ABRIL / APRIL / APRIL / APIRILA **2011**

NEUIGKEITEN 48
NOVEDADES
BERRIAK
NEWS

1

Contenido / Inhalt / Content / Edukiak

Bezugsbedingungen

Dieser Rundbrief geht kostenlos und automatisch an alle Mitglieder, die LizenzinhaberInnen, die Fördermitglieder und ausgewählte Kontaktpersonen. Er kann nicht abonniert werden, aber gegen andere Publikationen ausgetauscht.
Jedes Mitglied/Lizenzinhaber erhält zwei Exemplare (für Verwaltung und LehrerInnen/TandemvermittlerInnen). Die PDF-Version kann und sollte innerhalb der Tandem-Einrichtungen massenhaft weiterversendet werden. Den Acrobat Reader kann mensch kostenlos bei *www.adobe.de* , *www.adobe.es* , *www.adobe.com* bekommen.

Beiträge mit einer Länge von bis zu 15 Seiten sind uns willkommen, wenn sie per E-Mail eingeschickt werden. Bitte fordern Sie die genauen Manuskripthinweise an.
Wir lektorieren die Artikel und schicken dem/r AutorIn ein Exemplar des nächsten Rundbriefs mit seinem/ihrem Artikel zu. Auch Beiträge von ausserhalb des Tandem-Netzes sind willkommen.
Redaktionsschluss ist der 1. des Erscheinungsmonats, Versand gegen Monatsende.
Die Tandem-Neuigkeiten haben eine ISSN-Nummer und Artikel in ihnen sind eine Zeitschriftenveröffentlichung.
Wir nehmen Artikel in allen Sprachen an, eine Kurzzusammenfassung auf Englisch ist sinnvoll.
Die Verantwortung für die in Artikeln ausgedrückten Meinungen liegt bei ihren AutorInnen, bei Nachdrucken aus anderen Zeitschriften bei deren Redaktion oder AutorInnen.

Redaktion Nr. 48: Jürgen Wolff

Impressum

Öffnungszeiten des Stiftungsbüros

Telefon: montags – freitags 10-13 h
Fax: immer
Geschlossen wegen Reisen und Sommerpause: 1.7. bis 31.8.2011
Emails werden weiter bearbeitet.
Wahrscheinlich finden Sie alles Wissenswerte auf den Webs im Impressum.

0.   Prólogo del editor / Vorwort des Herausgebers / Publishers foreword

C(astellano): Este es el noveno número con cara nueva y diseño unificado. Tomando en cuenta que nuestro círculo de lectores/as se hace cada vez más internacional, se antepondrá a artículos importantes un breve resumen en Inglés no-nativo, para que puedan decidir si usan un traductor en internet como www.systransoft.com o www.promt.de .

D(eutsch): Das ist die neunte Ausgabe mit neuem Gesicht und einheitlichem Layout. Da unsere LeserInnen immer internationaler werden, kommt in Zukunft vor wichtigen Artikeln eine Kurzfassung auf Pidgin-Englisch, damit sie entscheiden können, ob sie einen Webübersetzer wie www.systransoft.com oder www.promt.de verwenden.

E(nglish): This is the ninth copy with new face and unified layout. Taking into account that our readers become more and more international, in the future will be introduced an abstract in no native English of important contributions, to facilitate the decision about the use of webtranslators like www.systransoft.com or www.promt.de .

1. Deutsch und andere verbreitete Sprachen

1.1.   *Rezension:*
Susanna Buttaroni (Hg.), **Wie Sprache funktioniert, Einführung in die Linguistik für Pädagoginnen und Pädagogen**,

Schneider Verlag Hohengehren, www.paedagogik.de, 2011, ISBN 978-3-8340-0747-6

Der Band wurde im Rahmen eines Comenius-Projektes der EU entwickelt und mit Personal in Kindergärten, PrimarschullehrerInnen, SprachheilpädagogInnen und Eltern erprobt. Er versucht, die sprachwissenschaftliche Ausbildung dieser Gruppen zu verbessern und ‚Theorieresistenz' (Fthenakis) zu überwinden, auch wenn, wie die Herausgeberin im Vorwort (S.XVII) feststellt, noch nicht viele Ergebnisse vorliegen, die direkt umsetzbar sind. Dennoch ist es wichtig, die „zauberhafte Komplexität der Mechanismen, die Sprachwahrnehmung und Sprachproduktion regeln und gewöhnlich unter dem Deckmantel einer unbewussten, nur Millisekunden dauernden Verarbeitung versteckt bleiben, …" (Buttaroni S. XVIII) kennen zu lernen.
Die klare Gliederung deckt alle wichtigen Bereiche ab:
1- Einführung in die allgemeine Linguistik, Judith Kainhofer / Hubert Haider
2- Psycholinguistik, Maria Nella Carminani
3- Neurolinguistik, Philip Rausch / Chris Schaner-Wolles
4- Erstsprachenerwerb, Maria Teresa Guasti

5- Bilingualer Erstsprachenerwerb, Natascha Müller

6- Zweitspracherwerb, Muzeyyen Sevinc

7- Fremdspracherwerb, Andreas Rohde

Das letzte Kapitel über Lesen von Susanna Buttaroni fällt etwas aus der Systematik, ist aber auch sehr interessant.

Der Zielgruppe und Verwendung entsprechend, sind alle Artikel in gleicher Weise didaktisiert. Zunächst werden die Fragestellungen angerissen, dann kommt ein Wechsel von Informationen mit Zusammenfassung und praktischen Aufgaben, sei es zur Reflexion oder Forschung, meist in Partner- oder Gruppenarbeit (mit impliziten Lösungen im folgenden Text, aber ohne Schlüssel), fast immer die Schlussfolgerung, und das Literaturverzeichnis.

Die Texte sind sehr detailliert, mit zahlreichen Tabellen und Grafiken, und aktuellen Forschungsergebnissen angereichert, sodass ein einfaches ‚Durchlesen' fast unmöglich ist. Das Buch braucht und verdient ein ‚Durcharbeiten', möglichst mit DiskussionspartnerIn.

Auf ein Referieren der Artikel im Einzelnen wird hier verzichtet, lediglich einige Anmerkungen zu Beiträgen verschiedener AutorInnen für eine eventuelle zweite Auflage:

S. 191 – es ist etwas ungenau, Fragewörter wie ‚wer, was, welcher' als ‚wh-´Wörter zu bezeichnen

S. 192 (34b) – ‚rotto' einmal als ‚gebrochen', einmal als ‚zerbrochen' übersetzt

S. 194 (40) – ‚che' wird als ‚dass' übersetzt, obwohl es auch im Italienischen Relativpronomen sein könnte

S 194 (41) - ‚the man' wird zu ‚der Mamm'

S. 209 unten – der Beschreibung der verschiedenen möglichen Sprachkonstellationen täte eine tabellarische Auflistung gut, beispielsweise fehlt die häufige Situation, dass jedes Elternteil seine Sprache spricht, eine davon die dominante Umgebungssprache ist, aber nur ein Elternteil die des anderen versteht, womit seine Sprache zur ‚schwachen Sprache' prädestiniert ist.

S. 245 ff – hier wird mit dem zweifelhaften Begriff ‚Muttersprache' operiert.

S. 294 – die Kritik der expliziten Korrektur entspricht dem Stand der Forschung, sie schießt allerdings etwas über das Ziel hinaus, wenn sie behauptet, dass das System auch des Erwachsenen nicht für die Korrektur reif ist. Alternativvorschläge und ein Eingehen auf Fossilisierung fehlen.

S. 305 – Ähnlich die Behandlung der Grammatik. Zunächst wird der Ansatz referiert, der die ‚awareness' für formale Aspekte der Sprache schärft, der auch in der Zusammenfassung auftaucht. Die Gegeneinwände bleiben etwas schwach, und Alternativen werden keine erwähnt.

Der letzte Absatz zum Lesen (und Schreiben !) behandelt die Abfolge beim Erstsprachenerwerb sehr genau, bei Bilingualen und in der Fremdsprache nur kurz. Wegen der Datenfülle und des klaren Gedankengangs lohnt sich die Lektüre aber.

Alles in allem ein sehr empfehlenswertes Buch, das neben den genannten Zielgruppen auch für die höheren Semester von Pädagogischen Hochschulen und anderen Lehrerbildungseinrichtungen angeschafft werden sollte.

Rezension: Jürgen Wolff

2. Baskisch u.a. Minderheitensprachen / Euskara ta beste hizkuntza gutxituak

2.1. *Webhinweis:* Lingvejo, Esperanto-Camp

(E) Around Easter, from April 20 to April 26, the next International Festival of Esperanto will take place near Genoa, Italy, and will be based on a theme of « Travelling Generations.

Saluton al chiuj lingvemuloj !
chu vi shatas vojaghi, lerni lingvojn kaj malkovri novajn kulturojn? Chu vi volas vivi interkulturan sperton, kun cento da junuloj el la tuta mondo? Dum la Paska periodo, ekde la 20° ghis la 26° de aprilo 2011, okazos apud Ghenovo la venonta Internacia Junulara Festivalo (http://iej.esperanto.it/ijf/2011/index.eo.php), kun la temo "Vojaghantaj generacioj".
Krom la richa programo en Esperanto, kiu inkluzivas kursojn, ekskursojn, koncertojn, prelegojn, diskejon kaj multon alian, iu programero estos Lingvejo: konversacioj en la itala, germana, franca, hispana kaj aliaj lingvoj konitaj au malpli oftaj. La ideo estas oferi por chiu lingvo po unu konversacihoro tage, administrota far denaskuloj kiuj moderigos, korektos kaj donos sugestojn. Nun ni estas serchantaj partoprenontojn kiuj volas esti grupmoderigontoj pri sia lingvo, proponu vin !
Sed atentu: la lokoj haveblaj por Lingvejo estas nur 30 !
Por informoj: http://iej.esperanto.it/ijf/2011/lingvejo.php,
lingvejo@esperanto.it (nur pri Lingvejo)
iej@esperanto.it (Festivalo)

Se vi ne konas la lingvon Esperanton, neniu problemo, dum la festivalo eblos partopreni kursojn por komencantoj kaj progresintoj. Sed Esperanto estas tiel simpla ke oni povas facile lerni ghin sole. Jen du multlingvaj retejoj, kie trovi materialojn kaj senpagajn kursojn :
• www.lernu.net
• www.kurso.com.br/index.php?eo

Teksto en : Esperanto, Italiano, Español, Português, Français, Deutsch, English
http://www.tandem-fundazioa.info/forumthread.php?
forumid=23&menuid=15&rootid=0&msgid=86#86

2.2. Die kochenden Kerle von der Muschelbucht, Lesereise Baskenland
Georges Housemer (Rezension)

(E) Literarian travel report on the spanish part of the Basque Country

Dieser locker geschriebene Reisebericht behandelt in seinen Kapiteln die folgenden Ausschnitte des Lebens im spanischen Teil des Baskenlandes, d.h. die Autonomen Regionen 'Baskenland' und 'Navarra':
- San Sebastián (Gipuzkoa)
- Die Insel Santa Clara in der Bucht von San Sebastián (G)
- Ferien auf dem Bauernhof in der Nähe von San Seb. (G)
- Die Flyschküste bei Zumaia (G)

- Das Guggenheim-Museum in Bilbao (Bizkaia)
- Orte im Norden von Navarra (N)
- Das Fischerdorf Lekeitio (B)
- Baskenland für FeinschmeckerInnen
- Gernika (B)
- Delikatessen von Tolosa (G)
- Die Wüste 'Bardenas Reales' in Navarra (N)
- Die Herkunft von Simon Bolivar (B)
- Salzgewinnung bei Salinas de Añana (Araba)
- Weinbau in der Rioja (A)
- Sport im Baskenland
- Die Werke des Bildhauers Chillida (G)

Die Auswahl der Themen ist interessant, geografisch etwas gipuzkoa-lastig. Die Kapitel sind anschaulich, reich an Anekdoten und Details, die auch Einheimischen nicht bekannt sind, wie z.B. die Heilkraft des Atlantikwasser gegen Lippenherpes, den hohen Selbstfinanzierungsgrad des Guggenheim-Museums, die Herkunft des Fußballclubs von Bilbao von britischen Dockarbeitern, den Titel 'slow city' für Lekeitio, und dass das Hotel Nizza in Donostia der Familie Chillida gehört.

Oft wählt der Autor Personen aus der Gegend aus, an denen er seine Eindrücke veranschaulicht. Das macht die Lektüre noch spannender. Allerdings fragt mensch sich, ob der Sitte einiger Deutscher und BaskInnen, einmal im Jahr die Insel Santa Clara zu 'besetzen', ein ganzes Kapitel gewidmet werden muss.

