occurrence across a corpus of texts spanning multiple genres, discussed in the later section on High-Frequency Vocabulary. In the context of the CREED model, exemplar-driven language learning consists of “generalizations coming from frequency-based abstraction of regularities from similar constructions”.<sup>12</sup> So, language learners use placeholders like (good + time of day) to create abstractions for creative use, expanding beyond mimicry. Language learning as viewed in the CREED model is emergent in that the plasticity of the human brain enables us to use seemingly simple input and derive complex linguistic information from it, similar to emergent weather patterns or the flight of birds. In CREED the language learning process is interactive in that it relies on the learner engaging with other speakers and real-time feedback from a conversation partner to reorient themselves to new social structures, thereby reorienting their attention toward new forms.

Why is CREED interesting in the context of this project? The basic principles and underlying assumptions of CREED are increasingly corroborated by research in SLA, not just in cognitive work, but in SLA work that emphasizes social aspects of language learning. The associative, social-interactive, and exemplar-based characteristics of language learning as emphasized by CREED are shown to be developed in interaction. CREED and research on interaction have both impacted CLT in that both of these models/perspectives on linguistic development highlight the important nature of interaction in developing associations in the

---

<sup>12</sup> Ellis, Nick, VanPatten, Will, *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. New Jersey, 2007, 80.

brain either between contexts of use and linguistic constructions (CREED) or between a learners developing linguistic system and gaps in their knowledge (interaction research).

CREED has been influential along with Usage Based Linguistics (UBL). Usage-based linguistics is emerging as an influential research trajectory in SLA and is increasingly being applied to issues and topics in second language teaching. Eskildsen and Kasper recount the developments of UBL. In their article *Interactional Usage-Based L2 Pragmatics: From Form–Meaning Pairings to Construction–Action Relations*, they explain that the early model of UBL focused on form-meaning pairings, morphemes or units of language which are agreed upon by a community of speakers. These form-meaning pairings are called *constructions* and work similar to building blocks in that at first, language learners use simple, concrete forms to express themselves. From these simple first forms, they incrementally build more complex forms and constructions. UBL claims that usage itself drives language learning, and the learning process is dependent on repeated usage, learner experience over time, and goes from simple to complex, from concrete to abstract.

If language learning proceeds over time from concrete to abstract, from simple to complex, then frequency of usage of a given linguistic item or construction in the learning experience is consequential, and frequency of usage must play a central role in the process. In the cognitive tradition, frequency is also important, but again the term frequency in that field is different from the term in High-Frequency Vocabulary Research. Frequency in cognitive approaches to language learning refers to the idea that the more the learner is exposed to the construction in a given context, the more likely the learner is to interpret that construction in

that context. Each time a sound is correctly associated with a given meaning, that connection becomes stronger and it will be easier and more likely in the future for that association to be made.<sup>13</sup> Using *constructions*, in combination with the idea of frequency inherited from the cognitive approach, Usage-based linguistics provides a framework for language learning.

What Eskildsen and Kasper emphasize in their paper is that linguistic items and constructions do not exist in their own right. Rather, they exist to accomplish social actions. Humans express themselves with constructions to achieve social actions. Language occurs *in situ*, that is, constructed by social reactions to statements in a given situation, these constructions are not the “primordial” unit of meaning, rather social interaction itself defines the meaning in context.<sup>14</sup> Eskildsen and Kasper view the most pressing and current issue in UBL as decontextualized language over interaction and use, as they state: “usage- based research on how L2 inventories develop still predominantly focuses on decontextualized instances of language use in the form of constructions rather than on the use of these constructions *per se*.”<sup>15</sup>

In contrast to the decontextualization mentioned above, the work Eskildsen and Kasper are doing now is developing a usage-based linguistics that moves the concept of form-meaning pairs to more interaction-based construction-action relations. The “social turn”<sup>16</sup> in SLA has

---

<sup>13</sup> This is an extreme simplification, for full details see: VanPatten, Bill., and Williams, Jessica. “Theories in Second Language Acquisition : An Introduction” *Second Language Acquisition Research.*, Ellis, Nick C. “The Associative-Cognitive CREED”, Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007. 78-79.

<sup>14</sup> Eskildsen, Soren, Casper, Gabriele, “Interactional Usage-Based L2 Pragmatics From Form–Meaning Pairings to Construction–Action Relations” *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition and Pragmatics*, Taylor and Francis, Abingdon, Routledge, 2018, 176.

<sup>15</sup> Eskildsen & Casper, *Interactional Usage-Based L2 Pragmatics*, 2018, 176.

<sup>16</sup> Block, David., *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh: University

inspired a wide range of research directions and has brought with it a shift in terms. What we see as a result is that the notion of Communicative Competence is replaced with the notion of Interactional Competence. What we have come to commonly conceptualize in second language teaching as form-meaning pairings is, in a UBL framework, better viewed as construction-action relations. One example of a form-meaning pairing might be “good morning” as “greeting used before noon”. The same example in a construction-action relation would be using the phrase “good-morning” in various contexts. “Good morning” to a friend might mean “I wish you a good morning”, using it at the start of a formal speech might do the work of “let’s begin”, and using it in the middle of a lecture might be an admonishment of the behavior a late student. This is a different yet consequential shift in how human language is viewed. When we speak of form-meaning pairings, we see language as the decontextualized use of structures external to imbedded social context. Instead, when we speak of construction-action relations, we see language as an expression of social norms where people solve problems and accomplish interaction collaboratively. Eskildsen & Kasper view language as constructions, and these constructions exist to accomplish actions, such as asking questions, answering them, challenging others, requesting, etc. These actions happen in interaction, i.e. in the back and forth of talk, across speakers, across turns. Learners are now encouraged to experience the life-worlds, or complex social and cultural realities of speakers, and researchers are now looking at language acquisition *In the Wild*<sup>17</sup>, or in contexts outside of the classroom.

---

Press, 2003.

<sup>17</sup> Hutchins, Edwin, *Cognition in the Wild*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1995.



The Icelandic Village projects serves as an interesting example of how pedagogy that emphasizes language usage and interaction as suggested above can work. The model was explained by Theodórsdóttir in 2018 at the Polyglot Conference in Reykjavik.<sup>18</sup> The students were prepared in the classroom for the first activity where they go to a café and observe the interactions. An important criterion is that the participating companies agreed to only use Icelandic and did not switch to English. First the learners simply observed the turns taken in the interaction, the atmosphere, recorded words or grammar they heard, and generally got a look into the life-worlds of the interactants, they then returned to the classroom and reviewed what they recorded. The students then practiced ordering a coffee or pastry item in the classroom, and on the second trip they tried to order an item themselves. Impressively, the students were able to order an item by themselves, completely in Icelandic, within the first week of being in Iceland. Thus, we see how important the actual usage is, how consequential the learner experience with other speakers is in in the back and forth of talk, and how the social context in a given moment prompts the frequent and contextually fitting usage of specific constructions in specific situations.

The difference between achieving this in the wild versus in the classroom is crucial to the argument for interactional competence. As researchers in this field remark, “The target for many second language learners is not just ‘to speak another language,’ but to become part of the social and cultural environment in which this language is used. This entails frequent and rich participation in the second language life-worlds into which a newcomer ‘bricolages’ his or her

---

<sup>18</sup> Polyglot Conference, “The Icelandic Village: Guided Participation in Real-Life Interaction in Icelandic”, *YouTube* video, 47.27. August 16, 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4h0aoyYAhuo>

way.”<sup>19</sup> What has been achieved in the *Icelandic Village* is a mixture of learners engaging with the culture, using basic rehearsed vocabulary to enter an interaction, and successfully navigate that interaction in the L2. They are learning the social norms of the language while simultaneously constructing meaning with their interlocuter. The implications of this program for the classroom are the rethinking of the classroom as a space to prepare for interaction, and a safe area for the exploration of the language with other learners. The classroom then is a space for priming interaction in the second language, rather than a space for only talking about it on the meta-level.

