INTRODUCTION

What dual-language education (DLE) means in general terms seems clear enough: the teaching and learning of two languages together. The particular term is used mainly in the United States, where alternative terms include two-way immersion, bilingual immersion, dual-language immersion, and developmental bilingual education. In Europe, the terms content-based language teaching, language x as working language, language x across the curriculum, and others have generally been replaced by the currently favoured term content- and-language-integrated learning (CLIL). One could probably read many things out of such a proliferation of terms, but one of them is that there is a great deal of interest in this concept and a great deal of local activity in making it operational. It is clearly seen as a significant development in foreign language education. But what exactly is significant about it?

The first point I would want to make is that DLE gives explicit recognition to an essential feature of foreign language learning that has generally been suppressed in the past. In all foreign language learning, two languages are always implicated: The language to be learned can only be foreign in relation to the language that is already known, and learners are always faced with resolving this relationship. Learning a new language (or using a new language in order to incidentally learn it, as some would have it) is always a bi- or multilingual and bi- or multicultural experience, in which other languages are clearly involved. Traditionally, foreign language pedagogy has seen this involvement negatively as interference and has sought to focus on just one language and to keep the other out as a disruptive influence. So although a language is always bilingually learnt, it has traditionally been monolingually taught. What DLE does is to bring teaching in line with learning and openly represent the two languages as partners in the enterprise.

This recognition of partnership has the obvious educational advantage that the learners' own linguistic experience does not have to be denied, with their own language stigmatised as an undesirable influence. But it still leaves two crucial issues unresolved.

Firstly, whether one adopts a traditional monolingual or a dual language approach to language education, there is still the question of which other language should be the partner. And secondly, whatever language is chosen as the one to be learnt, there is the question how a language is to be defined in the first place and what roles the two languages play in relation to each other.
LANGUAGE CHOICE

My own focus on the first question will be a broadly European one, and I will concentrate in particular on university settings. When considering the situation in Europe, three perspectives relevant to language choice in DLE suggest themselves immediately:

1. At the sociopolitical level, there is, to begin with, the language education policy of the European Union (EU). The EU Action Plan for Languages propounds the ideal that every EU citizen should speak three languages--his or her mother tongue and two foreign languages--and that these should be, ideally, the language of a neighbouring country, on the one hand, and a language of wider communication, a lingua franca, on the other.

2. This ideal finds expression in the idea of bilingual or even multilingual universities as important agents for promoting multilingualism and linguistic diversity in Europe, supported by the European Language Council (Conseil Européen pour les Langues, an association of universities and academic associations founded in 1997).

3. At the more immediate pedagogic level, there is the CLIL movement, currently very popular with education authorities in many European countries. Here there is an attempt to develop an approach to teaching and learning that will be more practically effective in realizing the ideals of a multilingual European community.

Although these perspectives have a common motivation, they relate to diverse contexts and might therefore be expected to result in rather different kinds of approaches and outcomes, in particular with respect to the choice of the partner languages. The fact is, however, that despite lofty ideals and efforts to the contrary, the bottom line is that English tends to win out at the expense of other languages and become the preferred and dominant partner. In Austrian schools, for instance, real efforts are made to make students take up the languages of neighbours (e.g., Czech, Hungarian, Italian, Slovenian), but in the vast majority of cases, when school-leavers enter the job market, if they have any proficiency in a foreign language at all it tends to be in English. As for the idea of bi- or even multilingual universities, my own alma mater, Vienna University, explicitly subscribes to the European Language Council's basic principle that the promotion of multilingualism and of linguistic diversity is of fundamental importance for European integration in all spheres and that the universities have a crucial role in this respect. However, the reality on the ground, so far at any rate, is that at my university the only language other than German that is really visible and audible to a significant extent (on the Web site, in courses and materials) is English. Similarly, Austrian policy makers do not tire of emphasizing that CLIL curricula are in principle designed to cater for a number of different foreign languages, but in practice it just happens to be English that is the language that gets integrated with content so as to be learned with it.

I do not think Austria is particularly bad or culpable in this respect. Developments in Austria would seem, by and large, to be representative of developments in most countries. What appears to be happening, then, is that the general idea, and ideal, of DLE ends up as a language duel situation. Maybe the fact that dual ("having two parts or aspects") and duel ("a competition or

---

1 See European Language Council (2003).
struggle between two people or groups")² sound the same should serve as a warning. A great deal of agonizing is indeed going on in the struggle of minority languages to survive (or of deliberate policies to maintain them), as well as the struggle to get European citizens to learn any other languages than English—let alone the struggle to get native speakers of English to learn any foreign languages at all. The so-called killer language English is often held responsible for these difficulties, but as we all know, it is not languages that kill.