Eine weitere Schwäche des Buches sind einige Ungenauigkeiten im geschichtlich-politischen Bereich und der Rechtschreibung des Baskischen, die für ein Lektorat in Deutschland natürlich Probleme aufwirft, z.B.

S.29 die „sozialen Preise" beim 'nekazalturismoa' / Ferien auf dem Bauernhof gab es in der Anfangszeit, inzwischen haben sie mit Hotels gleichgezogen

S.44, 49, 85 u.a. die Definitionen von 'altbaskisch' und 'baskisch' gehen etwas durcheinander, die Bezeichnung von Navarra und La Rioja als 'semibaskisch' ist originell. Eine anfängliche Klarstellung, wie die politische Gliederung ist, und wie weit der Kultureinfluss und der baskische Sprachraum reicht, hätte wohl mehr gebracht

S. 52 *Sorginak* ist mit 'Hexentanz' nicht 'frei', sondern falsch übersetzt, es heißt 'Hexen'

S. 53 der dazu gehörige Bach heißt sicher 'infernuk<u>o</u> erreka'

S. 75 bei der Darstellung des Nebeneinanders und der Überlappung/Widersprüche von historischen 'fueros'/Sonderrechten, 'estatuto'/Landesverfassung der Gebiete Araba, Bizkaia und Gipuzkoa und der spanischen Verfassung geht es etwas durcheinander. Das entspricht allerdings dem Durcheinander, das verfassungsrechtlich herrscht …

Alles in allem ein empfehlenswertes Buch, das weder die praktische Reisevorbereitung noch eine politische Analyse ersetzt, aber gute Einblicke gibt und unterhält, ein guter Urlaubsbegleiter.

Georges Housemer, Die kochenden Kerle von der Muschelbucht, Lesereise Baskenland; Picus-Verlag, Wien 2010, www.picus.at, ISBN 978-3-85452-979-8

3. Formación / Fortbildung / Teacher training

3.1. Opportunities for language learning and cultural awareness raising during participation in a Tandem language exchange program

Ania Driggers

ABSTRACT

The concept of tandem learning involves two speakers of different native languages, interested not only in language learning, but also in cultural exchange. This learning method is widely employed at European universities, but still unknown in the United States. From various theoretical viewpoints, it is assumed that interactional practices during Tandem may promote not only language learning, but also intense cultural exchanges. This study investigates if tandem learning actually provides opportunities for lexical, grammatical, and cultural learning.

To answer the following questions, audio-data collected from 18 tandem learners at the intermediate L2 level is analyzed. Additionally, questionnaires filled out by the participants are taken into account.

Results indicate that the tandem method provides learners with substantial opportunities for lexical learning (ranging from addressing a single word to complex discussions about idioms and proverbs), grammatical learning (pronunciation and morphology were frequently addressed), and cultural and pragmatic exchanges.

In addition, tandem participants confirmed through questionnaires their high levels of satisfaction with the tandem method. Such favorable feedback and the positive results obtained in this study suggest that the tandem method is a valuable tool for SLA.

Extracts of this doctorate thesis at the University of Michigan will be published in the next three editions.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The concept of tandem learning

The interactions involving a native speaker (NS) and a non-native speaker (NNS) are the central point of many studies in the field of second language acquisition since it is argued that such interactions may advance second language learning (Gass, 1997; Gass & Polio, 1998; Long, 1983; Mackey, 1998; Oliver, 1995; Pica, 1988; Tarone & Liu, 1995). Learning in tandem is an example of such situation.

The concept of tandem learning involves two speakers of different native languages (and different cultural backgrounds), where both are interested in a "language-exchange" and in learning

about the culture of their tandem partner. They establish a learning-relationship, meeting in most cases at least once a week for two hours or so, and speaking for an equal amount of time in each language. Tandem as a language learning arrangement between two individuals is gratis--there are no fees or tuition costs. Each participant simply gives time to the other. As such, it may be one of the best opportunities to practice and improve one's emerging second language (L2) skills outside of the classroom. Students can use their second language in a true communicative setting, learning new vocabulary and practicing grammar and pronunciation. They are also able to acquire pragmatic and intercultural skills through authentic interaction with a native speaker. This type of learning is very different from a typical classroom instructional environment.

In some foreign language classes, especially those that are teacher-centered, students are in many instances limited to just receiving information. They may learn all the grammatical rules and memorize vocabulary, but may also have few opportunities to speak and actively practice the learned material (as observed in some of my recent foreign language courses). Knowing grammatical rules does not necessarily mean that students can communicate in their second language. It is not uncommon that language learners are not able to ask or answer a simple question in the L2, largely because, even in more communicative classrooms, the opportunities for oral production frequently take the form of artificial simulations, which sometimes have nothing to do with the students' interests and real life conversations.

In a tandem learning setting, language production and authentic communication are the main goals. During such interactions, both tandem partners are playing an active role, and both are in control and responsible for their own learning. Furthermore, because the choice of topics of the conversation is closely connected with the learners' interests and needs, their mental effort is naturally increased. Also, regardless of the topics of the conversation, in the tandem setting, students are speaking all the time--producing an "output." Swain stressed in her research (Swain, 1995) that output serves second language acquisition in several ways. One of the functions of second language production is to practice the learned material and, as result of the practice, to enhance fluency. A second function is to notice the "gap" in the learners' knowledge. Anytime a non-native speaker wants to say something and experiences difficulty in the process of speech production, the NNS may realize the lack of linguistic resources. This deficiency, as Swain (1995) pointed out, can trigger cognitive processes, which then may help generate further knowledge of L2. Feedback from a native speaker, or intensive interaction between a NNS and a NS, may help fill in these gaps of knowledge and thus improve the NNS's performance in the future. For these reasons, conversation between a NS and a NNS often includes linguistic forms which are not generally present in a conversation between two native speakers. It is a special way of communicating, where both parties strive for mutual understanding and conversation flow, especially, as in tandem, where both speakers interact with each other regularly over an extended period of time.

Finally, tandem supports students' sense of independence and autonomous learning. The participants of this learning method are responsible for arranging their meetings and for overseeing their progress. The majority of the participants tailor their tandem meetings according to their interests and current needs, and are usually able to converse about issues and subjects that are relevant to them. Tandem learners may determine not only what is learned, but also how and when it is learned. Secondly, they can manage the frequency and type of corrective feedback they receive from their tandem partner. Tandem meetings allow learners flexibility with regard to the use of time, and because of this, participants of tandem are able to allocate more time during the meeting discussing areas of L2 that may be problematic or of keener interest for them, if desired.

In summary, one of the most significant advantages of the tandem learning method is its personal nature and the substantial opportunities for language production that it affords. Because of

this personal aspect, even students expressing a strong aversion to classroom language learning report enjoying their meetings with a tandem partner, as can be observed in the questionnaires collected for this research.

Although the tandem method provides learners with many unique benefits (autonomy, opportunities for language production and practicing of learned material, free choice of conversational topics, among others), it still possesses some limitations. One of the more significant limitations is the lack of formal, structured instruction of grammatical rules. For this reason, the tandem learning method and classroom instruction seem to complement each other rather well. By combining both methods, one can optimize learning. The classroom provides the structured grammatical foundation of the L2, while the tandem method provides a relaxed setting for use, practice, and further learning of the L2.

1.2. Previous studies and tandem research

Some studies suggest that interaction is beneficial because language learners may receive negative feedback as a response to their non-target-like speech production (Gass, 1997; Long, Inagaki & Ortega, 1998; Lyster, 1998; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Pica, 1994).

A smaller number of studies address communication strategies utilized by a learner who is having difficulties expressing certain concepts because of a lack of lexical resources or because of contextual constraints (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997; Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997). There are also studies focusing on learners' production and analyzing changes in learner output (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Swain, 1995). Their results suggest that interactional feedback motivates learners to modify their output, which may lead to increased fluency and automatization of the learned language. Lyster and Ranta (1997) emphasized that some forms of interactional feedback, such as elicitation and clarification requests, contribute to a learner's uptake and to output modification.

Additional studies addressing the learner's active role in the learning process have been conducted, among others, by Long and Porter (1985) who stressed the numerous advantages of a situation where learners interact and take control of their own learning. The ability to tailor the learning material to one's own current needs is one such advantage, and something characteristic of the tandem learning situation.

However, none of the above studies (dealing with input, output, and interactions between a NS and a NNS) were conducted in the context of a tandem learning situation. Many of them were conducted in classroom settings or in university research settings, with artificial pairs of speakers created for the purpose of the data collection. The re-addressing of some of these previously investigated research questions in a tandem learning environment is of interest to the field of second language acquisition.

Tandem research studies conducted in Europe address mostly the following topics: online tandem learning (Appel, 2000; Brammerts, 1999; Brammerts, 1998; Brammerts & Little, 1996; Schwienhorst, 1997, 1998; St.John & White, 1995; Warschauer, 1995); the place of tandem at German universities (Ehnert, 1986, 1987; Gaßdorf, 2001; Lewis, 2001; Wolff, 1985); learners' autonomy (Brammerts, 2001; Kleppin, 2000; Little, 2001; Müller, 1988; Nodari, 1996); French-German tandem (Neurohr, 1999; Woerner, 1993); and tandem learning as an intercultural activity (Bechtel, 2003; Vences, 1999; Woodin, 2001). There are very few studies that approach tandem from the linguistic point of view and investigate the relationship between tandem learning and traditional foreign language classroom learning.

1.3 Importance of this study

The goal of this dissertation is to investigate the linguistic processes linked to opportunities for lexical and grammatical learning in tandem. Additionally, I will research the intercultural exchanges that occur during tandem interactions. In doing so, I will attempt to close the existing research gap in the area of tandem learning, by adding a linguistic context to the pedagogical and cultural findings regarding this method.

Research related to tandem conducted at a university in the United States could open doors to the introduction of this learning method at American colleges and universities. Moreover, through their participation in tandem, American students could benefit from additional, inexpensive, and interactive exposure to authentic foreign language and culture. Tandem learning also presents an attractive solution to the question of how one creates a stronger relationship between classroom instruction and independent learning.

Tandem interactions could be of special benefit to American students since they often experience limited contact with foreign cultures. Participating in a tandem language project would improve their linguistic skills and broaden their intercultural knowledge. Also, American students returning to school in the United States after successful tandem experiences abroad, currently are not able to continue with this learning method because of the lack of tandems at U.S. universities.

In addition to aforementioned benefits, it is important to note that the tandem learning method fulfills all five goals of the National Curricular Standards for the Foreign Languages: Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. This strong correspondence between the National Standards and the tandem method could be highly useful for future educational purposes.

1.4 Tandem and Standards for Foreign Language Learning

As a result of the active involvement of the U.S. federal government and its financial support (1993), a coalition of four national language institutions: the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, the American Association of Teachers of French, the American Association of Teachers of German, and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese was able to develop standards for foreign language education for grades K-12, which were called "Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century."

These standards emphasize not only linguistic learning, but also intercultural communication, which is reflected in the guiding philosophy of ACTFL:

> Language and communication are the heart of human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which ALL students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical. Children who come to school from non-English backgrounds should also have opportunities to develop further proficiencies in their first language.
>
> (www.actfl.org/files/public/StandardsforFLLexecsumm_rev.pdf)

To maintain the required proficiency, ACTFL developed a total of eleven standards, divided into five goal areas, which are known as "The Five C's of Foreign Language Education": Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. According to ACTFL,

these standards cannot be achieved "overnight," but they should represent a realistic goal for the years ahead. The ideal implementation of these standards should start in the elementary school and continue beyond high school. It should be a life-long learning experience consisting of formal instruction and autonomous learning.

The Communication goal area addresses learners' ability to use the L2 in any communicative setting. It points out that students should be able to communicate ideas and opinions in the spoken or written form of the L2. Students are encouraged to engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions. (Standard 1.1) The communication goal area indirectly emphasizes the importance of comprehensible output. In order to communicate successfully, one should be able not only to understand received input, but also to respond to it.

The Cultures goal area requires that students gain understanding of other cultures. Learners should be able to make the link between how the practices of a culture shape its perspectives. According to ACTFL, learners "cannot truly master the language until they have also mastered the cultural contexts in which the language occurs." This statement is very significant because it stresses the importance of teaching and learning of all aspects of a language: its structure, lexical items, as well as intercultural elements.

The Connections goal area asks that learners connect with other disciplines and acquire a variety of types of information utilizing the knowledge of the L2. Using the foreign language in various settings, "students can acquire information and recognize distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its culture" (Standard 3.2). Through the employment of this principle, learners should be able to obtain information not available to them in their native language, and thus have a broader access to knowledge.