The question at this point is, “what is the implication?”. Social interaction is important for learning languages, and good things are happening in Iceland, but why are these things important? To summarize, usage-based linguistics and research on frequency of usage connect in a variety of ways that may give us insight for how to teach second languages. Social interaction is important for language learning because the learner experience, in terms of using constructions in social interaction, in context, and frequently, drives language learning over time. Learners assemble their repertoire from simple to complex, from concrete to abstract, all the while forming connections between how individual linguistic items and constructions relate to achieving social actions via expression. If we seek to meet or put into action the MLA and ACTFL guidelines, we note thus far that the central ingredients for classroom teaching are a view of language as something that consists of items and constructions that achieve social action via expression. This means that words and grammar would need to be tied to the actions

---

<sup>19</sup> Wagner, Johannes, “Designing for Language Learning in the Wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning”, *Usage-Based Perspectives on Language Learning*, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston, 2015, 75.

they are able to achieve, i.e. “requesting” is achieved by asking a question, and that the learning targets would have to be introduced in ways that allow the learner experience to go from simple to complex, from concrete to abstract. But how may one do this?

Despite a long history of scholars trying to discover the root nature of language, practical recommendations for what and how to teach are diverse and often conflict with each other. I am interested in seeing what current research says about what materials may be prioritized at the introductory level. What implications do we have so far from SLA in terms of the research I have reviewed? 1) We know usage is important for language learning, 2) we know interaction is important for language learning. Do we get any cues from this research about how to do language teaching in classroom environments beyond noting that we need words, structures, and interaction? Especially at the beginners’ level, teachers need to make concrete decisions concerning what words, what structures to teach, and in what kind of interactional contexts.

The questions teachers have about what exactly to teach are often affected by what kind of textbook a program uses. Textbooks are traditionally explicit guidebooks for teaching, they often claim to offer a research-backed pre-packaged system for progressing students in the language. They give a sense that if you just follow the material in the chapters, students will learn what needs to be learned. But do they deliver on this promise? If interaction is increasingly the center of learning, where does that leave the use of textbooks? If textbooks claim an association with research, do they embody the findings of that field?

A significant difficulty in the discussion of adapting research to teaching is the political pressures of the school system. Large assessment bodies like ACTFL, school administrators

seeking to align their curriculum to ACTFL standards, and the resultant accountability standards of the teaching profession assume the ability of a teacher to impart knowledge. But doesn't this run counter to the task-based/interactional model? If the role of the modern teacher is to create a space for interaction to occur, how do they do that when administrative standards mandate that certain material is "taught" in a particular sequence and in a particular way?

With this paper, I endeavor to offer a preliminary answer. My goals in this paper are to 1) explore the implications of the disparate research fields of high-frequency vocabulary, Classroom Interaction, and task-based instruction. 2) Analyze three textbooks for examples of opportunities for interaction in light of these research implications. 3) Make recommendations for aligning textbooks more closely with research and for adapting textbook tasks to the act of teaching.

The different research fields I am dealing with here do not often use the same jargon, research methodology, or directly address the considerations of the other fields in their writing. This paper is important because there are huge gaps between advances in SLA research and pedagogical recommendations, and between pedagogical recommendations and the lived experience of teachers in the modern social and political school structure. I hope this paper begins to close some of these gaps.

## Section 2: High-Frequency Vocabulary Research

No elementary language course works without teaching words. But which words should be taught when, and in what succession, and how many of them? I review research on high-frequency vocabulary and its potential impact on language teaching. I argue that while we have solid recommendations from empirical research on the role of high-frequency vocabulary for language teaching, available materials minimally reflect those recommendations.

One possible method to decide what to teach is to determine how many common words are needed for comprehension and try to focus on those most common words. Researchers in the field of High-Frequency vocabulary have made some recommendations for size of vocabulary needed to understand a diversity of texts. As a preliminary estimate for the size of vocabulary needed to understand the majority of texts in English, I.S.P. Nation estimates 9,000 word families, consisting of 24,000 individual lexical items.<sup>20</sup> The term “word families” indicates the root and base form of a word, as well as its inflections in the various tenses, *to take* is the root of the family *took, will take, taken*, etc. Regarding German, an estimate of 6,500 base words to understand the majority of texts has been suggested.<sup>21</sup> In modern high-frequency vocabulary research, there is a preference for using written materials as a corpus for determining vocabulary. This corpus is derived from recorded conversation, literature, scientific articles, newspapers, etc. In a recent article from 2018, Tschirner argues that students

---

<sup>20</sup> Nation, I.S.P., “How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening?”, *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 2006, 59-82.

<sup>21</sup> Kuesseling, F., & Lonsdale, D., “A corpus-based assessment of French CEFR lexical content”, *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69, 2013, 436-461.

need 8,000 to 9,000 words to understand texts at the undergraduate level, this works out to 5 words a day or 1,000 words per semester.<sup>22</sup> The question of whether these numbers are achievable or not within the timeframes of most L2 classrooms aside, should teachers be concerned with targeting high-frequency vocabulary as a specific goal? I want to explore the idea that the data on vocabulary frequency can be translated to pedagogical recommendations or to determine if its importance in teaching is overstated.

Teachers and administrators alike seek objective validation for the efficacy of their courses. Frequency is an often-cited basis by frequency researchers and textbook marketers as one angle to select the vocabulary to be taught in a class. If a textbook is explicitly based on a frequency dictionary, the teacher feels they are adhering to a proven progression of ability, and institutions can justify material selection in adherence with standards guidelines from assessment bodies. However, if we look at task-based meaningful interaction including Communicative Language Teaching and CREED, frequency of vocabulary derived from sources outside of the classroom may not inherently translate to teaching effectiveness in the confined social context of a classroom setting.

Vocabulary size is also important to assessment organizations looking to define standards of proficiency. Different countries have worked to establish standards for vocabulary size, and to codify them for assessment and course design criteria. European languages use a proficiency scale ranging from beginner (A1-A2) through intermediate (B1-B2) and native-like

---

<sup>22</sup> Tschirner, Erwin, *The Role of Frequency in Second Language Acquisition: The Case of German Prefix and Particle Verbs*, University of Leipzig, 2018, 137.

(C1-C2). In Europe the CEFR provides large estimates for vocabulary needed in German at each level A1 to B2, but does not for C1 and C2 (Table 1.1).

These estimates, as relayed by Tschirner, are based on older lists compiled by “expert opinion” in the 70’s.<sup>23</sup> Tschirner looked at the overlap of his corpus-based lists with an earlier frequency dictionary. Tschirner found the overlap of the frequent words between the two dictionaries for the B1 level to be 60%. These lists by experts were based primarily on everyday oral production of learners at the levels A1-B2, and the history of the CEFR framework is based in speech-act theory. Speech act theory and the lists derived from it used the recorded utterances of L2 learners studying abroad in Europe as their basis. Tschirners’ lists are based on a variety of texts in different genres, including transcripts of speech, scientific and academic texts, and they span multiple genres in literature.

Table 1.1. Vocabulary Size Assumptions for CEFR Levels of German by the European National Test Institutes<sup>24</sup>

Proficiency Level	Estimated vocabulary size
A1	650
A2	1,300
B1	3,500
B2	6,053
C1	N/A
C2	N/A

<sup>23</sup> Tschirner, *Issues*, pg. 62

<sup>24</sup> Tschirner, Hacking & Rubio, *Issues in Language Program Direction*, pg. 62.

Tschirner criticizes the previous lists of CEFR for not representing a diversity of texts, but I think an argument can be made that lists based on adult learners studying abroad in Germany is more representative of the vocabulary relevant to that population, and that lists based on a large corpus are not necessarily more relevant to language learners. Although I will not answer this question within this work I want to present the question: is vocabulary based on language used by L2 learners studying abroad most relevant to that same population than corpus-derived vocabulary representing potential use? Should we use vocabulary frequency lists based on corpora across all genres rather than conversation transcripts of L2 learners, when we are designing material for the same L2 learner population? Regardless, this shift from a list based on the oral production of L2 learners to one based on a corpus of diverse genres has an intuitive appeal. If we want our students to be successful with the language throughout the course of their experience with the language over time, it seems better to have their vocabulary be based on an aggregate of the most commonly used words across a variety of genres.