What is true, however, is that the language duel situation is especially acute when English enters the fray because other languages in competition with English are doomed to lose out due to the sheer socioeconomic power of English: When you talk about learning different languages and you line these different languages up, all competing for the same scarce resources, English wins hands down.

The reason for this has nothing to do with the intrinsic superiority of the language itself. Language is but an epiphenomenon of general cultural and socioeconomic conditions and developments; that is to say, it accompanies these developments. The demand for English is driven by the globalized market economy, so, to put it starkly, one could say that we in Europe are sold on English to the extent that we are sold on the global market economy, that is, a culture of socially and ecologically destructive consumerism, instant gratification, and monopolies by multinationals. As long as "the rich" speak English, those who want to get rich quick will want to learn English quick—and their numbers have been rising exponentially. Decision makers and experts in European language policies and education have hardly any direct influence on this extralinguistic state of affairs. There are practical and materialistic factors at play in determining language choice in DLE, whatever ideals about EU integration are expressed in policy statements. But what of the way the chosen languages are defined? I turn to the second question.

**LANGUAGE DEFINITION AND PARTNER ROLES**

In discussions about teaching and learning languages, the assumption always seems to be that the languages concerned are separate unitary things. We talk about competence or proficiency in a language—a language, a well-defined, more or less fixed entity. But of course a language varies—there is no one French, Turkish, or German, no one French- or Turkish- or German-speaking community. This is particularly obvious as far English is concerned, of course. So French, English, and Turkish are simply labels for a dynamic and diverse range of phenomena. As such these labels are convenient, but they are also misleading.

For it is naïve, and indeed counterproductive, to conceptualize languages as unitary, fixed entities, even if this is the view that people experience in their daily lives. From sociolinguistic and descriptive studies of languages, of how they vary and change, we know that what we call languages and varieties are mere sociopolitical constructs: there are no linguistic criteria as such for the delimitation of languages and language varieties. Language is a continuum in time and space, so what linguists can do is indicate variable features, but they cannot, as linguists, identify the boundaries that demarcate one variety from another (see Chambers & Trudgill, 1998). Varieties are sociopolitical constructs that exist in and through the perception of speakers. This insight is crucial and needs to be taken on board in language education and planning, in
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² Definitions are from the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.*
curriculum and materials design, and in pedagogic practice if we are to avoid the pointless duel of languages competing for attention and resources.

But this shift of perspective is hard to make. From their school days or even before, people are all used to thinking of languages as distinct, separate entities: kindergarten friends either speak the same mother tongue or a different one; at school, there are slots assigned on the timetable to learning different languages: today there are English and German lessons, tomorrow Spanish, and so on. Students take tests in Language X and Language Y--they have a good grade in one and maybe a not-so-good grade in the other. So on our CVs, we mention that we are fluent in speech and writing in Language X and Language Y, and that we also have limited proficiency in Language Z. We may go on to apply for jobs that require mastery of one or two foreign languages, or we may even decide to become a teacher of Language X, Y, or Z. We then take courses at the English, German, or Spanish department, and eventually obtain a degree that enables us to become a teacher of English, German, or Spanish. And then we start teaching in a school, and on the timetable there are slots assigned to different languages, and so on.

These perceptions prevail not only in daily life but also in research: Behind an enormous amount of work in psychology, second language acquisition (SLA), and language teaching research there is this axiomatic myth that there is such a thing as a language and native speaker competence and that these are well defined. But there are signs that the myth is now being questioned. SLA work taking a different, multicompetence perspective has begun to gather critical mass, though this has not (yet) replaced hard core SLA (cf., e.g., Firth & Wagner's 1997 criticism and responses to these by Kasper, 1997; Long, 1997; Poulisse, 1997; Gass, 1998), even though the monolingual bias of SLA research has increasingly come under attack (e.g. Cook, 1997; Sridar & Sridar, 1986).

But although there may be no such thing as a language--a stable, well-defined entity that you are or are not competent in, people nevertheless do think that there is. And this is because of the important function of languages as focal points of reference for individual and social identification, for a sense of self and a sense of membership of a group. For these reasons, people's mother tongue has a very special status in education, as a kind of secure home base of familiarity in relation to which what is new can be connected--which is, after all, the definition of all learning. The importance of the mother tongue for people's overall personal and educational development is particularly well documented in research concerned with bilingual children (e.g., Baker, 2000; Cummins, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), but the general point holds for any educational environment.