The Comparisons goal area addresses learners' necessity to develop an ability to compare American language and culture with an L2 and its cultural characteristics. Students are encouraged to compare the familiar environment with the unknown. This approach is necessary in the process of creating an open-minded society, able to face the globalization that is inevitable. As ACTFL pointed out, through comparisons students may "realize that there are multiple ways of viewing the world."

The final objective of the five C's is Communities. It encourages students to become life-long learners "by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment" (Standard 5.2) within an educational setting and outside of it.

According to the National Standards for Foreign Language Education, the United States "must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully" in any pluralistic society, abroad and in this country. Educators are required to implement the five C's in order to attain this goal. The implementation of the tandem learning method could be useful and helpful since tandem is compatible with the new standards. It is a very communicative approach (Communication), where participants are actively engaged in conversations, expressing their feelings and opinions and developing their ability to interact in a culturally appropriate manner.

Secondly, tandem allows its participants to gain deep understanding of other cultures, through direct contact with it (Cultures). The non-native speaker can learn directly from a native speaker what to do and what to avoid in the other culture in order to behave "appropriately." Tandem participants frequently demonstrate high interest in the progress of their learning-partners and ensure that they learn the whole spectrum of the L2: the linguistic elements, as well as cultural and pragmatic knowledge, as can be observed when looking at the analyzed data. Tandem provides learners with direct access to the other culture, through cultural activities which are the essential (although optional) part of tandem interactions: visits to museums, cooking traditional food for each

other, discussing customs and traditions of the native cultures in order to find the similarities and differences between them.

Thirdly, during tandem interactions, learners are able to use their L2 in various settings. Tandem meetings tend to take place at different locations, among others in private homes, bars, cultural centers, museums. Such a wide range of "instructional" settings leads to situations when learners discuss a variety of topics utilizing their second language, which in this instance becomes "a means to expand and deepen students' understanding of, and exposure to, other areas of knowledge" (Standard 3.1/Connections). For example, a visit to a museum may lead to an intense learning about German history through the means of the L2.

In many instances, above and beyond their usual tandem meetings, tandem partners often introduce each other to their respective friends and family, and in doing so "students can recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and cultures" (Standard 3.2/Connections). In summary, through learning a second language and through access to L2 information and its native speakers, tandem learners are able to have a "new window on the world" (Standard 3.2/Connections).

The fourth standard (Comparisons) is also a permanent element of most tandem interactions. It is common for tandem partners to compare the cultures, traditions, and linguistic features of their native languages (examples are discussed in the data analysis chapters). Tandem partners frequently look not only for differences between them, but also for similarities in order to "build a bridge" between their languages and cultures. Through the comparisons of the language studied with their own, tandem learners are able to notice certain features of their native language, which they used before, but were not consciously aware of. Such comparisons provide tandem learners with opportunities for reflections on their L1, L2, and the relationship between them. Tandem learners frequently "compare and contrast the two languages" as they notice differences, and in doing so, it is possible for them to gain a deeper understanding of their L1 and L2, and to develop critical thinking abilities with regard to "how languages work" (Standard 4.1/ Comparisons).

Since during tandem interactions, linguistic learning is as important as cultural learning, tandem participants frequently compare their own culture with the culture of their tandem partner. As Standard 4.2 states, "they expand their knowledge of cultures through language learning, they continually discover perspectives, practices, and products that are similar and different from their own culture, and they develop the ability to hypothesize about cultural systems in general." All these phenomena can be observed in the further chapters of this dissertation. Analyzed data provide examples of situations when tandem learners engage in discussions and comparisons of their native languages and cultures.

Finally, tandem learning involves a multilingual community of learners who engage in learning outside of the formal educational setting. They use the L2 for personal enrichment. Learners also enjoy the tandem interactions, and some tandems may be the beginning of life-long friendships. This also fulfills the fifth and final standard of ACTFL, Communities, which states that the L2 is "used as a tool for communication with speakers of the language throughout one's life: in schools, in the community, and abroad." (Standard 5.1)

Since tandem learning corresponds with all five standards recommended for foreign language instruction, and since it is relatively unknown in the United States, new research related to it should be of prime interest to language educators.

1.5 Research questions and hypotheses

As previously discussed, the tandem method provides opportunities for linguistic and cultural learning in an authentic, communicative environment. Tandem meetings are not only a social gathering--they are much more because their primary goal is language learning.

My goal is to determine what occurs during a typical tandem meeting: what is learned and what causes this learning. This investigation will focus on four features of learning: lexical acquisition, grammatical features spontaneously addressed during tandem learning, error correction, and intercultural learning. The research will analyze tandem-learners' output for the following characteristics: a) one partner asks the other for help; b) the NNS calls upon the language expertise of the NS; c) the partners negotiate meaning; and d) one or both tandem partners acquire new linguistic awareness about the L2 or about the native language. The research also will identify ways in which the NS signals the NNS that the original utterance of the NNS was unacceptable, grammatically and/or pragmatically. For example, the NS can recast the utterance, complete the sentence for the NNS, or provide a response that demonstrates a target-like way of expressing the original meaning.

The changes in learner output emanating from the tandem-learning process will be one of the focal points of this research. Generally speaking, any changes in the learner's language development will be analyzed. The study will look for an existence of a pattern of changes in learner's language and for eventual repetition of patterns by different tandem partners, investigating in which way tandem participants are learning through interaction and how effective such a learning environment is. I also expect that the data analysis will confirm my hypotheses that:

1-   H1: There are substantial opportunities for lexical learning because of students' participation in tandem.

2-   H2: There are substantial opportunities for grammatical learning from context and in context due to one's participation in tandem.

Additionally, this research will be one of the first comprehensive studies of tandem language learning as a whole; it will assess not only the linguistic learning in tandem, but also the pragmatic and cultural aspects of learning during tandem interactions. Since tandem partners have the possibility to choose the place of their meetings, many of the native speakers use it as an opportunity to introduce the foreign visitor to the local culture. Tandem meetings can take place in a café, museum, park, zoo, or private home. Each place creates a different context for learning and a unique environment for cultural experiences. This aspect leads to the third hypothesis of the dissertation, which states that:

3-H3: There are substantial opportunities for development of pragmatic knowledge and cultural exchanges because of students' participation in tandem.

Finally, participants' opinions about the value of the tandem learning method will be analyzed. In the current study, tandem participants evaluated advantages and disadvantages of the tandem learning method through multiple questionnaires and thus provided valuable information about future implementation and improvement of this learning approach. This aspect of data analysis will address the fourth hypothesis:

4-H4: The majority of tandem participants are highly satisfied with the outcome of their learning in tandem, and with the learning progress of their tandem partner, and would recommend this method to others.

To investigate the above research questions, this study will analyze data obtained from multiple audio-tapings of tandem interactions (authentic conversations between a native speaker and

a non-native speaker) and the results of four questionnaires, which were administered to measure tandem participants' perceptions about their experiences as tandem learners. By combining questionnaires with audio-tapings of dialogues, I intend to obtain a comprehensive picture of tandem interactions. According to Swain (1994), analysis of dialogues may be very profitable for second language research:

> I believe that another source, and perhaps a more direct source of cognitive process data, may be in the dialogues themselves that learners engage in with other learners and with their teachers. If one accepts the Vygotskian perspective that much learning is an activity that occurs in and through dialogues, that development occurs first on the inter-psychological plane through socially constructing knowledge and processes, then it must be that a close examination of dialogue as learners engage in problem-solving activity is directly revealing of mental processes. The unit of analysis of language learning and its associated processes may therefore more profitably be the dialogue. (p.142)

CHAPTER 2

TANDEM LEARNING

2.1 History of tandem learning

The term "tandem" appeared for the very first time in the second half of the 1960s and was closely connected with the establishment of the French-German Youth Exchange Program ("Deutsch-Französischer Jugendwerk," DFJW), which involved regular meetings between French and German teenagers. The essence of modern tandem learning was established in so-called "ateliers linguistiques" (Raasch, 1972). DFJW focused not only on the social aspect of the bi-national meetings (frequently conducted as summer camps), but also on their educational aspects. Language courses were of great importance to the organizers and the participants of these meetings. At first, these courses were conducted separately for each nationality during the summer camps: the German group learned French together, and the French participants studied German. After some time of separate study, the idea of mutual learning was introduced, and the concept of the modern tandem began (Bechtel, 2003). French and German native speakers were brought together to learn the language of their partner directly with and from the readily available native speaker. This approach allowed learners to learn from an expert, and to be at the same time the expert of their L1.

Shortly thereafter, the tandem learning concept was introduced at language schools in France and Germany. Its communicative approach gained great support among European language educators. In 1979, J. Wolff established the very first "Tandem-Agency" in Madrid, whose goal was to bring together German and Spanish learners, who were interested in learning with a tandem partner (Wolff, 1982). Additionally, the Goethe-Institut in Madrid started to offer German language courses supplemented with Spanish-German tandem interactions (Wolff, 1984). This approach proved successful and the so-called "Tandem-Initiativen" began to exist in Barcelona, San Sebastian, and in various cities in Germany. A few years later, Italy began introducing the tandem learning method at its language schools. These alternative language schools exist to the present moment and are part of the "Tandem-Network" (TANDEM ®). All of them offer traditional language courses, as well as the opportunity for tandem learning (Bechtel, 2003). Currently, language schools that are members of the Tandem-Network, function in the following countries:

England, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Argentina, Chile, and Spain.

Additionally, the tandem method found a significant level of interest and support among the academic community in Europe. Since the mid 1980s, many universities in Switzerland, Germany, and France, among others, have introduced the tandem learning component to their students. In Germany, the University of Bielefeld was one of the first to introduce tandem learning as a part of their formal curriculum and as an extracurricular activity (Bechtel, 2003).

Currently, the majority of German universities offer the tandem learning possibility, as well as support in finding a tandem partner. At most of these universities, interested students are able to fill out an application to indicate their language needs. Applications may be submitted online or personally to a tandem office, which matches tandem partners according to their age, personal interest, and linguistic needs. This service is gratis, and students may use it as often as desired. In most cases, students have the additional option of posting their own application directly to the blackboard in the front of the tandem office, and to manage their own tandem partner selection process. The learners' autonomy is of great importance for this learning concept although universities frequently provide additional counseling for any tandem participant with questions or doubts.

In addition to the personal tandem meetings, one additional form of tandem learning is currently employed at European universities: network based computer-mediated communication (CMC). One of the most successful networks was created at the University of Bochum-the International E-Mail Tandem Network, a project founded by the European Union, which involves universities from more than 10 countries. It was developed to promote autonomous and intercultural learning, and is considered an extension of the tandem learning method.

2.2 Guidelines to a successful tandem

Currently, there is strong support among most German universities for the tandem learning method. Universities provide supplemental guidelines to a successful tandem experience. These materials are readily available, either online or as handouts in language learning centers at the universities. The University of Kassel published on their official web-page the rules for successful tandem learning (http://www.uni-kassel.de/sprz/tandem/Tandem_Initiative/prinzneu.ghk), some of which will be used in this dissertation as an example of what is normally recommended for tandem participants. These rules can be seen as general guidelines, which can be provided by any university to novice tandem participants in order to help them to have a successful learning experience. Similar rules are posted on web pages of most German universities. I will present a few of these rules with the purpose of illustrating what is generally expected from tandem learners:

1.   Both partners should profit equally from tandem learning. Each language should be spoken half of the time.

2.   Tandem partners are responsible for their own learning. They should recognize and evaluate their linguistic needs and weaknesses and be able to address them during tandem interactions. Learners have the power to decide how much they want to learn, knowing that their tandem partner is readily available with help.

3.   Tandem partners should write down new lexical items, idiomatic expressions, or useful sentences. Taking notes is important!

4.   During each tandem meeting, tandem partners should try to correct errors and feel free to discuss them. Nevertheless, each tandem partner should decide how much error correction he/she wants to receive, and which type of correction would be most useful.

5. "Other countries, other cultures." Students should endeavor to be always aware that their tandem partner was born and raised in a different country, with different customs and different traditions. This awareness presents an excellent opportunity for intercultural learning and effective conflict resolution.

6. Students are encouraged to do different things with their tandem partner: go to the movies, visit a museum, or cook something traditional for the other person. Adding extra activities serves to keep the learning experience fresh and fertile, and importantly, helps to prevent any sense of monotony. (http://www.uni-kassel.de/sprz/tandem/Tandem_Initiative/prinzneu.ghk)

The above suggestions are guidelines for novice tandem learners, who may be unsure or confused about this learning approach. They may also be seen as general guidelines for successful tandem learning for all participants throughout the duration of their tandem interactions.