However, although there is a strong argument from Tschirner for corpus-derived frequency in contrast to conversation transcript data only, in that we want students to be best prepared regardless of what genre of text or speech they may encounter, there are still other concerns. First, in most analyses on the comprehension of texts, the first most frequent 1,000 words account for approximately 74% of comprehension, meaning once students cross the 1,000 most frequent words mark they can understand 74% of texts across all genres. The next 1,000 words account for around 6.4% and decrease exponentially for every 1,000 thereafter. Combining this with a 60% overlap with previous lists based solely on oral production of L2 learners, (i.e., what has been recorded from actual use) the implication of increased utility for



the remaining 40% seems reduced. In other words: the first 2k words would account for roughly 80% of usage across genres and are as such highly desirable for teaching purposes. Each following 1k words only adds a fraction compared to the most frequent 1 or 2 k.

An important question to ask here is: since we cannot predict what area of society/what domain/in what specific contexts the student will use the TL, and since we also cannot predict whether the dominant form of use will be verbal, written, or reading, are our students better served by vocabulary lists based on oral production, or lists based on a variety of genres including diverse written texts? We already see a 60% overlap, so the question applies to the utility of the remaining words. The intuitive argument for teaching high-frequency vocabulary is furthered by the percentage coverage of texts by a given number of words, that is the amount of material that can be understood when a learner knows a certain number of words, the coverage of the most frequent 2,000 words in English and German is shown in the chart from Tschirner on page 20 (Table 1.2). An additional reason for prioritizing High-Frequency Vocabulary is its impact on comprehension. Learners do not need to know every word in a text to understand it and can infer the meaning of unknown words through context. However, research estimates that 95% comprehension of a text's words is needed to infer the meaning of unknown words.<sup>25</sup> The amount of vocabulary necessary to comprehend the majority of texts and to infer the meanings of the remaining 5%, speaks to the importance of high-frequency vocabulary for students because in order for students to understand an entire text, they need to know 95% of the words already.

---

<sup>25</sup> Lipinski, Silke, *A Frequency Analysis of Vocabulary in Three First-Year Textbooks of German*, *Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* 43, no. 2 2010, 167-74.

Table 1.2 Text coverage of the most frequent 2,000 words of English and German.<sup>26</sup>

Language	Conversation	Novels	Newspaper	Academic Texts
German	90.3%	87.4%	80.3%	76.1%
English	89.2%	80.0%	73.9%	74.7%

Do current textbooks include these high-frequency words, and if yes, to which extent? A Master's thesis from the University of Tennessee Knoxville written by Ronald Johnson in 2010 provides an inciteful study. Johnson's study, *Focus on Frequency, A Comparison of First-Year German Textbooks* analyzed four textbooks: *Kontakte, Treffpunkt Deutsch* (2008), *Vorsprung, Second Edition* (2007), and *Deutsch: Na klar!, Fifth Edition* (2008), for adherence to the vocabulary list *Frequency Dictionary of German* by Randall Jones and Erwin Tschirner and *Grunddeutsch: Basic (spoken) German Word List*. The control textbook used for this study was *Kontakte* as it was co-authored by Erwin Tschirner and the vocabulary is explicitly based on Tschirners *Frequency Dictionary of German*. Johnson found that *Kontakte* did not have a significantly higher percentage of words from the frequency dictionary than the other textbooks, and the other textbook which mentions frequency came in third.<sup>27</sup> In analysis of the shared overlap of nouns and verbs between all textbooks analyzed and the frequency dictionary, nouns were found to overlap by 75%, and the overlap of verbs across all textbooks was 99%. Although *Kontakte* is explicitly based on a frequency dictionary, the overlap is only 44%. *Vorsprung* also explicitly mentions a basis in frequency but comes in second at 52%. The

<sup>26</sup> Tschirner, Erwin, *The Role of Frequency in Second Language Acquisition*, University of Leipzig, 2018, 138.

<sup>27</sup> Johnson, Ronald Eric, *Focus on Frequency: A Comparison of First-Year German Vocabularies*, 2010, 33.

highest percentage of 66% belongs to *Neue Horizonte*, which is not exclusively based on a frequency dictionary.

In a separate 2010 study by Lipinski, the textbooks *Deutsch Heute*, *Kontakte*, and *Neue Horizonte* were analyzed for their overlap with the 2006 *Frequency Dictionary of German* by Jones and Tschirner. Lipinski found that for the first 1,000 most frequent words listed in the dictionary, the percentage of overlap was 36% (*Deutsch Heute*), 24% (*Kontakte*), and 36% (*Neue Horizonte*).<sup>28</sup>

From both of the studies above, it is clear that a large discrepancy exists between High-Frequency Vocabulary recommendations and the contents of current textbooks. How do we explain this discrepancy? I believe even in the textbooks which reference frequency, other pedagogical or editorial considerations such as funding, imagined student populations, or market indicators have an effect, and theme-based editorial decisions confine the vocabulary selection to that which is necessary to discuss a topic or grammatical structure, (family tree and the past tense for example). My point here is that textbooks often do not overlap with high-frequency dictionaries, even if they claim a connection.

Regarding the discrepancies above, the predilections of textbook editors and market interests are not of particular relevance to this work, but it brings to light the influence of social and political factors in addition to the direct implications of research. Looking at the 70% consistency of the first 1,000 words across multiple media and genres, we see that these are

---

<sup>28</sup> Lipinski, Silke, *A Frequency Analysis of Vocabulary in Three First-Year Textbooks of German*, 2010, 170.

important words to teach at the beginning because they are in the most frequent 70% of frequency lists, and therefore students get very useful words.

However, can this research translate into recommendations for pedagogy? Many researchers in High-Frequency Vocabulary claim that because these words are shown to be most frequent based on corpus results, curricula should be oriented toward teaching words in this order. Research into classroom dynamics and interaction, as covered in the next section, however, challenges the emphasis of high frequency vocabulary as a core of classroom instruction. I will argue that high-frequency should constitute an orientation toward certain high frequency vocabulary, but not all of it.

Tschirner makes a convincing case for the importance of considering high-frequency by showing that the first 1,000 most frequent words constitute 74% of texts, by showing that certain endings like *-ung* constitute 19% of noun derivations in German.<sup>29</sup> In short, certain words and structures give you more bang for your buck than others. However, this does not on its own solve issues of motivation, retention of this vocabulary supported by class material, keeping interaction meaningful for the students whether using high-frequency vocabulary or not, institutional forces acting on the teacher and students, etc. I believe we can move closer to well-informed recommendations of teaching material by reconciling the importance of high frequency vocabulary with research on how classroom interaction works.

Interestingly, official frameworks for second language teaching as provided by ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) and CEFR (Common European

---

<sup>29</sup> Tschirner, Erwin, *The Role of Frequency in Second Language Acquisition*, 139.

Framework of Reference for Languages) are not informative regarding these considerations. ACTFL recommendations address only the stated objectives of general ability at certain stages. For example, the ACTFL recommendation for vocabulary use at the beginner level reads: “Able to understand and produce a number of high frequency words, highly practiced expressions, and formulaic questions.”<sup>30</sup> This guideline for beginners progresses to the intermediate guideline: “Communicates using high frequency and personalized vocabulary within familiar themes or topics.” Other than the term “high-frequency” being used in these recommendations, this metric is not informative regarding what vocabulary to include.