But there is also a downside to tying particular languages to particular identities, communities, cultures, and territories. The question "Your language or mine?" becomes an echo of the territorial "Your place or mine?", and it seems quasi natural that languages are held to be the jealously guarded property of certain communities. And of course the linguistic description of languages is complicit in this perception: there are, for instance, dictionaries of German and grammars of German as if there were one distinct, well-defined linguistic entity called German.
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3 These are collected and commented on in Seidlhofer (2003b).
4 Conversely, learning a foreign language has also been demonstrated to have a positive effect on first language (L1) use (Kecskes & Papp, 2000).
This perpetuates the entrenched idea that there is a real, central German with unitary integrity preserved by description and lots of peripheral varieties that, generally speaking, you do not need to pay any attention to. Thus real German is the preserve of real native speakers, who by definition are the only ones that can speak the language authentically.

It is clearly the case, then, that the sociolinguistically obvious realization that sharp lines between different languages cannot really be drawn is not operationalized in language education. Here, languages tend to figure as clearly demarcated elements in curricula, on timetables, and in teaching materials: usually, students are doing either Turkish, or German, or English. This is also true of U.S. DLE programs--admittedly rather different from European ones in many respects--where the clear separation of languages constitutes an important guiding principle:

The dual language program design is such that the languages are kept separate at all times--by alternating days, half days, or teachers. (Torres-Guzmán, 2002, p. 4)

One can, of course, talk about languages as clearly defined and separate if one takes a purely formalist point of view: for instance, one can say that Russian has its very specific aspect system, German the articles der, die, das, and so on. But if you look at the way language is used, you realize that the label for a language covers an incredibly diverse range of activities that no one speaker of the language ever encounters, let alone participates in. The name Language X covers a vast diversity of different behaviours in which language is used in all kinds of different ways for all kinds of different purposes, from singing lullabies to your children to negotiating a salary rise, from writing the history of a medieval castle to ordering food from a restaurant menu. All languages are variable and diversified in different ways, so learning one way or several ways of using a language does not mean that you have learned "the language"--reading and enjoying Proust, or Pamuk, does not mean you can negotiate a business contract with a French or Turkish company, or vice versa.

It follows that it is an illusion to think that you can know a language in its totality, as it were. Of course, there are a number of things that all speakers of a particular language would agree about, and this is what you would presumably want to start from and build on in language teaching. But this common ground covers a relatively small area: You could not even say that all speakers of English, for example, would agree that the final -s morpheme of the verb is superfluous in the phrase I goes or that you hear the realization of three sounds when you say the word hat in a conversation. So strictly speaking, it is clearly not the case that a language is a thing that you can acquire. Even as a native speaker, even if you are exposed to it from birth, you will draw on only a limited range of the virtually unlimited uses to which your language can be put. Ultimately there are always vast areas of incompetence. The idea of complete mastery of a language is a delusion.

You can, then, learn a language for certain purposes but never in order to achieve the whole comprehensive range. This is normal for both native speakers and nonnative speakers. So you always need to ask "What kind of English, French, and so on are you learning, or have you learnt as a native speaker? What is your range of competence?" This characterisation of a language in terms of a dynamic, variable, unstable repertoire range has an important bearing on the issue raised earlier about the choice of English as the preferred partner in DLE.
THE SPECIAL CASE OF ENGLISH

If you follow this line of reasoning, English is only special because while what is happening with English happens with any language, with English it happens on a larger, indeed global, scale. This is because English has entered into a very large range of domains of use all over the world. And as with all other languages, you need to ask whose English you are talking about, what use, and what function? As with any other language, competence will always be partial, but the crucial point about global English is that its wide range of domains of use is peopled not just by native speakers but, in fact, by a vast number and great variety of non-native speakers to whom these uses are available, too. In that sense the whole world is an Expanding Circle, to borrow Kachru's (1992) term (Seidhofer & Jenkins, 2003).