Learners are encouraged to be responsible for their own learning and to manage it intelligently in order to obtain the maximum benefit from the tandem method. On the other hand, sensitivity to the needs of the other learner is equally important, without which it is impossible to have a successful tandem.

2.3 New trends for tandem learning

Until recently, the tandem learning method was offered either as: a) structured tandem-language courses in an educational setting, or b) independent meetings of two tandem partners, who were in control of the content of their learning. The latter type of interaction is the focus of this research study.

The first form of tandem learning--the structured language courses-- is conducted with an instructor, who is responsible for the selection of conversation topics and the theme of the course. Tandem courses take place, in most cases, at universities or during binational meetings. Although they have formal structure, they try to remain true to the most important principles of tandem interactions -- two students from different nationalities work together as a team. This approach is a mix of the autonomous and structured learning. It is autonomous because there is an opportunity for authentic communication between a NS and a NNS, and students can personalize what they want to say about the provided topic.

There are, however, some elements of structured learning. First of all, students have fixed times for their classes. Secondly, there is an instructor who controls the situation (manages the instruction) and who prepares the topics for the conversations and tasks which need to be accomplished. The instructor also sets the time limits for each assignment and, in some cases, has to grade it. For this reason, students may perceive it more as a different form of formal instruction.

The second form of tandem interactions, which I will analyze in this document, is the autonomous tandem learning between two learners, who are completely in control of their learning. In this setting, learners are on their own, without any outside influences. This situation has many advantages: tandem participants can choose topics for their conversations, they have no fixed times to meet, their performance is not evaluated by a third party, and there is nobody else in control of their interaction.

Both approaches have some advantages and disadvantages. Learners participating in the fully autonomous approach have the freedom of doing what they want, but this may present some motivational and organizational difficulties for them. Also, students participating in formal

instruction normally receive a grade or at least some form of documentation to acknowledge their effort; autonomous tandem learners do not have this option. Their meetings, although educational, are often not officially recognized as such.

The above problems were recognized by the linguists of the Freie Universität in Berlin, and a new form of tandem learning emerged in 2007. During my data collection in Berlin, which was partially conducted with students from this university (as well as students from the Tandem Language School), I had the opportunity to have direct contact with Professor Tassinary, who is one of the developers of the new approach to tandem learning.

The new approach to tandem learning retains the element of strong emphasis on learners' autonomy, but additionally provides tandem participants with opportunities for some structure, readily available to them, if they choose it.

The initial phase for this type of tandem is exactly the same as for any other tandem-- students submit (or post on a blackboard) an application for tandem and once they have found their learning partner, with whom they want to continue to learn, they can decide if they want to follow: (a) the traditional approach-entirely autonomous learning, without any control mechanism or (b) the "new" approach, which still consists of autonomous learning, but with one major difference--students have to sign a "learning contract." This contract is between tandem partners and the language learning center. Before signing the contract, students are obliged to evaluate their language needs in the following areas: listening, reading, speaking, and writing (language learning centers are able to provide help with this). According to the results of this evaluation, students are required to set goals for their learning and to explain their approach to achieve it. Learners should provide concrete examples of activities they may employ during tandem interactions. Tandem partners also have to state in their learning contract the possible frequency and duration of their meetings. Additionally, they must agree to keep a learning journal, which documents their tandem work: learners' performance during each tandem meeting, accomplished linguistic goals, etc. Finally, students are required to return to the language learning center by the end of the semester with their learning journals for evaluation of accomplished tasks. After successful evaluation, tandem participants are able to receive an official certificate and accreditation from the university, which documents their tandem work and accomplishments.

This new approach recognizes tandem as a valuable tool in the process of second language acquisition and rewards serious participants with an official certificate. It should motivate tandem participants to think about their linguistic needs right from the beginning of the tandem learning process and to develop an awareness of them. This approach motivates tandem learners to take greater advantage of their interactions through the added element of "forced" self-evaluation and reflection on linguistic needs of each learner; on the other hand, it preserves learners' autonomy--the defining element of tandems. Learners willing to sign the learning contract are not obliged to lock themselves in the library and focus on grammar study; on the contrary, they are encouraged to enjoy their tandem meetings, which should be diverse, fun and educational. The only differences between this new approach and the traditional tandem learning are the contract signed at the beginning of the semester and the frequent self-monitoring/evaluation of progress in the learning journal.

…...

3.6 European tandem research

Only a few European studies conducted in the context of tandem language learning investigated the intercultural aspects of tandem learning, or the general validity of such a learning approach.

One of the most interesting investigations (partially related to this tandem research) was conducted by Bechtel (2003). Bechtel investigated the process of intercultural learning during French-German tandem interactions in an official, semester-long tandem language course at the University of Gießen in Germany. His focus was how, and if, language learning in tandem contributes to intercultural learning. In order to answer this question, Bechtel audio-taped and transcribed data collected during interactions between various tandem partners throughout the semester.

Bechtel's investigation was based on the assumption that individuals are constantly influenced by culture to perceive and to do things in a certain way. Cultural norms and rituals are crucial for societies--they tell people what to expect in certain situations and how to react to them. In the case of a change in cultural parameters, a "cultural shock" can occur. For this reason intercultural learning and contact with other cultures should be considered of great importance in modern education, as Bechtel (2003) pointed out.

One of the central features of intercultural learning, according to Bechtel, is the development of one's ability to present a cultural/political/social point of view to members of other cultures, and the ability to understand the points of view of the others. For the purpose of his research, Bechtel distinguished between the "I perspective," and the "They perspective." The first was related to the situations when tandem partners reflected and talked about their own culture and country; the second occured when the learners talked about foreign cultures. He noted that during tandem interactions, the "exchange" of perspectives frequently was observed, meaning that learners developed the ability to accept and to justify the differences of the "other" culture. As a result, they were able to develop empathy for the perspective of their tandem partner.

Bechtel concluded that intensive intercultural learning is constantly present during tandem meetings, due to the interaction between two learners from different cultural backgrounds. Each person is already a "live" source of cultural information, and at the same time an "object"/representation of his/her culture.

 Secondly, Bechtel pointed out that the intercultural aspect of tandem learning is to a very high degree learner-dependent. Each learner enters a tandem with a unique set of linguistic and cultural experiences, which make each interaction unique. Intercultural learning, like all other learning aspects of tandem interactions, arises from context. The intercultural aspect of tandem is always present as the primary focus of an interaction or as the background for linguistic learning.

Bechtel stressed intercultural learning can be observed in an active dialogue between tandem partners, in which they intend to find similarities and differences between their cultures. Additionally, intercultural learning can be observed in the process of conscious evaluation of the opinions of "the others" about one's culture and country, in order to respond to it in a non-confrontational manner, expressing at the same time one's own opinions. In order for intercultural learning to be successful, as Bechtel pointed out, tandem partners should avoid prolonged monologues about their own cultural experiences. Secondly, tandem partners should engage in a topic, which would be of interest to both of them. Since intercultural learning in tandem is strongly related to the opinions and experiences of its participants, one cannot readily distinguish between correct and incorrect information. This inability to make this distinction could be seen either as strength or as weakness of learning in tandem. In summary, the results of Bechtel's study suggested that the tandem method provided its participants with substantial opportunities for intercultural learning.

Another study related to intercultural learning was conducted by Woodin (2001), who investigated the presence and development of intercultural learning through language learning in tandem. Woodin's investigation is based on a very broad definition of culture. In her opinion,

culture is more than countries, their history and languages; each person has her/his own culture and its manifestations. Traditionally, according to Woodin, culture was taught through literature, history and art; but in order to grasp the full meaning of "culture" one should understand that it is dynamic and relative. It changes with the point of view of the learner; for example Spanish culture would be evaluated very differently from the point of view of a German person compared to an Italian person.

According to Woodin, intercultural learning involves not only learning of the facts of foreign culture, but also its pragmatics. One should learn about the accepted behavioral norms and customs in the other cultural setting. As Woodin points out, tandem learning provides an excellent opportunity to accomplish both goals of intercultural learning. One can learn cultural facts and appropriate ways to act in various situations in the other culture. For this reason, the tandem method connects the "old approach" of factual cultural instruction with the new, more practical approach of intercultural learning through interaction and direct contact with the cultural and pragmatic information. This approach seems to be of great interest among European educators, who are still trying to adjust to the more recent historical developments, such as the expansion of the European Union. Even before the study conducted by Woodin, the need for educational adjustments, due to changing societies, globalization, and new political conditions, was closely investigated in a study conducted by Schratz (1992).

As Schratz (1992) stressed, based on the recent social and political situation, the current approach to education, ecology, and economy might not be sufficient in order to meet growing demands on human beings. In the area of education, new learning methods should be developed in order to address learners' needs as well as sociopolitical demands. As Schratz pointed out, some of the traditional educational approaches may not be very useful in the future; for example, people may not be easily "educable" in large groups only. The knowledge accumulated by humanity is growing so fast that it exceeds the existing possibilities for its dissemination. Due to rapid global changes, it will be increasingly harder to plan careers and future developments of the job market. All these factors call for adjustments in most areas of human life, including foreign language education.

In considering the above conditions, Schartz proposed a more holistic approach to the teaching and learning of foreign languages. In general, such approach would include better communication between teachers and learners, increased opportunities for autonomous learning, and a shift from specific goals of individual disciplines to more general educational objectives. According to Schartz, the tandem method represents some of the above aspects of holistic learning, and could be of significant value for future educational purposes. The tandem learning method truly involves the learners in the learning process and allows them expression of their identity and personality in true communication. Similar conditions could be transferable into a "formal classroom" in order to achieve more authentic learner involvement and to make the instruction meaningful. Similar results were presented in a study conducted by Goebel (1992), who also stressed the need for more meaningful foreign language instruction.

In summary, all the above studies pointed out the potential benefits of the tandem learning method. Bechtel (2003) and Woodin (2001) stressed its utility in the process of intercultural learning. Schartz (1992) and Goebel (1992) highlighted its potential for future educational purposes since learning in tandem allows students more meaningful interactions than the traditional classroom setting.

It is widely recognized that communication in tandem is different from the one in a typical classroom. Apflebaum's (1993) study took a broader look at intercultural and linguistic processes present during tandem meetings. Her focus was on error correction, intercultural learning, and the participants' perception of tandem.

Participants were three French-German tandem pairs; two tandems completed the data collection process, and one withdrew from it (although some of the pair's data appear in the data analysis part of Apfelbaum's study). The task was "story telling" in which participants were free to choose the topics. Audio-recordings and transcripts of these tandem meetings were used for data analysis.

Results suggested tandem partners were able to "tell stories" in the L2 with a linguistic sophistication near the level of their L1. This may be due to the fact that full sets of data were obtained from advanced level participants. Negotiation was employed to clarify linguistic doubts or for general knowledge questions. Lexical learning was the focus of most learning episodes during interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers. Morphology (i.e. plural forms and articles) was the second most addressed feature in these interactions. Syntax and word order were not addressed at all in any of the dialogues. Although linguistic learning was present during these tandem interactions, it did not have as strong a presence as the intercultural learning which resulted from the meetings. According to Apfelbaum, the participants hoped to gain more grammatical knowledge from their interactions, but it was not the case. Nevertheless, they expressed increased motivation to continue with L2 study because of their participation in tandem.

Error corrections were present during the tandem interactions, but not all participants felt comfortable being corrected by the native speaker. Some preferred self-initiated corrections and self-repairs, which may be explained by the relatively advanced level of the participants. Apfelbaum confirmed that students' comments about error correction were, to some degree, confusing and contradictory. For example, one of the participants regretted she did not correct her tandem partner enough, but simultaneously stated she did not like being corrected during tandem meetings. Finally, the study of Apfelbaum confirmed the bilingual communication in tandem as beneficial. It seems that using both languages in the same conversational setting, helped students develop their abilities in fluent bilingual conversation and interaction.

Despite the limitations of a small sample size and advanced proficiency, Apfelbaum concluded that tandem learners focused primarily on lexical learning, and secondarily on morphological features. Syntax was not addressed at all by students evaluated in her data. Errors were corrected, but infrequently and with some resentment from tandem partners.

CHAPTER 4
THE PRESENT STUDY

4.0 Introduction

As mentioned in chapter 2, this study is an investigation of the linguistic and intercultural learning aspects of the tandem method. The following four hypotheses are investigated:

H1: There are substantial opportunities for lexical acquisition because of students' participation in tandem.

H2: There are substantial opportunities for grammatical learning from context, and in context, due to one's participation in tandem.