In a collaborative project with P21 (the Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills), ACTFL created a document called the “21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Map”. It provides recommendations for skills students should demonstrate at the beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels. Examples of possible activities at each level are given, but the skill set accomplished in the L2 is separate from the effectiveness of a curriculum to develop the L2 in general, which is demonstrated by many native speakers being unable to demonstrate these skills, (such as interpretation of graphs and analyses of complex literary texts). In the introduction to the document the modern classroom is said to be focused on language use over language knowledge, and students are seen as the “doers” and “creators” of the language.<sup>31</sup> This document reads as being in line with task-based methodologies like CLT, but like CLT I find the effectiveness of this approach to be in its’ focus on interaction, rather than on the particular constellation of features defining it, i.e. a diversity of skills, authentic materials, or clear rubrics for grading. I want to distinguish clearly

---

<sup>30</sup> ACTFL Interpersonal Guidelines, <https://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-performance-descriptors-language-learners>

<sup>31</sup> ACTFL & Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, *21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Map*, Washington, DC, 2011, 4.

here between my interest in the effectiveness of certain tasks on L2 acquisition (the realm of instructed SLA) and the interests of schools and assessment bodies like ACTFL to build diverse skills through the use of language. I suggest that while the ACTFL guidelines may be effective in formulating relevant goals, these goals can only be effective inasmuch as they promote interaction in the target language in the classroom.

One study which offers a bridge between the kind of High-Frequency Vocabulary mentioned above, a Usage-Based approach to vocabulary in the sense of exemplar-driven construction creation, and the socially embedded use of constructions exemplified by the Icelandic Village is the Eskildsen article *L2 Negation Constructions at Work*.<sup>32</sup> Eskildsen argues for viewing the constructions as locally contextualized. Using Conversation Analysis as a basis for studying the use of negation constructions by two English as a Second Language (ESL) learners, Eskildsen shows that although the usage pattern of the two subjects is in accordance with previous findings of UBL in the sense of being concrete, exemplar-based, and probabilistic. The prevalence of a construction is locally and contextually dependent. Eskildsen shows that the learner has certain interactional targets: negation, request, reassure, direct, etc. and the kind of constructions that become preferred (more statistically likely), are guided by their effectiveness in reaching these context-dependent interactional goals even if the ideal construction for achieving this goal is not yet available to the L2 learner.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Eskildsen, Søren W., "L2 Negation Constructions at Work" *Language Learning* 62, no. 2, 2012, 335-72.

<sup>33</sup> Eskildsen, Søren, *Language Learning* 62:2, "L2 Negation Constructions at Work", Language Learning Research Club, University of Michigan., MI, USA, 2012, 335-372.

We must ask then: how does L2 interaction in classrooms actually work? If words are not just individual, context-free items, but situated in classroom discourse in order to achieve goals, then high frequency research needs to be accompanied by research on how classroom interaction in the L2 works. One source for detailed studies on classroom discourse is research conducted by conversation analysts, and the next section will review some basic research findings.

### **Section 3: Classroom Interaction**

Classroom Interaction research uses various methods to record and analyze the forms of interaction between both learners and teachers and among learners. In Olcay Serts' book *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*, he argues that "classroom interaction IS social interaction"<sup>34</sup> In this conception the space of a classroom is inherently bound with the social influences of a teacher-student dynamic, as well as the myriad and complicated connections between students. The idea that the classroom is a unique social space with norms unique to it raises concerns of an over-emphasis on high-frequency vocabulary based on large corpus data.

The corpus of relevancy across multiple genres that underlies high-frequency lists seems strong in principle, but potentially misses the confined space of the classroom and does not address concerns of immediate relevancy to the student, the motivation component associated with that immediacy, the political and temporal realities of instructors, or other pertinent social considerations. The orientation toward the classroom just described by Sert is referred to by

---

<sup>34</sup> Sert, Olcay, *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*, 2015, 9.

Sert as the “emic perspective”<sup>35</sup> that is “participant relevant, rather than researcher imposed”<sup>36</sup> High-Frequency then, regardless of relation to coverage across genres, is an a-priori theory occurring prior to the interaction of students with each other or with the teacher, and must be modified when encountering this interactional space. The space of the classroom, furthermore, is described as co-constructed and institutional. Co-constructed in that CLT and other modern methodologies have taken L2 instruction away from lecturing of content where the majority of turns taken are by the teacher, toward an interaction-based model where students negotiate meaning between each other and the teacher. The classroom space is institutional in that despite this interactional focus, “participants address themselves to an institutional-specific agenda”<sup>37</sup> They take attendance, have warm-up exercises, proceed according to a syllabus, take tests, are graded, etc. These institutional norms are immediate and relevant to the students, more so in the social space of a classroom than in an abstract scenario designed to draw out vocabulary relevant to hypotheticals. One method at this time for determining the norms of this social space and the institutional norms which inform it, is Conversation Analysis.

Conversation Analysis has been applied to the study of how classroom interaction works (Seedhouse, 2004), and its implications for classroom interaction are covered by Jean Wong in her book *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy*. She writes that Conversation Analysis is distinguished from other approaches because, “The insiders perspective is not obtained by interviewing the speakers, but by uncovering how the participants treat each

---

<sup>35</sup> Sert, *Social Interaction*, 2015,10.

<sup>36</sup> Sert, *Social Interaction*, 2015,10.

<sup>37</sup> Kasper, G., ‘Categories, context, and comparison in conversation analysis’, in Nguyen, T. and G. Kasper (eds), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives*, Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, 2009a, 1-28



other's talk in the details of interaction."<sup>38</sup> Conversation Analysis offers a unique resource for studying interaction as it, "offers a wealth of knowledge that can make our understanding more specific, more systematic, and more pedagogically sound. Conversation Analysis delivers the stuff that interactional competence is made of, Interactional Practices"<sup>39</sup>(the verbal and non-verbal methods participants use to engage in social interaction). Communication in the classroom is much more than IRE (Initiation, Response, Evaluation)<sup>40</sup> and as Sert accurately points out, "Co-construction of 'mutual understanding' between interactants is the basic means through which social relations and institutions are built, shaped, and constantly reshaped in talk-in-interaction."

It is this co-construction which is central to this project. How can a supposedly objective or quantitative understanding of vocabulary (high-frequency) be unified with social structures and L2 interaction in a classroom where meaning is continually reshaped?

Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) and Sert (2015) do this sort of work and provide the following recommendations for how to go about shaping classroom discourse. Combining the recommendations from Seedhouse and Walsh (2010) and Sert (2015), the following implications for instruction based on classroom discourse analysis include:

---

<sup>38</sup> Wong, Jean, *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*, Routledge, New York, NY, 2010, 6.

<sup>39</sup> Wong, Jean, *Conversation Analysis*, 2010, 8.

<sup>40</sup> Christie, Frances, *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective*, Continuum, 2002, 4

1. Maximizing interactional space (through increased wait time, by resisting the temptation to 'fill silence', by promoting extended learner turns, and by allowing planning time) (Seedhouse and Walsh 2010)<sup>41</sup>
2. Shaping learner contributions (seeking clarification, scaffolding, modelling, or repairing learner input) (Seedhouse and Walsh 2010)
3. Effective use of eliciting (Seedhouse and Walsh 2010)
4. Interactional awareness (Seedhouse and Walsh 2010)
5. Successful management of claims/displays of insufficient knowledge (Sert 2011)
6. Increased awareness of UTP (Unwillingness to Participate) (Sert 2011, 2013b)
7. Effective use of gestures (Sert 2015)
8. Successful management of code-switching (Sert 2011)

If part of our goals are to increase exposure to input for our students, elicit production, repair, follow instruction etc., and if the skills listed above have an associated vocabulary list, then focusing on terms relative to these social structures, (even if repeated as a formula) gives our students the ability to understand and perform the functions they do in the class anyway, in the TL. Whatever lists may be created from these structures, relative to the norms of the individual classroom, there will certainly be some overlap with terms high on the frequency lists. However, focusing on the structures of students' actual interaction and moving toward accomplishing that interaction in the L2 rather than prioritizing vocab based on frequency in the abstract, has the added benefit of increased motivation (students see that they can accomplish

---

<sup>41</sup> P, Seedhouse, and S. Walsh, 'Learning a second language through classroom interaction' in Seedhouse, P., S. Walsh and C. Jenks (eds), *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 127-46.

things in the L2) and moves the input of the classroom to predominately being in the L2 sooner. It has long been argued by researchers like Krashen and proponents of CLT, that L2 input in the classroom should occur as much as possible. Moving the focus from High-Frequency Vocabulary to High-Frequency Interactions (informed by Conversation Analysis) allows more input to occur sooner, that is we should make use of high frequency vocabulary to the extent it can be integrated with recurring interaction structures that occur in language classrooms.