So to say that English is taking over is a misleading simplification. You need to ask where it is taking over, for what purposes, for whose needs, and to whose advantage. What you see when you observe the development of languages over time is that different language forms follow a differentiation of function, as the language in question is differently appropriated by different groups of speakers. Eventually, this can, of course, result in what are regarded as different languages, such as was the case with the diversification of Latin into today's Romance languages. But what is currently happening in global English is that texting, e-mails, the language of youth culture, special-purpose language/working argots are used as powerful ways of fostering group solidarity, a sense of belonging, and so on, as powerful as any dialect, deliberately chosen by the people who use it. The young people who use English to interact over the Internet, for example, do not seem to see it as a threat to their identity but, on the contrary, as a complementary means of self-expression.

If English is seen from the perspective sketched above, that is, not as a unitary, well-defined and static entity but as the sum of a vast range of partial competences that get drawn on in hugely diverse domains and activities, this also throws a new light on the threat that English is said to pose to other languages. If adjustments are made to English in conceptualisation and attitude along the lines proposed here, this threat is put in perspective and so substantially reduced. Languages will always be claimed and appropriated by different groups for their purposes, but in the case of English, precisely because of its global spread, these groups comprise non-native speakers of the language more than they do native speakers.5

I said before that English is a very special case with respect to its socioeconomic power and, resulting from that, its popularity as the foreign language of choice for most people in the world. Also resulting from that are concerns about the hegemony of English (i.e., English-speaking people), the so-called killer language English, and the inequalities among speakers of different languages, which (currently and for perhaps the next 40 or 50 years or so, cf. Graddol, 1997, pp. 60ff) benefit those who can operate effortlessly in English, that is, mainly its native speakers. These inequalities are, for instance, acutely felt by non-native speakers of English in such areas.

5 Figures vary according to definitions of speaker categories and availability of demographic data, but Crystal (2003, p. 69) gives the following conservative estimate: English as a first language: 320-380 million; English as a second language (L2; mostly in postcolonial settings): 300–500 million; English as a foreign language: 500–1,000 million. This means that roughly only one out of every four users of English in the world is a native speaker of the language.
as academic publishing and opportunities of employment (see, e.g., Ammon, 2001; Curry & Lillis, 2005; Phillipson, 2003).

Of course, it would be thinkable, in principle, to legislate for another language to be used in certain domains, such as Chinese for business, or Esperanto (Phillipson, 2003), but who would do the legislating when faced by a global phenomenon? And legislating for language variation and change has usually been a failure because languages develop in conjunction with other developments: Worries about English hegemony really are (or should be) worries about global capitalism and greed, unholy political alliances, exploitation of the weak/disempowered, and so on. The only constructive way forward would seem, as in all other important questions that concern human life, not censorship but education. I shall return to this point below.

But there is a different way of thinking about the special case of English: The unprecedented global spread of English, I would argue, calls for a completely new conceptualisation of English, and one that is compatible with what I have said so far about the difficulty of defining languages; the counterproductive effect of regarding them as distinct, well-defined entities; the inevitability of language variation and change; and the intrinsic partiality of linguistic competence/mastery. This would entail seriously following through the realization that, especially in the case of English, it is not just thinkable but acceptable, legitimate, and necessary to accept nonnative ways of using the language as entirely normal— that English as a lingua franca is a natural development that deserves acceptance and linguistic description alongside the time-honoured notion of English as a native language.

I have discussed the case for a conceptualisation and description of English as a lingua franca extensively elsewhere (e.g., Seidlhofer, 2001, 2004), also in relation to European language policy (Seidlhofer, 2003a, 2003c), so all I want to stress here is that it is high time we came to terms with a new concept of an English that is used independently of native speaker communities, and whose use creates its own, ad-hoc norms in the lingua franca interactions that are taking place across the world every day, with millions of different speaker constellations and in millions of different settings. But as long as the only descriptions we have of English are ones of English as a new language, notwithstanding metalevel discussions of linguistic imperialism and ways of resisting it, the misconceived idea that native speakers of English hold exclusive property rights will persist. What is needed, and entirely in keeping with the linguistic principles discussed above, to make English as a lingua franca tangible and viable as a linguistic reality is the description and codification of its salient features. Work on this is in now under way (see Seidlhofer, 2004, for an overview; see also Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English, n.d., and Seidlhofer, 2005).

A number of points have emerged from the discussion so far, and these might be summarized as follows:

- the global power of and resulting demand for English
- the all-pervasiveness of language variation and change rather than self-enclosed and well-defined entities constituting separate languages
- the conceptualisation of English as a lingua franca as a natural development
- the idea of repertoires and domains rather than complete mastery
the educational importance of the mother tongue

As I have tried to show, these issues can be seen as interrelated, and taken together, they pose quite a challenge for educational institutions in that they call for a considerable amount of rethinking and reorientation if their implications are to be followed through in language education programmes, particularly in DLE.6

A CASE IN POINT: ENGLISH ONLY OR DLE?