H3: There are substantial opportunities for development of pragmatic knowledge and cultural exchanges because of students' participation in tandem.

H4: The majority of tandem participants are highly satisfied with the outcome of their learning in tandem, and with the learning progress of their tandem partner, and would recommend this

method to others.

4.1 Participants

4.1.1 Participants' selection

The data to be analyzed in this document were collected from April through August 2007 in Berlin, Germany. Participants for this study were recruited mainly through the help of the Tandem Language School. This school, as a part of the Tandem Network, offers not only the traditional classroom L2 instruction, but also tandem-interactions for enrolled students. Students enrolled at the school and participating in tandems were contacted and asked if they would be interested in voluntary participation in this study. Tandems studying the following language combinations were initially considered for this research: German-English, German-Spanish, and German-Polish. The reason for the selection of these languages was my own linguistic abilities—I am fluent in these four languages and thus able to analyze, transcribe, and understand such data. However, as there was also interest expressed from speakers of other language combinations, such as German-Danish, German-Czech, and German-Japanese, I decided to explore if data collected from them could also be utilized for analysis. I met with each of these tandems for an evaluation, which was mostly related to my linguistic abilities to cope with the data than to the quality of their tandem interaction.

Due to similarities between German and Danish, and Czech and Polish, these tandems were able to participate in this research. The German-Japanese tandem had to be excluded because of my inability to transcribe and understand anything in Japanese. There were no other requirements for participation in this study: age, race, gender, and level of L2 proficiency were not considered factors which could exclude anyone from participating.

4.1.2 Participating tandems

Fifteen tandems (each consisting of two learners or in total 30 learners) participated in data collection for this study. Among these tandems, there were 13 "regular" tandems (learners were at compatible L2 levels and their age was in the range of 18-40 years); and two "special" tandems, which consisted of older participants (ages around 70, intermediate level of proficiency). Among the 13 regular tandems, 9 represented tandem pairs where both learners were at the intermediate level for their L2s; three tandems were at the advanced level; and one tandem was at the beginner level.

4.1.3 Tandems-general information

(The second capital letter after the first initial/initials indicates the native language of the participant: G=German, S=Spanish, C=Czech, E=English, D=Danish)

Table: General information about regular Tandem

Tandem	Languages	Male/Female
DG/RS	German/Spanish	F/M
LC/AG	German/Czech	F/F

TG/OS	German/Spanish	F/M
RD/AlG	German /Danish	F/F
BG/MS	German/Spanish	F/F
MG/JE	German/ English	F/F
MiG/SE	German/English	F/M
NoS/SoG	German/Spanish	F/M
MaG/CS	German/Spanish	M/M

Among these 9 tandems there are:

A. GENDER:

1 male-male tandem

4 female-male tandems

4 female-female tandems

B. LANGUAGES:

5 German-Spanish tandems

2 German-English tandems *

1 German- Danish tandem

1 German-Czech tandem

> * According to the Tandem Language School in Berlin, there is a strong demand for the German-English tandems, but not enough native English speakers. The strong demand may be due to the historical past of Berlin, where most of the population from the eastern parts of the city had very limited access to the English language. Currently, due to the demands of the employment market, English is a very important part of everyone's curriculum vitae.

4.2 Materials

All participants completed four questionnaires (see Appendices A, B, C, and D). They could choose an English or a German version of it.

The first questionnaire asked for general information, such as gender, age, native language, length and quality of previous L2 instruction. It also addressed learners' expectations with regard to tandem learning. It was administered after the first audio taping. The second questionnaire was closely related to the evaluation of tandem interactions and the relationship of such a learning method compared to traditional classroom instruction. This questionnaire was administered after the second or third tandem meeting. The third questionnaire asked participants to point out the perceived strengths and weaknesses of their typical tandem interactions. It was completed about one week later. Finally, the last questionnaire was a multiple-choice summary of all research questions

asked in the previous three questionnaires, with a few additional items related to the participants' satisfaction with their tandem learning experience. It was given to students after the completion of all audio data collection.

4.3 Procedure

4.3.1 Consent Form

Prior to the data collection process, tandem participants completed an informed consent form. This form indicated that they were voluntarily participating in a study evaluating the tandem learning method. It was explained to them that although widely employed in Europe, tandem learning is almost unknown in North America, and that their participation in this research study could help bring more attention to tandem at universities across the United States and Canada, and broaden the cultural experience of many students in these countries. Secondly, participants were informed that multiple audio tapings of their interactions with their tandem partner would be necessary, as well as completion of four questionnaires. Finally, learners were informed about the confidentiality of collected data and their right to withdraw at any time.

Since consent forms are not widely employed in Germany, their function had to be carefully explained to the participants. Not all participants wanted to sign this form, and for this reason one tandem withdrew from participation in this research prior to the data collection process. All other tandems who agreed to sign the consent forms participated in the data collection.

4.3.2 Audio data

In addition to questionnaires, audio data were collected. The tapings were conducted during regularly scheduled tandem meetings. Tandem participants informed me about the time and place of their meetings so that their data could be collected. Learners were encouraged not to change their routines and the style of their interactions for the tapings. For this reason, audio data collections were conducted at various locations, such as universities, museums, a zoo, cafés, bars, private homes, and parks. Although some locations were noisier than others, the technology allowed me to separate the background noise from the participating speakers, and to obtain data which were clearly audible for analysis. The DS-30 Olympus digital stereo voice recorder was used for data collection.

Audio data were collected 4 times from each tandem. The tapings were approximately 45 minutes for each session. Data were collected on average two times a month. I was always present during the first taping for each tandem, taking notes of nonverbal communication and my general observations. During consecutive tapings, I respected the preferences of the learners, either for being alone for the taping, or with me taking notes. My goal was to provide them with a comfortable environment in order to obtain authentic data. It was more important to obtain authentic interactional data than to be able to observe each interaction.

It is crucial to stress that learners were asked to maintain their routines, and no conversational topics or new learning strategies were introduced to them during the process of the data collection. Their interactions were truly authentic.

Additionally, most tandems had known each other for a fairly long time (an average of 7 months) before participating in this research; therefore, they had established certain routines and traditions related to their interactions, and neither my presence, nor the taping device influenced them significantly. The only time learners appeared aware of the recording process was during the very first meeting, but according to their statements, due to the very small size of the recording

instrument, they were quickly able to forget about it. After completion of audio-data collection, all tapings were translated into English and transcribed for data analysis.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

5.1 Participants selected for data analysis

This research will focus on the nine regular, intermediate tandems. The reasons for the selection of this group are:

1. Most of the learning which occurs in tandems occurs at intermediate levels, where there is still a large "room for improvement" grammatically and lexically. Advanced tandems tend to have different objectives for their meetings; often they have known each other for a very long time (in some cases more than a year) and frequently they are at the level, which could be described as "near-native speaker." Only on rare occasions is there a need for grammatical correction or a new vocabulary item. These types of tandems are already transformed from a learning situation into a friendship relationship, where pragmatic and cultural learning are more important than the lexical and grammatical aspects. Due to this distinctly different nature, advanced level tandem interactions should be investigated separately. The same could be argued in relation to beginner level tandems. First of all, these tandems are in danger of failing because learners generally cannot easily communicate with each other. Secondly, learners may be unable to explain any possible linguistic problems due to limited L2 resources. In summary, beginner level tandems represent a very challenging situation, and only very determined learners can manage it.

2. As previously pointed out, most tandems occur with learners at the intermediate level. At this level, learners can communicate quite well, but they are still actively developing vocabulary and improving their grammar. Even though they have already learned most of the grammatical theory, learners are frequently unsure how to use the grammatical features in a conversation. They still are working on fluency, and they need a lot of feedback to achieve it. Corrective feedback seems to be important at this level, and is very much appreciated by learners.

For all these reasons, the nine regular tandems at the intermediate level were selected for data analysis. Future studies could potentially address similar research questions at the beginner and advanced levels.

5.2 Individual tandem descriptions

In the following section I will shortly describe (in a form of tables) the nine intermediate tandems chosen for this research. **Information was obtained from questionnaires, and is presented in its authentic form—as quotes.** In each table, the following points will be addressed: participants' age and gender, reasons for having a tandem, goals for learning in tandem, learners' subjective feelings about error corrections, learners' evaluation of their progress.

5.2.1 Tandem DG/RS

24

Table 2: Tandem DG/RS

Participants/Gender	RS /M	DG/F
Age/Occupation	21/Student	21/Student
Reasons for participation in tandem:	"Tandem is more useful to gain L2 fluency than classroom."	"L2 improvement, cultural exchange"
Goals for tandem learning:	"Lexis and oral fluency. It is hard on one's own to learn new words"	"Lexical acquisition and intercultural learning"
Participant's opinion about error correction.	"100% necessary; to recognize one's errors"	"Corrections are important. It is the only way to learn."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"Almost all. Arriving in Germany I couldn't speak (knowing theory!)"	"New vocabulary, colloquial usage of Spanish, Spanish culture."
Did you gain cultural knowledge in your L2 through tandem? What did you learn?	"Food culture. Customs and traditions of German people. How families live in Germany."	"I learned about the educational system in Spain, Spanish: food, customs and traditions."

Both tandem partners were university students, having the goal to become foreign language teachers (RS-English teacher, DG- Spanish teacher). This factor could be viewed as a facilitator for their tandem learning since both had the ability to explain grammar to the other person. Although having a lot of contact with their respective L2 at the university, both RS and DG viewed their tandem meetings as crucial for development of L2 oral fluency. According to them, formal instruction did not provide sufficient opportunities for speaking or addressing a variety of topics.

In addition to their weekly tandem interactions, RS was frequently invited to the home of DG and her parents, which allowed him to experience the way of life of a typical German family, and even more, as he was a part of it while being there. I was able to observe one of these events. Also, RS was introduced to DG's friends, and was frequently invited for social gatherings with them. This allowed him to have direct access to the German culture and be immersed in the German way of life. He reciprocated and introduced DG to his Spanish classmates.

5.2.2 Tandem LC/AG

Table 3: Tandem LC/AG

Participants/Gender	LC/F	AG/F
Age/Occupation	30/Journalist	38/Student
Reasons for participation in tandem:	"Learning from a native speaker, gratis, opportunity for personalized topics."	"Because there are no other possibilities in Germany to use the Czech language."
Goals for tandem learning:	"Everyday communication, developing the ability to express ideas, vocabulary."	"I want to read Czech literature in original and understand Czech TV."
Participants' opinion about error correction.	"Very important. It is not common during everyday conversations with a NS, but possible during tandem"	"I want that my partner corrects all my errors. I'm here not to do small-talk, but to learn."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"Better pronunciation, a lot of new vocabulary and idioms, better grammar."	"Idioms, pragmatics-what to say/not in certain situations, speaking the L2 without fear."
Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?	"We compared our both cultures and explored why people do or say things (or not)."	"Yes, but I already knew a lot about Czech Republic before. "

Both learners (LC and AG) were very motivated, ambitious, and aware of their linguistic needs. They gave each other written homework in addition to their meetings. LC had the habit of paying attention to any problems she had with the L2 at work or in everyday life situations. She wrote them down and then discussed them during tandem meetings. Due to the above factors, the meetings between AG and LC involved intense and in-depth metatalk. Meetings were held twice a week for 2-3 hours. They were very much "work" and oriented toward producing learning outcomes. Lexical learning, grammatical learning, and intercultural learning were observed during these interactions.

5.2.3 Tandem OS/TG

Table 4: Tandem OS/TG

Participants/Gender	OS/M	TG/F
Age/Occupation	24/Student	22/Student

Reasons for participation in tandem:	1) Language learning 2) Contact with NSs	"It is more fun to learn L2 and use it directly."
Goals for tandem learning:	"Vocabulary, prepositions, verbs with prepositions."	"Vocabulary and oral fluency development."
Participant's opinion about error correction.	"Is crucial, but not all errors, only important ones."	"It's crucial; without it I could as well talk to my self."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"Vocabulary, colloquial language usage."	"One to one translations don't work; colloquial L2."
Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?	"Understanding of academic life in Germany; German traditions and customs."	"Yes, about family values (Spanish parents are more conservative); traditions…"

TG and OS were students interested in conversation, development of oral fluency, and contact with native speakers of their L2. Their meetings consisted of "regular" tandem-meetings, in most cases at the university during lunch hours, and of informal socializing with the tandem partner and friends. According to them, tandem was indispensable for oral skills improvement. OS indicated that more than one tandem can be very beneficial because it gave one the opportunity to converse more. Knowing German was very important for his future career, and he knew that through tandem he could supplement his grammar-oriented university courses.