The question, however, is to what extent is this already being accomplished? And what areas are there for improvement? What methodologies have been developed which attempt to maximize interaction, and where do we stand with modern textbooks reflecting these efforts? In the following analysis I will look at some examples of what current textbooks are doing regarding what linguistic material is being introduced and practiced in a given teaching unit. However, I am not looking to prove or disprove the ideas I presented in the preceding review, rather I wish to show some examples of what is being done in current textbooks and provide suggestions for possible improvement.

## Chapter 2: TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS

My central question in this thesis is what should be taught in elementary second language classes from the very beginning, and what perspectives current and emerging research in SLA and in studies in how classroom discourse works suggest on the matter. From the review thus far, it seems evident that a) high frequency of the specific vocabulary and grammar in language classes is desirable, that b) beyond frequency of linguistic items and constructions, it is useful to realize that these are not decontextualized items, but that they rather do actions in context in the real world as well as in classrooms, and that c) it is useful to consider which actions learners primarily achieve in classroom environments and what kind of social-interactional contexts in the classroom facilitate the language learning process. In other words, we can learn what is prioritized in textbooks by looking at what linguistic material is taught in what contexts, and what (and how many) opportunities for use are provided.

Recall from Eskildsen and Kasper's work, (2018) that the term *construction* refers to any structural linguistic item. Usage-based linguistics does not differentiate between words and grammar per se, because any linguistic item or structure is viewed as something which accomplishes some action when people talk or write. Eskildsen and Kasper point out that form-meaning pairings are construction-action relations, making the difference between morphology and syntax immaterial. Textbooks of course contain grammar and words and present them as different. However, from a usage-based perspective this separation is not required. Words and grammar are subsumed under the term *constructions*. In the analysis below I will use this term when I consider the three questions above.

To analyze what current textbooks do in all three regards, I here provide a review of three different elementary German language textbooks available on the American educational market in terms of these three considerations. Providing a comprehensive review of all textbooks currently available on the U.S. market is beyond the scope of this project. However, a sampling of select, commercially successful, elementary German language and culture textbooks will provide an exploratory glimpse into what is widely considered essential constructions at the entry level of teaching German. I chose three textbooks that have been a staple in the market and have multiple editions. The three textbooks chosen for this project are *Deutsch: Na Klar!* (Eight Edition, 2020), *Treffpunkt Deutsch* (Seventh Edition, 2019), and *Sag Mal, An Introduction to German Language and Culture*, (First Edition, 2014). These textbooks were chosen because they were candidates for the primary textbook used in the University of Tennessee's beginning language curriculum.

In my examination of these textbooks there a few select questions I wish to answer:

- 1) Do these textbooks state, either within the text or on the publisher's website, any clear influence from the findings of research? And if so, what branch of research/findings do they cite?
- 2) What constructions are offered in chapter 1? How many opportunities are there to use these constructions?
- 3) Which dialogues, or other opportunities for interaction are provided? How many dialogues are there?

## Section 1: Deutsch: Na Klar!

Deutsch: Na Klar! Is an elementary German language and culture textbook first published in 1990. It is now in its 8th edition and is widely used in the U.S. Na Klar! covers the basics of German grammar in self introductions and simple descriptions, ending with voicing ones' opinion. The 8th edition I am using here does emphasize a graphic novel format for the chapters, featuring "recurring characters as conduits to convey cultural information".<sup>42</sup>

In a description of the Introduction titled, "*Organization of the Text*", the structure of the book is described as: "simple yet effective, the program begins with a focus on the world of the learner (classroom expressions), moves to the survival world, and culminates in the world of issues and ideas"<sup>43</sup>The format of each chapter is the same, with the following structure. Topic warm-up, vocabulary presentation and activities, illustrated culture with discussion questions, grammar explanations, cultural reading with discussion questions, video clips, reading section with pre- and post-reading tasks, chapter vocabulary list, end of chapter self-quiz (organized as can-do statements). The stated goals for chapter 1 *Das bin ich* (That's me) are:

- Give information about yourself and others using single words and short phrases
- Describe yourself and others by naming characteristics
- Name your hobbies, interests, and things you like to do
- Formulate questions on familiar topics
- Respond to questions on familiar topics with single words or short phrases

---

<sup>42</sup> Donato, Robert Di, Clyde, Monica D., *Deutsch: Na Klar!*, Eight Edition, McGraw-Hill Education, 2020, xvii

<sup>43</sup> Donato, Robert Di, Clyde, Monica D., *Deutsch: Na Klar!*, Eight Edition, 2020, xxii

- Talk about multiculturalism in Germany
- Name several German customs and facts about Germany

Deutsch: Na Klar! says in its preface “Deutsch: Na Klar! gives students everything they need to build a solid foundation in Introductory German, with its unique integration of authentic materials and targeted listening and speaking activities, contemporary culture, and communicative building blocks.” Also, it states “The chapter vocabulary lists have been revised with an eye to frequency of usage in the real world”<sup>44</sup>. Therefore, it claims that the vocabulary is adherent to a frequency list, and that the communicative building blocks promote interaction. In Deutsch: Na Klar! there is no explicit association with research, but some of the vocabulary used in the preface alludes to the ACTFL guidelines, i.e. authentic materials, receptive skills (listening and reading) and productive skills (speaking and writing), and the promotion of “meaningful” vocabulary. However, can we find that reflected systematically in the chapter structure and the activities provided?

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to provide a comprehensive, statistical analysis of the usage and relative recycling across social contexts and teaching materials offered of all the linguistic items and constructions provided in a given chapter. Therefore, I will focus on 3 individual constructions in the context of 1 chapter and analyze how often they occur and in what kind of contexts. This provides a qualitative sampling of what kinds of items and constructions are presented, used, and reused in a given chapter of this textbook and in

---

<sup>44</sup> Donato, Robert Di, Clyde, Monica D., *Deutsch Na Klar!*, Eight Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Education, 2020, xvii.

what kind of social contexts. I have chosen *besuchen* (to visit), *langweilig* (boring), and *arbeiten* (to work). *Besuchen* occurs eight times, two of those are decontextualized in vocabulary lists. A feature of this text I noticed is the high amount of exercises that show the same verb conjugated in various tenses. *Langweilig* occurs eight times. Three of these instances are decontextualized in a list. *Arbeiten* occurs 13 times. Two of the instances of *Arbeiten* are in decontextualized lists. This chapter focuses heavily on verb conjugation and practicing verb endings. My general impression of vocabulary usage is positive. There is not a large amount of material per chapter compared with the other two textbooks and the text uses a lot of tasks to practice this smaller amount of vocabulary in combination with verb-ending usage. This repetition is beneficial, because repeated usage increases the relative frequency of usage within the text and therefore increased opportunities for usage by learners in class or during homework.

But how many and what kind of exercises are used? There are a total of 15 opportunities for interaction with a classmate in this chapter. Most of the opportunities are the middle part of a three-part task series. First a knowledge check or interview-style tasks collects information, then there is a dialogue to confirm information or discuss meaning, then the results are presented to the class. This parallels the interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational standards of ACTFL. There are, however, many exercises which are directed at the learner to do alone. The dialogues are interspersed with a majority of knowledge check tasks. If this text is meant for use in a classroom setting, many more of the tasks could be in the form of dialogue or collaborative problem-solving, thereby increasing amount of class time spent interacting in the language with increased



opportunities for input. The activities directed for solo work would need to be modified into interactive models to agree with the research recommendations for efficacy of interaction.