In what follows, I shall use my own department at the University of Vienna as an illustration of the needs, concerns, and opportunities of language education in relation to the issues discussed so far.

Our English department offers undergraduate and postgraduate courses in practically all branches of English studies (Anglistik und Amerikanistik, as it is called in German). The majority of our approximately 2,500 students opt for a degree that prepares them for the teaching profession at the secondary level. The academic level is high, and students tend to find courses more demanding than in many other disciplines, but this also means that our graduates are popular with employers, especially school authorities. Apart from its scholarly approach, the department also takes pride in the fact that all our teaching happens in English, and all the oral and written student assignments are in English as well. You could say, then, that at least on the face of it, the department is pursuing a successful English-only policy.

And, of course, there are no problems with face validity when it comes to English studies. Whereas other disciplines may be worried about downsizing or even closures, demand for English is booming due to the global economic power of English. But in reference to the points raised earlier in this paper, which English are we talking about?

Since the arrival of postcolonial literatures and World Englishes on the curriculum, English has indeed become Englishes in at least some of our literature and linguistics courses--even if my Microsoft Word spelling checker does not accept the pluralisation and insists on offering me English's or Englishness as correct alternatives. There are seminars on World Englishes familiarizing students with research into indigenised varieties. Students read about the future of English? and learn that those who speak English alongside other languages outnumber first language speakers and so "will determine its world future" (Graddol, 1997, p. 10). In our applied linguistics courses, many students get interested in "the cultural politics of English as an international language" (Pennycook, 1994) and "linguistic imperialism" (Phillipson, 1992), discuss proposals for "resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching" (Canagarajah, 1999) and are encouraged to question native speakers' "ownership of English" (Widdowson, 1994, 2003), to go "beyond the native speaker" in SLA research (Cook, 1999), and to recognize the strengths of "the non-native teacher" (e.g., Braine, 1999; Kamhi-Stein, 2004; McKay, 2002; Medgyes, 1994).

6 The point about languages being social constructs, nonfixed, in flux, always shaped by their use and only partially acquired is made very eloquently by Brumfit (2005) in an article that I got to see just as I was finishing the present article.
But even though English as a content area has diversified, English as a means of expression has not followed suit. So the global status of the language is something that my colleagues and students are very much aware of. But they are not expected to reflect this in their own language use. English is still a rather fixed entity in the singular when it comes to teaching and using the language as such. The language English, conceived of as a monolithic entity, is still largely considered the main knowledge base and reference point, and indeed it often is the only unifying element in a department like mine, inhabited by linguistics, literature, and cultural studies scholars who research and teach in very diverse areas of expertise. Perhaps the only common denominator of all research and teaching activities is that a clearly legitimate object of study is English as it is used by its native speakers, usually either in the United Kingdom or in the United States. And it is this that also provides the yardstick against which students' work is judged, in essays about topics in linguistics, literature, and cultural studies as well as in their language proficiency examinations.

Curiously, then, while we expose students to new ideas about researching, teaching, and learning Englishes and about the sovereignty and prestige of indigenised varieties, while we analyse with them Chinua Achebe's and Salman Rushdie's use of the language and discuss the potential special expertise of nonnative teachers, assumptions about the E in TESOL have remained curiously unaffected by the momentous developments of the last 15 years or so. That is to say, most classroom English language teaching has changed remarkably little considering how the discourse about it has: What constitutes a valid target in TESOL is still determined with virtually exclusive reference to native speaker norms. I do not wish to deny that there may be learning purposes for which adhering to native speaker models is a valid, or at least arguable, option. What is very striking, however, is that there is hardly any overt reflection at all about the schizophrenic situation sketched above.

It seems to me that important educational opportunities are being missed here because it would be both desirable and feasible to make room for an explicit discussion of the intrinsic impossibility of defining languages as distinct unitary entities, and of the fascinating processes of language variation and change that we are witnessing on an unprecedented scale, and at an accelerated pace in the case of global English. I am confident, however, that these opportunities are about to be taken up more and more in the near future, as discussion about English as a global language is moving centre stage in many walks of life. As a consequence, it will also become easier to achieve an open-minded and dispassionate contemplation of the desirability and feasibility of describing salient features of English as a lingua franca as an alternative manifestation of English, alongside the existing concept of English as a native language, that can make an important contribution to addressing issues of power and inequality connected with language use.