5.2.4 Tandem RD/AlG

Table 5: Tandem RD/AlG

Participants/Gender	**RD/F**	**AlG/F**
Age/Occupation	27/Student	Mid 30s/Student
Reasons for tandem participation:	"To improve L2 and to meet a German person."	"I have family in Denmark and future plans of living there."
Goals for tandem learning:	"Vocabulary."	"Vocabulary and better writing."

Participant's pinion about error correction.	"I like it. My partner shows that she is interested-correcting me; and I can improve."	"I like it. Otherwise I can get used to speaking incorrectly. It is important for pronunciation."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"New words, a lot of facts about Germany; I also have a new friend because of tandem."	"Vocabulary, colloquial use of L2. I have the impression that my lexicon expanded considerably."
Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?	"German history, facts about every-day life in Germany and peoples' problems."	"I learned a lot about the educational system, social problems, and life in Denmark."

Tandem RD/AlG was unique because of the more formal approach--participants signed a learning contract (see Chapter 2) and were very aware of their learning goals and their linguistic needs. They were meeting each week for two hours at the university's language learning center or at various cafés. Tandem partners also socialized in addition to their regular meetings. They went to the movies, restaurants and bars. Both (AlG and RD) stressed that they were able to learn a lot, and this may be explained through their approach. In addition to their interactions, each tandem partner prepared at home an "essay" with new words learned during the previous tandem meeting. Essays were corrected and discussed at a subsequent meeting.

5.2.5 Tandem MG/JE

Table 6: Tandem MG/JE

Participants/Gender	**MG/F**	**JE/F**
Age/Occupation	30/Dance student	31/Student
Reasons for tandem participation:	"Fluency in English. I always hated the classroom L2 learning."	"Need for corrections without pressing friends to do so."
Goals for tandem learning:	"Vocabulary, grammar, but most of all the practice of speaking. One-on-one interaction is very effective"	"Vocabulary. One can not learn words from book and know, if the NS would use it in certain context or not."
Opinion about error correction.	"I want to be corrected.	"On the beginning I didn't like it, but once I realized

	Although my tandem partner has good skills, I think that I could improve her pronunciation."	how important it is to correct bad habits, I wanted to be corrected. "
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"Vocabulary. I also improved my pronunciation."	"Vocabulary, my grammar and pronunciation improved."
Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?	"I knew the USA and its culture before; but still I learned small details."	"Yes, I think I learned a lot about German culture and traditions from her."

MG and JE were very motivated to learn and to improve their L2 skills. In the conversation with the researcher, MG pointed out that she was aware of JE's relatively high level of German. For this reason she wanted to offer her customized (JE's needs adjusted) instruction, in order to "keep" her as a tandem partner. As a result, MG utilized flashcards with German idioms and proverbs during some of their tandem meetings, and paid increased attention to JE's errors. JE stressed that for her it was much easier to learn German in the "real world" (tandem). It was easier to remember things learned in context and in a casual atmosphere. She also mentioned that although she did not like error correction at the beginning, she changed her mind once she realized how important and beneficial it was.

 This tandem was also employing a combination of various tandem meetings. In addition to the learning oriented interactions, MG and JE went together to the zoo (where they learned animals' names), cinema, and a dance show. JE also had a chance to visit MG at her home on multiple occasions.

5.2.6 Tandem MS/BG

Table 7: Tandem MS/BG

Participants/Gender	**MS/F**	**BG/F**
Age/Occupation	23/Design student	31/Student
Reasons for tandem participation:	"To have a contact with a local person and to learn the L2 at the same time."	"Because of the good experience with tandem of my other friends. Also, to understand flamenco texts "
Goals for tandem learning:	"Grammar and vocabulary."	"Speaking/conversation"
Participant's pinion about error correction.	"It is important. If not, one thinks that she speaks	"Good and important for

	correctly."	speaking error-free."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"How young people live in Germany."	"Cultural knowledge, vocabulary, pronunciation."
Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?	"My tandem partner explained me many cultural aspects of Germany. German food."	"The differences between Spanish and Catalan. How to make typical Spanish food."

Both learners were at the lower intermediate level at the beginning of their meetings. As MS stressed, she participated in various German courses, but was never able to communicate or to speak. Her participation in tandem pushed her to do it. As she pointed out, she learned "almost everything" through tandem. It allowed her to minimize her fear of speaking the L2, which was very strong before. She described the tandem experience as learning German while having fun interacting with a tandem partner. BG stressed that tandem allowed her to have direct contact with Spanish culture through her tandem partner, in addition to all benefits previously pointed out by MS. She was able to learn not only about Spanish culture, but also about the Catalan traditions since her tandem partner had these two cultural backgrounds.

Although focused on learning, this tandem had quite informal meetings in cafés and bars. Additionally, tandem partners participated in various cultural/athletic activities together, such as kayaking, cooking, parties, cultural events, and a flamenco class.

5.2.7 Tandem NoS/ SoG

Table 8: Tandem NoS/SoG

Participants/Gender	**NoS/F**	**SoG/M**
Age/Occupation	28/Student	33/Engineer
Reasons for tandem participation:	"It is the best opportunity to speak the L2."	"To practice the L2/ L2's culture with a NS in a relaxed environment."
Goals for tandem learning:	"Grammar and vocabulary."	"Mainly vocabulary; I learn Grammar in L2 instruction."
Participant's opinion about error correction.	"It's important, because if nobody corrects me I will always make the same errors."	"Very important, but not constantly."

What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"New vocabulary, grammar, facts about life in Berlin."	"I could practice with her my Spanish, so I don't forget it."
Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?	"Yes, I learned a lot about Berlin and other parts of Germany through our trips."	"It is hard to say, but for sure, one can get rid of stereotypes. "

Tandem SoG and NoS involved not only intense linguistic learning, but also intense intercultural exchanges. Tandem partners (frequently accompanied by other friends) organized many excursions to explore various German cities. Because of it, NoS highlighted that her previous stereotypical opinion about German people changed. She stated in one of the questionnaires, "German people are also nice and dependable. Sometimes Spanish people have a very different idea about Germans. Tandem, definitely, helped me to revise it."

Her tandem partner pointed out that for him tandem provided a more stimulating learning environment compared to a traditional classroom, where one could be exposed to boring topics. However, both (NoS and SoG) stressed that formal learning is important.

5.2.8 Tandem SE/MiG

Table 9: Tandem SE/MiG

Participants/Gender	SE/M	MiG/F
Age/Occupation	27/Web developer	30/Midwife
Reasons for tandem participation:	"To improve my L2. One is always engaged during tandem learning."	"L2 improvement--to work and live in Canada."
Goals for tandem learning:	"Grammar to sound intelligent and vocabulary to understand it."	"Speaking fluently. Vocabulary expansion."
Participant's opinion about error correction.	"If I say something incorrectly I want to know it; it's why I'm here."	"I want to be corrected, otherwise I don't learn much."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"Vocabulary; also when I'm stuck trying to say something complicated, she helps me with it."	"Fluency in speaking."

Did you gain L2 cultural knowledge though tandem? What did you learn?	"I have already been in Germany for few years, so I know a lot."	"I know already the US culture, so I'm focusing on other things –speaking, lexis, pronunciation."

This tandem consisted of two learners with an "aversion" to formal learning settings. SE did not like them because of very few opportunities to speak. He knew that a receptive understanding of an L2 and speaking it are very different. Because SE lived in Germany, he understood the importance of tandem learning and error corrections. He liked tandem because during such interactions he was actively engaged all the time and could pause for clarification if he did not understand something. During tandem, he could also learn with somebody he liked, "rather than with a random assortment of people in a class." A flexible schedule was also a plus since both learners were professionally engaged.

MiG pointed out that tandem accommodated her individual needs better than formal instruction since she was interested in conversation and error correction more than in formal grammatical instruction, which, as she pointed out, she was able to do at home.

5.2.9 Tandem MaG/CS
Table 10: Tandem MaG/CS

Participants/Gender	**MaG/M**	**CS/M**
Age/Occupation	37/Student/Journalist	31/Student
Reasons for tandem participation:	"I need to pass Spanish exams at the university. Also, to be able to talk to people form Spain/Latin America."	"I need to speed up my German progress and getting together with a German may help with it. "
Goals for tandem learning:	"Vocabulary-it's hard for me. I can learn grammar alone at home."	"Vocabulary-to have more resources for communication."
Participant's opinion about error correction.	"It's very important, only so I can recognize my errors."	"I like it. The *job* of a tandem partner is to do it. This is a main goal of the tandem activity."
What did you learn from your tandem partner?	"Mainly I refreshed/practiced my previous knowledge."	"Grammar and vocabulary. I think that we both learned grammar from each other."
Did you gain L2 cultural	"I learned about Columbia."	"Yes, about life in Germany."

knowledge through tandem? What did you learn?		

According to CS and MaG, they liked tandem for the opportunities to be able to clarify linguistic doubts as they arose in context. As CS pointed out, in a classroom he had to share his time with others and was not able to ask questions at any given time. During tandem interactions he fully took advantage of being able to ask questions, and as analyzed data will show, his curiosity resulted not only in his L2 learning, but also in MaG's learning about his native language.

CHAPTER 6
DATA ANALYSIS-LEXICAL LEARNING

6.0 Introduction

Lexis is of great importance for this study given the strong interest tandem participants expressed in lexical acquisition in the questionnaires. This chapter will analyze opportunities for lexical learning during tandem interactions according to features frequently observed among various tandems, such as single and multi-word learning, proverbs, and idiomatic expressions. For each described phenomena, I will provide a small number of typical interactional examples.

It is important to stress that conversations are transcribed in their original form, with some errors. Their translations into English preserve some of these errors because of focus of this research.

6.1 Opportunities for lexical learning in tandem

Lexical learning was frequently observed during tandem interactions. It had various forms and arose on various occasions, but always in an interactional context. Although all data analyzed here were collected from participants at the intermediate level, a full range of opportunities for lexical learning could be observed, from the very basic, explicit, single-word search to the very complex learning of idiomatic expressions. In the following chapter, I will discuss the most common phenomena related to lexical learning in tandem. I will start with explicit learning of a single word. This type of learning is not very complicated and does not involve complex negotiations. In some aspects, it seems similar to lexical learning in other educational contexts (e.g., in a formal classroom). However, learning in tandem is different, and my goal is to point out these differences. Next, I will address multi-word learning and the learning of idiomatic expressions and proverbs. These situations are more complex. Learners are involved in prolonged negotiations and clarifications of meaning. As a result of it, scaffolding can be observed in such conversations. Learning different types of lexical items involves different processes; for this reason the opportunities for single-word learning and multi-word learning in tandem will be discussed separately. Presenting the full range of types of lexical learning in tandem, I would like to demonstrate that tandem provides substantial opportunities for lexical acquisition.

6.2 Explicit, single-word learning

Excerpts 1A, 1B, and 1C are fragments of an interaction between MG and JE. Their meeting began with 45 minutes of a "German session" during which tandem partners talked in German

about various idiomatic expressions prepared by MG for JE. After these 45 minutes in German, the "official" tandem language was switched to English. Learners engaged in an informal conversation, during which the explicit question of MG about the correctness of the word *eyebrows* in English started a long conversation about the names of different body parts in English and in German. Both learners ended up learning the same lexical items in their respective L2s. It is important to point out that MG and JE were addressing more specific vocabulary, such as freckles, eyelashes, collarbone, etc. Some of these words were new to them; others were addressed for review purposes. All of these words were addressed spontaneously. MG and JE did not utilize a word list.

In summary, Excerpts 1A, 1B, and 1C were chosen for analysis because they represent examples of direct, very explicit ("how do you say") opportunity for lexical learning during tandem interactions, which was frequently observed in dialogues among all tandems.