For Deutsch: Na Klar, I note the following. The text claims to focus on frequency of vocabulary, providing communicative building blocks, and integrating culture. It does so to the extent that its constructions occur multiple times, it does not do so in that most activities are designed for solo work. Individual constructions such as verbs like *besuchen*, adjectives like *langweilig* are used frequently and recurrently. The context in which they occur are fictional conversations in comics format, and decontextualized vocab lists. Overall, this text does well on focusing on repeated exposure to each vocabulary item. The interactive elements are structured with a preceding knowledge check/information gathering task and succeeded by a presentation of the gathered information. This reinforces the ACTFL standards three skills model. However, many of the tasks in this chapter can be completed by a learner alone and are not formatted for easy adjustment to an interactive form. I believe opportunities for interaction are missed in light of this. Also, many of the tasks, including pair and small group work tasks can be completed with yes/no or single-word responses. Formatting tasks with more open-ended solutions and allowing the teacher to guide the tasks promotes interaction. The teacher emphasizing interaction has to modify the majority of tasks in these texts toward that end.

## Section 2: Sag Mal

*Sag Mal* is another elementary German language and culture textbook first published in 2014. It is now in its' second edition. In the preface, the book states, "Sag mal supports beginning-level students by giving them everything they need to succeed at learning German. With thorough coverage of reading, speaking, and listening skills, integration of dramatic and authentic videos, and an inside look into German-language culture, this 12-lesson program has everything you need to tailor instruction for your course." It also states, " In the opening at-a-glance section, the text describes the communicative goals shown at the beginning of each chapter", it says they are, "real-life tasks you will be able to carry out in German by the end of each lesson". This is in line with ACTFLs' can-do statements and the interpretative, interpersonal, and presentational model but doesn't associate it with a particular branch of research.

In *Sag Mal*, the introductory chapter is broken up into three sections, Lektion1A, Lektion 1B, and Weiter gehts' (it continues), each Lektion includes the sub-sections of "Kontext" (the theme of the section), Fotoroman (image-assisted stories), Kultur (cultural section) and Strukturen (explicit grammar and vocabulary). I will be analyzing the first two sub-sections Lektion1A, and Lektion 1B Addressing each section in turn, the stated goals (listed as "communicative goals") of Lektion 1A are:

- Greet people and say good-bye
- Make introductions
- Use polite expressions

The vocabulary is provided in a side bar at the beginning of each Lektion. Lektion 1A focuses on greetings: good morning, good-bye etc. This selection is inline with the goal of interaction, in that rather than give single vocabulary items, allowing the classroom to immediately become an environment where meaningful input occurs among students and between student and teacher. It also represents a departure from strict high-frequency as terms like *kennen lernen* (to get to know) are not the most frequent across all genres, but these set phrases allow students to interact and display social competence quickly. The first activities provided have categorization and comprehension check formats. The first activities have students sort polite expression, people, and hello/goodbyes into the correct order.

The stated communicative goals of Lektion 1B are:

- Talk about classes
- Talk about schedules

The communicative goals for Lektion 1B are:

- Talk about classes
- Talk about schedules

Although no association with a research field is claimed in the preface, we can see multiple key words often associated with research traditions: high-frequency, real-life tasks, and interaction. *Sag Mal* lists several features that may imply an orientation to empirical research supporting the design of this textbook. *Sag Mal* lists the following relevant features: “abundant illustrations, photos, etc. all created or selected to enhance your language-learning experience”, “practical, high-frequency vocabulary for use in real-life situations”, “a focus on

pronunciation”, “contemporary cultural presentation of everyday life of German speakers”, “guided vocabulary and grammar activities to give you a solid foundation for communication”, “an emphasis on communicative interactions in partner, small group, and whole class activities”. While these claims reflect an orientation to vocabulary teaching in the context of activities that foster interaction between students, will they be reflected in the chapter?

I will examine these three examples of constructions in chapter 1, *Gern geschehen* (My pleasure), *das Mädchen* (the girl), and *hier* (here). These three examples are introduced in a sidebar list at the beginning of the chapter. *Gern geschehen* occurs a total of five times, either written within the chapter or as the correct answer to an audio exercise or part of a dialogue. *Das Mädchen* occurs eight times. But *das Mädchen* occurs nowhere in a dialogue, only in labeling exercises with pictures or as examples for grammatical structures: *ein Mädchen*, etc. *Hier* occurs eight times, both in examples within the chapters and within the dialogue. *Hier* has the advantage of being very similar to the English, and in the review of the chapter an exercise has students describe numbers to each other using the format, *Hier ist+(the number)+(item)*. For enough instances of these terms to occur for retention, many additional interactions using these constructions are necessary.

What opportunities for interactions or dialogues are there in this text? There are two main themes for this first chapter: *Wie geht's?* (How are you?) and *In der Schule* (in the school). In *Wie geht's*, there are short 2-3 sentence sets of preset phrases using basic greetings. The vocabulary material is first introduced in this dictation format, with learners reading from the page. However, following the initial exposure there is a page titled, *Kommunikation* with small group or partner exercises to role-play the preset phrases learned. This format occurs multiple

times within each chapter, and in chapter one there are a total of 24 tasks in which students must spontaneously interact. These 24 do not include instances where single-word answers are sufficient, they are each interview or collaboration tasks.

For *Sag Mal*, we note the following. The text claims to focus on practical high-frequency vocabulary, lots of opportunities for interaction, and cooperative tasks in terms of applying research. It does so to the extent it includes many opportunities for spontaneous interaction (24 instances in Chapter 1), it does not do so in that its' constructions do not occur frequently, and it misses opportunities for interaction in that it includes an overwhelming amount of material per chapter, that is, an abundance of content in terms of lexical, grammatical, and cultural content. Overall, I think the text reinforces interaction quite well. The abundance of tasks and interactions speaks to the efficacy of interaction as supported by research. The constructions used are mixed in terms of their occurrence in dialogues or interactive tasks. The terms I selected for my analysis did not occur enough times in the text alone to achieve retention, and frequent repetition of these constructions outside of the text is necessary. There are two sections of the text which I feel do not lend themselves to interaction. The first is the focus on pronunciation. The fifth page of the chapter focuses on pronunciation, but focusing on this in isolation instead of in the repetition of input during interaction seems to me time better spent on the tasks. Especially given that German characters always have one associated phoneme, I think input and repetition is sufficient for building pronunciation. Another issue I find with this chapter is the sheer amount of material. Chapter one alone contains alphabet, greetings, school vocab, nominative case, accusative case, plurals, compound nouns, numbers, definite and indefinite articles etc. The visuals of the text are

somewhat overwhelming, and I think much of this space could be spent reinforcing interaction. On the whole though, there are many opportunities provided by the text for students to interact and preceding these non-scripted dialogues with rote memorization and diction permits a low barrier of entry for students.

In comparison, *Deutsch: Na Klar!* includes its' constructions more recurrently and in more contexts where *Sag Mal* focuses on interaction. They are the same in terms of adherence to ACTFL and including multiple avenues of language use (interperative, presentational, interpersonal), but different in terms of opportunities for interaction and recurrence of constructions.

### Section 3: Treffpunkt

*Treffpunkt* is an elementary German textbook. First published in 1991, it is now in its' 7<sup>th</sup> edition. *Treffpunkts'* preface states, "***Treffpunkt Deutsch*** takes a student-centered, communicative approach to teaching German that enables students to use the language actively and successfully. The title reflects a major objective of authors Margaret Gonglewski, Beverly Moser, and Cornelius Partsch: to transform the classroom into a Treffpunkt — a meeting place where students get to know one another, as well as the German-speaking countries, by using German. The 7th Edition has been revised to provide an up-to-date view of the German-speaking world, including additional coverage of culture in every chapter to engage students." This focus on a "meeting place" theme shows an interactive focus, so we would expect to see many opportunities for interaction. The text covers basic grammar and

vocabulary, and themes of chapters range from friends and family through everyday life and ending at telling a story and discussing what you would like to have.