A trickier question is the one of students' linguistic development, and this relates to the last two bullet points above, the idea of repertoires and domains rather than complete mastery, and the educational importance of the mother tongue. The desire to achieve a high degree of proficiency in English is at the top of most of our students' priorities, but because time for instruction and studying is limited, this creates a conflict with another explicit goal of the course, namely, a high-level academic education in the content areas that make up English studies, held to be an important foundation for teacher professionalism. In addition, the question arises of how realistic
our students' expectations are that they will leave university with a well-nigh perfect command of English in virtually all areas of language use. A third issue is what consequences the exclusive use of English in all receptive and productive activities the students engage in might have for their mother tongue development and for their intellectual (and emotional) development in general. However, these issues do not constitute a topic of discussion in the department's daily pursuit of excellence.

My own perception of these conflicts has developed over years of observation and interaction and discussion with the students I teach and has resulted in a critical stance towards our English-only policy. I believe that the problems resulting from this policy are, roughly sketched, the following: Students, through no fault of their own, tend to be obsessed with the unrealistic objective of perfect mastery of English across all domains and registers, from youth slang and tabloid newspaper style to academic papers on aspects of linguistics and literature. This pursuit of linguistic proficiency is the goal everything else seems to be subordinate to. When students talk about studying English they often reduce the subject to the language side of things, leaving out of account the reflection and understanding the course is designed to foster in the areas of linguistics, literature, and cultural studies. They also leave out of account the role of their mother tongue in the formative years of their intellectual development. The danger inherent in this situation, at least as I see it, is that students' intellectual development and the extent they engage with difficult conceptual questions is limited with what they can express in the foreign language, and certainly in productive tasks they may find themselves saying what they are able to express rather than what they want to express. This problem reminds me of Harder's (1980) discussion of the reduced personality of foreign language learners, who continuously have the feeling that they would, and should, be able to say more than their linguistic resources allow them to. An important factor in all this is, of course, that drawing on the resources of the students' mother tongue, except for a one-semester's translation course, does not constitute a design feature of our curriculum.

Apart from likely disadvantages this entails for students' own development and psychological well-being, it also perpetuates the fallacy of foreign language learning as the acquisition/accumulation of separate, parallel monolingual competences and furthermore fails to acquaint future language teachers with ways of constructively involving their future pupils' mother tongues in their own teaching.

With all these misgivings in mind, I decided to conduct an enquiry into how the students themselves perceive these issues, or rather whether they perceive them as issues at all. I therefore designed a questionnaire, the most relevant questions of which for the concerns of this paper were the following three:

---

7 The vast majority of the students are native speakers of German, but over the last years in particular the numbers of non-German speaker students have been rising steadily. This increasingly multilingual situation poses yet more challenges, the discussion of which would, however, go beyond the scope of this paper.

8 The questionnaire consisted of seven main questions, the first four of which were designed to help students focus on the elements of the course they were following and eliciting their evaluation of these as well as of their own progress. The remaining three questions are discussed in the main body of this paper. All students whose e-mail addresses were available received the questionnaire, and students were asked to volunteer to fill in and return it, either anonymously or with their names. The questionnaire was made available in both English and German. One
A. In some university language departments, students can use their first language (rather than the foreign language) e.g. for writing essays, exams, M.A. theses. The convention in Vienna is to use only English. If you had the choice, which language would you choose for the following? Please indicate the appropriate box by writing in your reasons for choosing it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English - why?</th>
<th>German - why?</th>
<th>Both - how? (please describe)</th>
<th>Other - why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Discussions in proseminars, seminars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Proseminar / seminar papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Secondary literature (e.g. reading for lectures and seminars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Teacher feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. MA/PhD thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. What are the benefits, for you as a student, of only using English in your ‘Anglistik’ studies?

C. What are the disadvantages, for you as a student, of only using English in your ‘Anglistik’ studies?

The space available in this paper only allows me to report briefly and in a summary way on the students' responses. The general picture that emerged is the following.