Excerpt 1A

Interaction between MG/JE

1 MG: What are those, eyebrows? [MG is pointing to her eyebrows.]

2 JE: Eyebrows. Genau. (*Exactly.*). Das sind Augen**bogen**, ja?

(*These are „**Augenbogen**," yes?*)

3 MG: Brauen. (*Brows)*

4 JE: Augenbaruen↑. Augenbrauen. Ja, das ist genauso auf Englisch.

(Eyebrows↑. *Eyebrows. Yes, it is exactly the same in English.)*

5 MG: Hm… **Eyes Brows?**

6 JE: Just, eye. Eyebrow.

7 MG: Just eye? [MG writes down the word.]

8 JE: [looks at it] Genau. Das ist genau wie auf Deutsch.

(*Exactly. This is exactly the same as in German.)*

9 MG: And this? [MG points to her eyelashes.]

10 JE: Eyelashes.

11 MG: How do you spell it?

12 JE: E-Y-E-L-A-S-H-E-S

13 MG: [Writes it down]

14 MG: Wimper. (*Eyelashes.*)

15 JE: Wimper, ja. (*Eyelashes, yes.*)

The conversation about body parts is initiated by MG during the official "English session" through the use of verbal and non-verbal communication. MG points to her eyebrows and asks for confirmation of her hypothesis that the English word is *eyebrows* (1). JE confirms that what MG said is correct, repeating the word *eyebrows* and saying *genau* (exactly) (2). The word g*enau* may

have two functions. It re-confirms that MG's hypothesis is correct, and gives JE the opportunity to switch languages from English to German. In the same turn (2), JE asks MG if the word *Augenbogen* would be the German translation of *eyebrows*. JE is testing a hypothesis (2). Her hypothesis is incorrect. As Swain (1998) would point out, hypothesis formulation and testing may serve the language learning process because learners can receive feedback and learn from it. This is also the case in this conversation; JE's hypothesis is incorrect, and MG provides corrective feedback (single-move recast). It is important to stress the recast addresses only the incorrect part of the word, making it very salient (3). JE repeats the correct form two times (successful uptake). The second repetition is followed by her statement *it is exactly the same in English* (4). This statement demonstrates that JE compares English and German and reflects upon similarities. However, in English the word *eyebrows* consists of eye+brows (eye-singular, brows-plural) while in German the word *Augenbrauen* consist of Augen+Brauen (Augen-plural, Brauen-plural). MG says *Hm* (5), which is her direct reaction to the just heard statement of JE that the word *Augenbrauen* is exactly the same in English as in German. Although MG used *eyebrows* correctly in her previous sentence, she asks, ***Eyes Brows?***

MG's ***Eyes**brows* is directly corrected by JE (6), who stresses the singular use of "eye" and repeats the correct form *eyebrows*. MG writes down the word, which is checked by JE for its correctness (8). Since both learners are focusing on lexical items related to "eyes," MG asks about eyelashes, using nonverbal communication and an explicit question about it (9). She receives the correct answer (10). In the following turn, MG asks about the spelling of *eyelashes* (11), writes it down, and translates it into German, *Wimper* (13). JE repeats the word and later says *yes*. It may suggest that the word *Wimper* is not new to her.

This excerpt is significant for understanding tandem interactions for several reasons:

1)   It demonstrates that tandem learning is not only small-talk. Most tandem participants seem very much aware of their linguistic needs (here MG, expressing her need/desire for a review of body parts). Learners utilize the interaction with their tandem partner to address these needs, and to create opportunities for lexical learning.

2)   This conversation is an example of collaborative dialogue because, as Swain (2000) would point out, a collaborative dialogue is knowledge-building and it constructs linguistic knowledge. According to Swain, through their interaction (dialogue) learners "regulate each other's activity and their own" (p. 111). They have an opportunity to produce the language and to reflect on it. "Their jointly constructed performance outstrips their individual competences." MG's and JE's dialogue is an example of language learning through collaboration. In this exchange, MG has contact with the new word *eyelashes*, and JE is able to modify her incorrect hypothesis about the word *Augenbogen.* As Swain (2000) stresses, "as each participant speaks, their saying becomes what is said, providing object for reflection." (p. 113). Excerpt 1 is an example of such a situation. JE and MG use the language and reflect on it. Such instances of reflections on "what learners said" are described by Swain (2000) as opportunities for knowledge construction.

3)   Learners are actively involved, paying attention to what is said--which unfortunately causes MG to produce *Eyes Brows* as a reaction to the previous statement of JE. They use the information provided by their tandem partner to revise their hypotheses about language. In JE's case, she corrects her incorrect hypothesis about *Augenbogen;* in MG's case, she temporarily revises her (correct) hypothesis. As previously mentioned (Chapter 3), attention is very important in the process of lexical learning (Frantzen, 2003). It is necessary for

noticing. Also, there seems to be a connection between learners' motivation and attention (Ellis, 2001). Motivated learners pay more attention to feedback and look for opportunities to learn. In Excerpt 1A, MG is very attentive to feedback and the comments of her tandem partner.

4) Learning in tandem is spontaneous. It is not limited to "pre-planned" words. Although this conversation may look like learning a list of words, these words are of interest for learners and arise spontaneously during the interaction. MG and JE want to know them. Their interest is intrinsic. For this reason, their motivation is high, and they pay attention to what is said. This may lead to opportunities for lexical learning.

5) Learners are not rushed. They have time to study the spelling of new words and to write them down. This results in the presence of lexis-based LREs, as well as form-based LREs.

Excerpt 1B

Excerpts 1B and 1C represent continuation of the previous conversation.

16 MG: And this? What's that, which you have? **Springels**?

[MG points to the freckles of JE.]

17 JE: Oh, this. Freckles. [JE points to her freckles.]

18 MG: In German it is "Sommersprossen." (*Freckles*)

19 JE: Sommersprosssen. (*Freckles*) Sommer... [Writes it down.]

20 MG: And „freckles"?

21 JE: F-R-E-C-K-L-E-S

22 MG: OK.

23 JE: Sommersprossen. [Whispering]

In excerpt 1B, tandem partners utilize their environment, in this case, the freckles on the face of JE, and the previous conversational context (talking about the human body) to address a new word. This exchange starts as MG asks JE through the means of verbal and non-verbal communication, *what's that, which you have?* (16), by pointing to her freckles. At the same time, MG is hypothesis testing by calling freckles *springels*. However, her hypothesis is incorrect. JE recognizes, through the nonverbal communication, which word MG is searching for, saying *Oh, this* and touching her face. Consequently, she provides the correct word (17). In the next turn, MG translates *freckles* into German, even though JE has not asked for it (18). It is important to stress that in both excerpts (1A and 1B) each lexical item is addressed in both languages. JE repeats *Sommersprossen* and writes it down. MG waits patiently for her to finish, and then asks *and freckles*. JE interprets this as a request for the spelling, which she provides (21). The conversation ends with JE repeating the word *Sommersprossen*. This can be seen as consolidation of the new lexical item.

This excerpt also represents collaborative learning, as described in Excerpt 1A. New knowledge is created through interaction. Both tandem partners address at the same time the same lexical item. Their learning pattern is quite similar; they hear a new word and write it down. As Swain and Lapkin (1998) would state, there is a presence of lexis-based and form-based LREs since learners address the meaning and the spelling of the words.

Excerpt 1 C

1 MG: What is this? [MG points to her collarbone.]

2 JE: Collar. Collarbone.

3 MG: How do you spell it?

4 JE: C-O-L-L-A-R-B-O-N-E

5 MG: [Writes it down.]

6 MG: Schlüsselbein. (*Collarbone)*

7 JE: Schlüsselbein. S-C-H-L

8 MG: Ü-S-S-E-L-B-E-I-N

 I think it has this name because it looks a little bit like a key, its end. It looks like a key, the end of an old key.

9 JE: OK

10 MG: What is "Oberarm"? (*Upper arm*). Do you have special word?

11 JE: Do we have a special word? Upper arm. And what is this? [Points to her forearm.]

12 MG: Unterarm. (*Forearm)*

We have two bones there. Do you know their names in English?

13 JE: I should know what they are called, but…One is… I don't actually know. I really should know it, but I don't know. Sometimes I don't know these things. This is anatomy.

14 MG: It's OK because when I'm interested, I can look it up in a dictionary. But this, what is this? [MG touches her wrist.]

15 JE: This is your wrist.

16 MG: Handgelenk. (*Wrist)* And these are fingers and fingertips? [MG touches her fingertips.]

17 JE: Yes. What's that in German?
18 MG: Fingerspitzen. (*Fingertips)*

19 JE: Fingerspitzen. Ja. (*Fingertips. Yes.)*

Excerpt 1C represents a collaborative dialogue rich in lexical LREs. It demonstrates the extensive length and complexity of the LREs during tandem interactions. When looking at Excerpts 1A, B, and C, there is evidence that tandem learners are able to spend a considerable amount of time discussing topics chosen by them. During these interactions, which start with an explicit question about the correctness of the word *eyebrows*, participants are also able to focus on vocabulary related to other body parts. They do not have to move on to another topic. They can study in depth new

lexical items; this is one of the advantages of tandem learning. Having no schedule to follow, learners are able to devote sufficient time to any lexical or grammatical item chosen by them.

Similar to Excerpts 1A and B, Excerpt 1C represents an opportunity for mutual lexical learning. New words are repeated aloud and then their spelling is addressed. In addition, metatalk is employed by MG (8), when she tries to explain the possible source for the German name of a collarbone, which consists in German of two parts (key+leg).

After discussing the collarbone, upper arm, and lower arm, learners continue with fingertips, and further in the conversation, with other body parts. Although the topic was initiated by MG, both learners benefit from its introduction by addressing the same words in their L2s.

In summary, Excerpts 1A, B, and 1C represent a collaborative dialogue related to mutual lexical learning of body parts. This conversation allows MG and JE to notice gaps in their lexical knowledge and to address them. This opportunity for lexical learning has arisen directly from their conversation. As Swain (2000) would point out, their saying and responding to what is said represents language learning.

New words are frequently addressed through their loud repetition and annotation. This pattern can be observed in all three excerpts. Such repetition is important. It suggests that learners have a strategy when approaching new or/and difficult words. Although their learning is spontaneous (MG and JE do not have a plan with regard to lexical items they will discuss, as they arise from their conversation), learners have a strategy for how they address problematic words, studying their form and their meaning.

Second, and importantly, tandem learners are able to test hypotheses during interactions. In above excerpts, MG asks about various words she seems to know, but is not sure about them. In Excerpts 1A (1) and 1C (15), her hypotheses are correct, whereas in Excerpt 1B (1) it is not the case. MG creates a word which is incorrect in English. Through JE's feedback, she is able to modify her hypothesis. The same applies to JE (e.g., Excerpt 1A, 2). As Swain (1993) would stress, this process of modification represents second language learning.

Finally, learners frequently employ nonverbal communication in their conversation. The nonverbal communication is mainly utilized for word-search because it facilitates communication. It is easy for learners to point to an object and ask for its name. From the language-economical point of view, it is quicker than description of a searched item.

All the above excerpts represent typical lexical learning situations, which could be observed among all participating tandems.

Excerpt 2

Excerpt 2 is a fragment of a conversation between RD (native speaker of Danish) and AlG (German native speaker). RD and AlG developed a very interesting routine for their tandem interactions. During each tandem meeting, they wrote down the unknown L2 words. Later, at home, RD and AlG prepared essays with these words. During a subsequent tandem meeting, they discussed these assignments with each other.

Excerpt 2 represents a fragment of an essay-related discussion, which is conducted in German. Since RD wrote about the refugees in Denmark, she felt that the overall tone of her essay

was very depressing....

1 RD: Ich mache sehr depressive **Sentences**. **Sentences**, was ist das?

(*I made very depressing sentences. Sentences, what is this?*)

2 AlG: Sätze. (*Sentences*)

3 RD: Sätze. (*Sentences*)

4 AlG: Der Satz. Sätze. (*The sentence. Sentences.*)

5 RD: Sätze. (*Sentences*)

6 AlG: Und wie heisst das auf Dänisch?

(And how do you say it in Danish?)

7 RD: Setnig. (*Sentence)*

8 AlG: Setnig, ist ein Satz?

(*Setnig, is a sentence?)*

9 RD: Ja. (*Yes.)*

10 AlG: Wie schreibt man das?

(*How do you spell it?)*

11 RD: S-E-T-N-I-G

12 AlG: [Writes the word.]

Excerpt 2 starts with RD's comment about the depressing sentences of her homework (1). Communicating her idea in German, RD uses the English word *sentences* in her utterance, not being able to come up with the German equivalent of it. Directly, in the same turn, RD continues in German, and asks AlG about the German translation of the English word *sentences*. AlG translates the word (2); RD repeats it (3). In the next turn, AlG provides the basic, singular form of the noun, its article and then repeats the plural form. RG repeats only the plural form, which was the focus of her previous word search. In turn 5, AlG uses this context to ask RD about the Danish translation of the word *sentence*. In the following turn, it is provided to her (7). AlG asks for confirmation if *setnig* means *sentence* (8). She receives it (9). Finally, AlG asks for the spelling of the new word and writes it down.

Excerpt 2 represents the following features of tandem learning:

1)   It confirms that processes observed in Excerpts 1A, B, and C (explicit lexical learning, focus on spelling, and mutual learning of the same lexical item) can be observed as well during other interactions and are not limited to one particular tandem (MG/JE).