*Treffpunkt Deutsch* consists of one introductory chapter and 12 full chapters. Structurally the chapters place a heavy focus on learning goals. The first chapter of *Treffpunkt*, titled “Jahraus, Jahrein” (year out, year in), lists its “Lernziele”(Learning goals) as:

- Describe the geography and climate of the German-speaking countries
- Learn vocabulary to talk about the weather and to state your nationality and country
- Distinguish between ei and ie in German
- Identify people and things using German nouns
- Ask and respond to simple questions
- Compare and contrast university life in the U.S. and the German speaking countries
- Talk about people and things using pronouns
- Express states and actions
- Understand authentic video of German speakers introducing themselves
- Learn vocabulary to talk about the days of the week, the months, and the seasons, and to say where you’re going<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Gonglewski, Margaret et al., *Treffpunkt Deutsch: Seventh Edition*, (Pearson Education Inc., New York, NY, 2019) 20.

Students are primed for the chapter in a *Vorschau* (preview section), each chapter includes 2 cultural sections and a final part of each chapter gives tasks for the students to do to prove to themselves that they are capable in German. A new feature in the seventh edition is the inclusion of Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs) and “*Can-do*” statements in Mylab. These IPAs claim to help teachers “assess learner’s progress towards performance goals.”<sup>46</sup> The text also explicitly mentions that it is aligned with the 2015 World Readiness Standards for Language Learning in that it uses the interpretive, interpersonal, and presentational framework.

The three constructions I have chosen for the analysis of this book are *die Mensa* (the cafeteria), *warum* (why), and *wenig* (few). *die Mensa* occurs 14 times in this chapter. It occurs in two separate vocab lists, within a paragraph of cultural information, and as the answer to knowledge-check exercises. *Warum* occurs 4 times in the text. 2 instances of *warum* are in vocabulary lists. *Wenig* occurs twice. Perhaps with an interaction focus these constructions will be used more frequently, but from the text itself the occurrence of the words is below recommendations.

What opportunities for interaction are provided in this chapter? Out of 53 exercises there are a total of 23 tasks which expressly provide opportunities for interaction in *Treffpunkt* Chapter 1. Of the tasks I found, none of them could be answered with yes/no responses. As a preliminary opinion, if a teacher followed the text book exactly, I think more interaction would have occurred by the end of the chapter than if they had done the same with the other two

---

<sup>46</sup> Gonglewski et al., *Treffpunkt Deutsch*, 2019, xvi.



texts. Most of the texts have the learner collect information with a partner and then role-play the results.

In this text we have a term which exceeds the 12 instances mark for retention, within the text alone. *Die Mensa* is a term central to this chapter. I feel that this book is putting a lot of effort into making material more up to date with students' lives. The names of celebrities and scenarios show an attempt to modernize, I think this attempt drives the college, social media, and student life vocabulary to high instances. If this book is used at the beginning college level, much of this material will be relevant. However, there are some choices which seem not to promote interaction. *Warum* occurs in a list of w-words. This format is common in language learning, as in English they have a central role in question asking. However, introducing *warum* and then providing little opportunity or ability to answer, seems less effective. Students at this stage do not have either of the constructions which usually succeed the questioning turn: *weil* and *denn*. The example given in the text just answers with a statement, *Ich finde es zu kalt* (I find it too cold). Without resources to answer a why question, the word *warum* offers little in the way of interaction at this point in a course. *Wenig* occurs twice, once more than the instance necessary to include it in the chapter at all. Interestingly, the meaning of *wenig* is achieved in several tasks using *nicht viel* \_\_\_\_ (not much \_\_\_\_). If the meaning is being practiced in these tasks, and a construction used to accomplish that meaning is presented, it's interesting that very little opportunity is available to use it. Regarding opportunity to interact, this book scores a bit higher with me. The use of interactive tasks more often than not is beneficial and there is even an interactive task in English during the cultural sections. In the instances where the teacher would like to expand the tasks to focus on a particular grammar

point or make it a larger group activity, the resources are available. I would like to see the texts try and include a little less material, i.e. getting in all of the w-words, putting a variety of colors, astrological signs, etc. And focus on maximizing opportunities for interaction and creative discourse.

In comparison to *Deutsch Na Klar* and *Sagmal*, *Treffpunkt* includes the most opportunities for interaction. Most constructions recur very infrequently within the text, but the chapters include so many opportunities for interaction that a skilled teacher has many opportunities to focus on those constructions. *Treffpunkt* is similar to *Sagmal* in that they both include a lot of material per chapter, and some words require more complex grammatical structures to use which the students do not yet have.

## CONCLUSION

In this thesis, the main question I pursued was what recommendations do we have from research for how to teach entry level language. In pursuit of addressing that question, I reviewed research on second language acquisition, high-frequency vocabulary, and classroom interaction. I found that research on second language acquisition suggests that social context and co-construction of meaning is a significant factor, research on high-frequency vocabulary suggests that the first 1,000 most frequent words of language have much support for inclusion, and research on classroom interaction has specific social and cultural norms which teachers need to be aware of when choosing interactive activities and instructional material. In this examination, I have sought to find implications for beginning-level language instruction as informed by three disparate fields of research.

This prompted the question of how or to what extent current language teaching reflects High-Frequency and social interaction in the classroom. In order to ascertain that, I analyzed three textbooks. A sampling of specific items and constructions in each textbook and a comparison suggest the following state of affairs. All textbooks followed the ACTFL guidelines and used that language, some textbooks contained a high recurrence of constructions, and interaction was done in different ways in all three textbooks. Based on these insights, it would seem that current textbooks reflect research on the importance of including culture and high-frequency to some degree.

However, often the opportunities for interaction were limited and to some degree constituted a minority of type of activities in the text. Within the textbook proper there is not enough opportunities for interactions using the provided constructions within the textbook to

align with the implications of the research I have examined above. One suggestion for a follow-up study is to examine opportunities for interaction in all the accessory components of the textbook package, i.e. audio files, video clips etc. That said, a final caveat in any such study is that while nominally the opportunities for interaction may be present, we do not know how teachers use textbooks in their classrooms. In other words, textbooks and their components may provide an infrastructure for teaching, but classroom practice may vary from instructor to instructor.

We see from the percentage of overlap in texts for the first 2,000 words of a language that high frequency vocabulary is valuable and useful. If you can establish a vocabulary set that spans a wide range of genres in the native language, doesn't that mean textbook design and class structure can simply start with the most frequent words and progress toward specialized vocabulary?

There are several nuanced issues with this approach. From this point of view it is unclear whether vocabulary termed "high-frequency" based on a corpus which spans literature, transcripts of conversation, scientific papers, news reports, and other diverse media represent high-frequency terms within the context of a learning environment with varying language abilities and a patient instructor. The notion that what we do in the classroom in the L2 should prepare students for and reflect the "real world", obfuscates both the uniqueness of the social structures among students and between students and teachers, and the reality that most students of a foreign language will not go on to use the L2 at a high-level. Additionally, within two years, or even four, students cannot be brought to a high degree of proficiency compared to the myriad linguistic skills required to function in a native environment. I believe how

students interact in a classroom and the relevance of the material to their everyday experience greatly impacts their learning, and this may not overlap with the frequency of words derived from corpus research. I think a fundamental flaw in the various solutions to language teaching is decontextualization from the interaction of social spaces. Recommendations by researchers don't always align with the realities and social-interactional constraints of classrooms.

Interaction has become the name of the game for many teachers. Research on interaction recommends maximizing interaction among students, and the social aspect of language will do the work. SLA research on interaction suggests task-essential forms used by students to solve problems through collaboration is effective. The field of Classroom Interaction informs us on what social-interactional contexts are meaningful for language learners, inasmuch as it may support language learning, provides us with insights about how interaction may be structured in classrooms, this is important because as shown by interaction research, meaningfulness and retention are tied to these social contexts.

The social contexts that are important to language learners are inherently part of the classroom environment, and these can be described by classroom interaction research which uses conversation analysis methods to record norms and frequent turns. These norms and turns can then be targeted for instruction in the L2 to move the already existing social actions into meaningful input in the L2.