**Question A**

An overwhelming majority of students voted for English in all boxes except for boxes (d), Secondary Literature, and (f), Teacher feedback, for which most said that both English and German should be used or that the participants should be able to choose. Interestingly, the reasons most frequently mentioned for a preference for the mother tongue for feedback

hundred eighteen questionnaires were returned, which was more than I expected considering all this happened outside term time and over a brief period (from late August to early September 2004).
(especially when this coincides for teachers and students) was that it was important that it was more "personal" or "natural," and that it was important to "avoid misunderstandings": 9

A.f.2: kann auch in Deutsch sein, vielleicht ist Deutsch als Muttersprache die "emotionalere" Sprache (could also be German, perhaps German as a mother tongue is the more "emotional" language)

A.f.24: Generally better in English but it does feel sometimes a little odd to talk to an Austrian lecturer in English outside class

A.f.35: This can be in German, if the teacher is Austrian and the feedback is given personally and not during a course. It might feel more natural.

A.f.71: Code-switching wo notwendig--finde ich angebracht (Verständnisprobleme) (code-switching where necessary--I find that appropriate [comprehension problems])

The main reasons for voting for English in the other boxes were that students want maximum exposure to English, opportunities for practising, "perfecting" (as many put it) their English, learning the terminology of their discipline, and having the chance to "prove" that they can do difficult things in English, such as write their MA thesis:

A.a-g.20: Man muss immer an seinen Sprachkenntnissen arbeiten. Deshalb bin ich dafür, dass auf der Anglistik Deutsch nicht verwendet werden darf. (One must always work on one's language skills. This is why I am for not allowing the use of German in the English department.)

A.a-g.60: Ich bin in allen feldern für englisch da man dadurch öfter englisch spricht bzw schreibt und gewandter im umgang mit ihr wird. Ausserdem studiere ich ja english und nicht deutsch. (I am for English in all boxes because like that one speaks and writes more English and gets better at it. And apart from that I study English after all, not German.)

A.a-g.77: I would choose English only, to use your native language is stupid. Why would you study English if then write in your native language?

A.g.2: sollte in Englisch sein. Meine Literatur wird hauptsächlich in English sein und hier kann ich zeigen was ich "drauf" hab. (should be in English. My literature will mainly be in English and like this I can show what I'm capable of.)

A.g.22: (E) Weil sich das "gehört" und zeigt, dass man imstande ist, in der Zielsprache eine wissenschaftl. Arbeit zu verfassen. (Because this is "as it should be" and shows that one is capable of writing an academic paper in the target language.)

9 Responses quoted in English were originally in English; responses in German are followed by my translation in parentheses. The letters and numbers preceding the quotations indicate Question A, the respective box (a, b, etc.), and the number assigned to the respondent. (E) and (G) indicate that the student’s comment was entered under “English” or “German” respectively in the questionnaire.
A.g.23: bec at the end of studies you should show what you can do in English

A.g.38: (E) Yes, to improve your English, to show you're capable to express yourself in English on an academic level  (G) No!!!!!!!!!!

A.g.8: Abschließender "Beweis", dass man die studierte Sprache auch in geschriebener Form (und wissenschaftlich arbeitend) beherrscht. (The final "proof" that one masters the language studied also in the written form [and in scientific work].)

But while the quantitative vote clearly is for English only, the not inconsiderable number of remarks arguing for using both languages (especially in Boxes b, d, and f) makes it clear that students are aware of the difficulties of doing everything in the foreign language, and of missing out on the opportunity of drawing on their mother tongue. Here are some quotes to convey a flavour of these responses:

A.a.62: Particularly at the beginning of the studies a mix would be helpful, e.g. lecture in English, but allow time for questions in German

A.b.116: esp. in the beginning language competence might not be sufficient for in-depth academic discussions in English. Students rather keep silent then or simplify their comments. Valuable thoughts might be restricted if English only discussions take place among a group of 20 German speaking students (actually weird concept, department of English is like an English speaking micro-world within German speaking Vienna??!!)

A.b.5: Weil ich bei bestimmten Themen viel mehr zu sagen hatte, blieb aber ruhig, weil ich mich auf Englisch nicht richtig ausdrücken konnte, es fehlte manchmal ein Schlüsselwort. (Because I had far more to say about certain topics, but remained silent because I could not express myself properly in English; sometimes I lacked a key word.)

A.b.68: Code switching, insofern authentischer, da wir ja meist alle deutschsprachig sind, auch leichter und man kann mehr in die inhaltliche Tiefe gehen. (Code switching--more authentic insofar as most of us are after all German speaking; [it is] also easier and you can go more into depth as far as content is concerned.)

A.d.116: […] If only English texts are used, danger to only focus on Anglo-American research.

A.d.42: I'd say both languages. the target language and your mother tongue (in my case Croatian) because learning sth complicated is easier to understand on your L1. I believe it has sth to do with our lexicon and our brain.

A.e.116: […] Content exams should test content and not language skills. Especially under stress it would sometimes definitely lead to better results and more in-depth thoughts if students could write in their mother tongue.
A.e.42: You practise your brain more. The paths between the 2 languages are used more frequently, so the strengthen your confidence in your knowledge, find your weak spots and correct them.

A.g.4: Eher auf Deutsch, weil hier akademischer Inhalt zählen sollte und mich persönlich hierbei die Fremdsprache etwas abschreckt. ... Gerade die Diplomarbeit soll inhaltlich bemerkenswert sein und gut ausformuliert werden. Studenten sollen sich in der Sprache ausdrücken können, welche ihnen am angenehmsten ist; in der sie ihre Gedankengänge am besten ausformulieren können. ([MA thesis should be] rather in German because it is academic content that should count here, and I personally am slightly discouraged by the foreign language in this. … It is the MA thesis in particular that should be remarkable in terms of content, and well formulated. Students should be able to express themselves in the language that is most agreeable for them, the language in which they can best express their thoughts.)

**Question B**

As for Question B, responses there--unsurprisingly--tended to echo what had already come in justifications for using English in Question A. Respondent 93 sums this up as "getting used to English as the normal everyday language," and several students said something very similar to Respondent 71: "Wenn alles nur auf Deutsch vorgetragen wird, kann ich ja gleich etwas anderes studieren" (If all the teaching is done only in German, I might as well study something different altogether).

**Question C**

Question C is where differences in opinion become particularly clearly visible. While 42 of 118 students said that they see "no" disadvantages of using only English, there is also a wide range of disadvantage mentioned that does reveal a concern among students that using English only is problematic--even in those questionnaires that had English ticked in all the boxes in Question A. These disadvantages include greater difficulty ("one is constantly under pressure not to make mistakes that one must not make," 4, translated from German), valuing linguistic correctness over content ("Sometimes in discussions it turns out that not the person with the better argument but the person whose English is best seems to be right. This should not be," 17), lacking an emotional side ("emotional topics often cannot be expressed as well as in the mother tongue," 22, translated from German). A particularly frequently mentioned concern is that students feel unable to talk and write in their mother tongue about what is important and interesting to them, the content/ideas of what they are studying, because they have only come across the special terms in English:

I would like to be able to talk about the concepts that I have learned in my monther tongue as well. When I wanted to explain something to a friend of mine and became aware that I could not translate basic terms that have become very familiar to me in English, I started to read books about linguistics, for example, in German as well. Maybe it would be useful if German texts were provided in the lectures right away. But only as an addition. (80)
The thing is you stop using your mother tongue in formal situations (writing formal papers etc.) and your first language becomes very colloquial. After a few years of studying in English you find it difficult to express yourself in a beautiful language (your 1st language) and this comes as a surprise … (69)

From students' responses, then, it is clear that there are disadvantages to neglecting the mother tongue in higher education, even if the development of the foreign language requires great amounts of time and energy. The essential complementarity of L1 and L2 is an aspect that comes across as important to students, whether they are aware of it or not. The intrinsic nature of language discussed in the earlier part of this paper, the impossibility of complete mastery, and the more realistic idea of thinking in terms of linguistic repertoires appropriate to certain domains or social situations would seem to be more compatible with a dual-language model rather than a strict English-only policy. This appears to be a particularly pertinent suggestion in the case of English studies, where a conceptualization of English as a língua franca as a natural development would be an apposite instantiation of the socio- and psycholinguistic insights discussed in this paper, and a timely addition to the traditional focus on English as a native language.

The crucial educational point, particularly in an English language teacher education course, should be to get across what language is, how it adapts and varies, how English does not only belong to its native speakers, and that any language can be taken up for learners' own purposes and expression of self, of their own reality. The important thing is to recognise this and to follow through its implications in language pedagogy. As Widdowson (2003) reminds us,

The English that teachers have to teach is not that which is monolingually realized in contexts of native-speaker use, but that of the bilingual subject English as a foreign language. … [There is a] need to reconceptualize the subject as essentially concerned with the process of bilingualization. (pp. 156, 162)

In that sense, then, we are all involved in DLE, whether our activity bears that name or not.
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