Classroom practices are currently a mixture of cultural content, grammar tables, classroom/school vocabulary items as well as abstract themes, and various tasks with more and less frequent vocabulary. However, the available empirical evidence on language learning would suggest that promoting interaction in tasks with themes and vocabulary immediately

relevant to the learners would be important to start doing. SLA research supports a view of language where, given circumstances in which learners use the target language to complete a meaningful task together, acquisition will occur. Instead of teaching language as transmission of information, viewing the teacher as an expert who imparts knowledge on the student, research suggests that moving into more of a guiding rather than instructive role, focusing on creating these opportunities for meaningful interaction to happen would foster language learning effectively. But where does that leave us with teaching materials? If the ability of teachers to transmit knowledge of a language into learners' minds is now less emphasized, what do they teach?

So, what does that mean in terms of general recommendations for entry level teaching? From the contributions of the reviewed research we can conclude three things with some certainty: 1) We know usage is important for language learning, 2) we know interaction is important for language learning, and 3) Regarding High-Frequency Vocabulary, much has been said regarding the benefit of including high-frequency vocabulary in class instruction and textbooks, and for the first 2,000 words there is good evidence that high frequency is beneficial, but research into what is being actually included has shown no connection between claims of high-frequency inclusion and frequency adherence in textbooks.

I set out a difficult task for this thesis in that I attempted to find unity in the findings of disparate fields of research. Trying to answer a question from the perspective of one field would have offered me a more coherent framework for analysis. I find it valuable however, to look at multiple avenues which are not always trying to support or refute each other's findings and see what shared concrete recommendations can be found among them. I have found that

High-Frequency Vocabulary makes a strong argument for the first 2,000 words of a language due to its coverage of a variety of texts, but I argue that this result doesn't speak to the unique social contexts and needs of students in social spaces which follow institutionalized procedures. Kasper and Eskildsens' work emphasizes experiencing the "life-worlds" of the target culture and of the students, and making interaction and co-construction of meaning central to language learning. Where this social focus overlaps with high-frequency is valuable, but as it concerns designing a curriculum, is incidental. I argue that for interaction to occur, we need to enable conversation in the L2 as early as possible, using the lived experiences of learners as documented by CA as our guide. When analyzing elementary German textbooks in light of these results, I found them considerably lacking. I recommend using textbooks as springboards for interaction rather than following them strictly. The adherence of these books to high-frequency lists, even when they explicitly claim adherence, is less than 50% on average based on the 2010 Johnson study. There are opportunities for dialogue and interaction, but they are mixed with knowledge-check and solo exercises. Without supplementation, textbooks do not alone result in a class in tandem with the findings of the research I have examined here. Textbooks provide much desired structure for teachers, but do not represent the culmination of recent research.

The impact of this study on curriculum design is that I encourage teachers to focus on getting their students negotiating meaning in the L2 as quickly as possible. This is best achieved by first knowing and then focusing on their specific social position, identifying what structures they often use in the L2, not words but social actions, and moving the accomplishment of those actions into the L2. Textbooks can be a useful resource for materials, but I encourage teachers

to use them as a resource, rather than as the central scaffold of their courses as they are hit and miss regarding adherence to research.

Future research needs to be done on textbook adherence to research findings, especially in the case that they claim explicit adherence. Additionally, high-frequency interaction resources, as opposed to high-frequency vocabulary dictionaries, would be of great use to teachers. More sophisticated methods for assessing students in the area of interpersonal ability is also needed, moving from assessments focusing on vocabulary or grammatical structure retention, to assessments on the ability of students to achieve social actions, regardless of structures used.



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1) ACTFL Guidelines 2012
- 2) ACTFL, *Performance Descriptors for Language Learners, 2012*
- 3) ACTFL & Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, *21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Map*, Washington, DC, 2011.
- 4) Block, David, *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*, Edinburgh, University Press, 2003.
- 5) Brandl, Klaus, *Communicative Language Teaching In Action: Putting Principles to Work*, Pearson Education Inc., New Jersey, 2008.
- 6) Cert, Olcay, *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*, Edingburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd., 2015
- 7) Christie, Frances, *Classroom Discourse Analysis*, Continuum, New York, NY, 2002.
- 8) Donato, Robert Di, Clyde, Monica D., *Deutsch Na Klar!*, Eight Edition New York: Mcgraw-Hill Education, 2020.
- 9) Ellis, Nick, and Laura Collins, "Input and Second Language Acquisition: The Roles of Frequency, Form, and Function Introduction to the Special Issue.", *The Modern Language Journal* 93, no. 3, 2009, 329-36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264090>.
- 10) Ellis, Rod. "Instructed Second Language Acquisition: Learning in the Classroom", *Applied Language Studies*, Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass., USA: B. Blackwell, 1990.
- 11) Eskildsen, Søren, *Language Learning 62:2: L2 Negation Constructions at Work*, Language Learning Research Club, University of Michigan., MI, USA, 2012.
- 12) Johnson, Ronald Eric, *Focus on Frequency: A Comparison of First-Year German Vocabularies*, 2010.
- 13) Kasper, G., 'Categories, context, and comparison in conversation analysis', in Nguyen, T. and G. Kasper (eds), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives*, Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center, 2009a.
- 14) Larsen-Freeman, Diane., and Long, Michael H. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. Applied Linguistics and Language Study*. London ; New York: Longman, 1991.
- 15) Lipinski, Silke, *A Frequency Analysis of Vocabulary in Three First-Year Textbooks of German*, *Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* 43, no. 2, 2010.
- 16) Modern Language Association, *Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World*, 2007, <https://www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Teaching-Enrollments-and-Programs/Foreign-Languages-and-Higher-Education-New-Structures-for-a-Changed-World>
- 17) P, Seedhouse, and S. Walsh, 'Learning a second language through classroom interaction' in Seedhouse, P., S. Walsh and C. Jenks (eds), *Conceptualising Learning in Applied Linguistics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- 18) Polyglot Conference, "The Icelandic Village: Guided Participation in Real-Life Interaction in Icelandic", *YouTube* video, 47.27. August 16, 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4h0aoyYAhuo>

- 19) Rott, Susan, *Form-Meaning Connections in Language Acquisition*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey 2004, 84.
- 20) Wagner, Johannes, *Designing for Language Learning in the Wild: Creating social infrastructures for second language learning*, Usage-Based Perspectives on Language Learning, Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston, 2015.
- 21) Wong, Jean, "'Applying" Conversation Analysis in Applied Linguistics: Evaluating Dialogue in English as a Second Language Textbooks", *IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 40, no. 1, 2002.
- 22) Wong, Jean, *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*, Routledge, New York, NY, 2010.
- 23) <https://www.tiki-toki.com/timeline/entry/775191/Methods-and-Approaches-in-the-History-EFL-Teaching/>
- 24) Taylor, A., *Communicative Language Teaching*, 2010, Feb. 1.  
<http://blog.tjtaylor.net/method-communicative/>
- 25) Tschirner, Erwin, *The Role of Frequency in Second Language Acquisition: The Case of German Prefix and Particle Verbs*, University of Leipzig, 2018.
- 26) VanPatten, Bill., and Williams, Jessica., "Theories in Second Language Acquisition : An Introduction", *Second Language Acquisition Research*, Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007.
- 27) Anton, Christine et al., *Sag Mal: An Introduction to German Language and Culture*, Vista Higher Learning, Inc., Boston, MA, 2014.
- 28) Gonglewski, Margaret et al., *Treffpunkt Deutsch: Seventh Edition*, Pearson Education Inc., New York, NY, 2019.
- 29) Dinsmore, Thomas H., *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching, Chapter 2: Principles, Parameters, and SLA*, John Benjamin Publishing Company, Philadelphia, PA, 2006, 53.

## VITA

Andrew Graves is a Masters' candidate at the University of Tennessee Knoxville. His two passions are language and martial arts. He lives with his partner and adorable cat in Knoxville, TN.