2)   It suggests that there is a pattern related to the explicit, single-word learning context. The other partner is asked directly about the unknown or forgotten word, and the answer is provided; consequently, the new word is repeated and often written down by the learner. Frequently, if the word is also unknown in the L2 of the other learner, he/she asks for it and repeats all the above processes (similar pattern was observed among all other tandems).

3)   It represents mutual learning in collaborative dialogue. RD and AlG talk about their

essays. During their conversation, they encounter linguistic problems, notice them, and address them. As Swain (2000) would point out, the act of attempting to produce language focuses learners' attention on their linguistic deficiencies and imperfections. With the help of their partner, they are able to overcome these difficulties and in doing so, they create opportunities for language learning. Since the tandem learning setting is based on mutual exchanges, frequently, both learners learn the same word and/or expression. The linguistic deficiency of RD (not knowing the word *sentence* in German) created an opportunity for its learning not only for her, but also for her tandem partner. Although AlG does not need the word *setnig* for communicative purposes, she asks about it and creates an opportunity for learning. This phenomenon occurs frequently during tandem interactions. It suggests that during tandem meetings, learners are exposed to opportunities for learning resulting not only from their immediate need for certain word and/or grammatical item (communicative needs), but also from the needs of their tandem partner.

4)   Excerpt 2 introduces a new element to the concept of lexical learning in tandem, which is connected with linguistic economy, and exactly, with the usage of English as a "lingua franca." Although RD has enough linguistic resources in her L2 to engage in negotiation of meaning using only German, she chooses not to do it. Her preference is the use of English. From the economical point of view, it is a very successful decision. There is no miscommunication between RD and AlG, and the communication continues. Even more, both tandem partners learn the translation of the word *sentence* in their respective tandem languages.

The use of English has one more function--it is one of two methods utilized by tandem learners for a quick word-search. In Excerpts 1A, B, and C, learners utilize nonverbal communication for word search because they can point to objects.

In summary, Excerpt 2 represents an example of a single word learning event during collaborative dialogue in tandem. The same lexical item is learned in both L2s. English, used as a "lingua franca," is employed in the process of word-search. Similar processes can be observed in the next excerpt.

Excerpt 3

Excerpt 3 represents a fragment of a conversation between BG and MS, who are discussing MS's project for the university. MS, a design student, is in the process of preparing an innovative project for one of her seminars. MS is experiencing a lot of difficulties finding the right idea and often talks about it with BG.

During this particular tandem meeting, MS presents her recent idea, and both tandem partners are in the process of analyzing it. This project was later successfully accomplished with significant assistance from BG, who helped her Spanish tandem partner with the whole technical part of it due to her expertise in the area.

1 MS: Meine Richtung ist. Wie ist, war auf Deutsch die „olores"?

(*My direction is. How is, was in German "olores"?*)

2 BG: Geruch.(*Smell)*

3 MS: Geruch? (*Smell?*)

4 BG: Geruch. Riechen. (*Smell. To smell.*)

5 MS: Riechen ist das Verb, aber das... The smell of?

(*To smell is the verb, but the… The smell of?*)

6 BG: Geruch. (*Smell*)

7 MS: Geruch. (*Smell*)

8 BG: Geruch ist das Substantiv von riechen. Riechen, Geruch.

(*Smell is the noun from to smell. To smell, the smell.*)

9 MS: Wie schreibt man?

(*How do you write?*)

10 BG: G-E-R-U-C-H. Wie riechen nur mit „u." Riechen, Geruch.

(*GERUCH. Like to smell, only with „u." Riechen, Geruch.*)

11 MS: So, **Geruche**.

(*The smells*)

12 BG: Gerüche. (*The smells*)

13 MS: Gerüche. Die Gerüche sind sehr wichtig für unsere „**memoria."**

(*Smells. The smells are very important for our „memoria."*)

14 BG: Gedächtnis. (*Memory*)

15 MS: Gedächtnis. Du kannst hier sein und etwas riechen…

(*Memory. You can be here and you can smell something…*)

16 BG: Hm...

This conversation was continued for a very long time afterwards. MS explained to her tandem partner the whole idea of the importance of the "memory of a smell," and how she wanted to execute her project (through smart-tech clothing, which she needed to design and prepare herself). Since MS was in an early developmental stage of it, both learners engaged in a very intense brainstorming about possible solutions for her design. Throughout its whole duration, this tandem interaction represents not only language learning, but also language used as a cognitive tool. This tandem learning could be viewed as a joint problem-solving activity. During this conversation, the problems were not only linguistic, but also more practical; they were directly related to the execution of MS's project.

Excerpt 3 represents language learning closely interconnected with learner's environment. This should be viewed as one of the major differences when comparing classroom learning with tandem learning. Students participating in a foreign/second language classroom setting are often limited to language learning in isolation from the real world. The authentic needs of each student are seldom addressed in the traditional learning environment; on the contrary, tandem offers more possibilities for a practical approach since during tandem learning, the learners' environment is an important part of their interaction. As van Lier (2000) stated, "the learner is immersed in an environment full of potential meanings" (p. 246), and as observed in this excerpt, and many other

excerpts discussed in this dissertation, learners "act and interact within and with this environment" (p. 246). Here, MS is inspired through her project (university environment) to talk about it, thus making her environment an important part of the tandem learning. During typical classroom interaction, it would not be possible do this to such extent.

Excerpt 3 begins with MS's explicit question about the German equivalent for *olores* (the smells) (1). The conversation is conducted in German, but MS uses the Spanish word to express her thoughts. BG translates it as *Geruch* (2). In the next turn (3), MS repeats *Geruch* with a questioning intonation, implying that she is uncertain about it. In turn 4, BG confirms the word by repeating *Geruch* and adding the corresponding verb *riechen*. MS confirms her understanding that *riechen* is the verb, but she again asks for the noun, this time in English *the smell of* (5). BG repeats the same German noun *Geruch* (6), which this time seems to be accepted, as MS repeats it (7) without any questioning in her voice.

As observed so far, although BG used the correct noun 3 times before, MS did not immediately accept her translation. The question arises as to why this happens. The data does not provide a clear answer to it, but there is one additional factor worth considering. BG was at the lower intermediate level in Spanish (and a much higher level in English), which could have caused MS to perform the word search twice, first in Spanish, then in English, where she was more confident that BG would have understood her better. Secondly, the noun form *Geruch* seems at first glance to be different from the verb form *riechen*, which could have caused MS to question this word at first. In languages that MS knows, the noun and verb forms are very similar (English: the smell-to smell; Spanish: oler-el olor), but not in German. BG provides an explicit explanation of it in lines 8 and 10.

As observed in this excerpt, finding the correct word is not the end of lexical learning during a typical tandem interaction. Frequently, the word's spelling is addressed (9, 10), and learners talk about lexical items and reflect on them.

Two types of language-related episodes are present in this exchange: lexis-based and form-based. The lexis based LREs could be observed in the process of MS's search for the lexical item. The form based LREs are observed in the focus on the spelling and morphology (Swain & Lapkin, 1998). The first part of this conversation represents the lexis-based LREs, and the second part represents the form-based LREs. It means that learners are interested not only in learning the meaning of an unknown word, but also in its orthography, and sometimes morphology. During tandem meetings, lexis-based LREs lead frequently to opportunities for further elaboration on an unknown word.

The second part starts with BG's explanation that *Geruch* is a noun related to the verb *riechen* (8). Secondly, its orthography is explicitly explained (10). In the next turn (11), MS tries to produce the correct plural form of the noun. She manages to add successfully an "e" to the end of the noun, but fails to produce the umlaut. BG immediately provides corrective feedback in the form of a recast (12). It is understood as such, and there is direct uptake (13). At this point the next LRE starts. It is again a lexical one, where MS asks about the translation of the Spanish noun *memoria* (13). BG directly provides a correct translation for it (14), which is accepted immediately this time, seen in direct repetition of the new word by MS (14).

In summary, all the above excerpts (1A, 1B, 1C, 2, and 3) represent instances of opportunities for single-word learning during tandem interactions. As observed in described conversations, word searches are frequently utilized in the process of learning a new word in the L2.

In Excerpts 1A, B, and C, nonverbal communication, or the question *what is this,* or a combination of both are employed in the process of lexical search. Excerpts 2 and 3 add a new element--English is used as lingua franca for lexical searches. Both the nonverbal communication and the use of English as lingua franca suggest that learners are interested in quick solutions while searching for an unknown L2 word.

Although each excerpt is in its own way unique, there is a learning pattern related to single-word learning in tandem, which could be observed among all of the analyzed tandems, as well as in other collected data. This pattern consists of: question about an unknown word, its provision, word's repetition, and focus on spelling (and on occasions on morphological features of learned words, such as their plurals, morphological irregularities, etc.)

Lexical learning is constantly present during tandem interactions, but as observed, it is learning in context, and often resulting from the learners' environment. Lexical learning in tandem is closely related to the authentic and direct learner's needs and occurs in the context of an authentic interaction, where learners rely on the linguistic expertise of their tandem partner. For example, learners use explicit word search markers, such as *How do you say it in Danish?* (Excerpt 2, turn 6) or *Do you know their names in English?* (Excerpt 1C, turn 12). These markers initiate the word search and point to the hearer's expertise. Through the cooperation of both learners, new knowledge is constructed. As Swain (2000) would state, learners jointly constructed performance outstrips their individual competencies.

Although the lexical learning of a single word is strongly present during typical tandem interactions, tandem offers many other approaches to vocabulary learning. Some of them will be discussed in the following sections, which will address idioms, proverbs, and multi-word interactional learning.

6.3 Idioms

In the previous section, I looked at opportunities for single-word lexical acquisition during tandem interactions. It is a process characterized by the NNS's direct question or hypothesis about a lexical item in the L2, the NS's answer to it, repetition of the learned word (sometimes accompanied by a question about its spelling), and writing it down. Frequently the same learning process is repeated for the other learner, if the lexical item is unknown to him/her as well. Although addressing a single word appears to be an easy and relatively uncomplicated task, learning of idiomatic expressions is just the opposite. Research conducted in the field of SLA tends to support this claim. Laufer (1997) pointed out that, "Both teachers and learners will admit that idiomatic expressions are much more difficult to understand and learn to use than their non-idiomatic meaning equivalents" (p.151). According to Laufer, idioms are perceived as the biggest obstacles for advanced learners in the process of the acquisition of L2 accuracy. When addressing idioms, there is more than one word to learn and little clue to the meaning of the idiom from the meaning of each individual word that constructs it.

The tandem method, as a holistic approach to language acquisition, makes it possible for learners to experience various aspects of L2 learning. For example, with regard to lexical acquisition, it can range from explicit single-word-learning to complex idiomatic discussions, even during the same tandem meeting. The excerpts below represent a few examples of idiomatic learning observed during tandem interactions.

Excerpt 4

This excerpt is a fragment of a dialogue between MiG and SE. Prior to this interaction, learners were conversing about SE's weekend camping trip. SE tells his tandem partner that he was the only one who was using a sunscreen during the trip. Two other of his friends not only did not do it, but were making fun of him, until the moment when they got very badly sunburned.

1 SE: Die beide haben **an mir gelacht**.

(*Both of them laughed about me.*)

2 MiG: Sie haben dich ausgelacht. (*They made fun of you.*)

3 SE: Ausgelacht, SPF 40, **ho, ho, ho...** (*Made fun of, SPF 40, ho, ho, ho*)

4 MiG: Ha, ha, ha...

5 SE: Aber sie sind beide dann rot wie **Lobsters** geworden.

(*But later they turned red like "lobsters"*)

6 MiG: Wie was? (*Like what?*)

7 SE: Lobsters. [Laughs]. Was ist „Lobster" auf Deutsch?

(*Lobsters.[Laughs]. How do you say "lobster" in German?*)

8   MiG: Ist das ein Krebs? (*Is it a crab?*)

9   SE: Wie ein Krebs, aber länger. (*It's like a crab, but longer*).

10 MiG: Ah, ein Hummer, vielleicht. (*Ah, lobster, maybe.*)

11 SE: Ja, genau. Hummer, ja. **Rot wie Hummer.**

(*Yes, exactly. Lobster, yes. Red like a lobster.*)

12 MiG: Das würden wir nicht sagen. Wir würden dann krebsrot sagen.

 Oder noch besser knallrot.

 (*We would not use this expression. We would rather say crab-red. Or better, bright red.*)

13 SE: Ja, knallrot. (*Yes, bright red.*)

Although German and English may have many similarities, sometimes, these similarities are not enough to successfully produce a correct idiomatic expression in the L2, especially when the NNS is transferring idiomatic knowledge from the L1 into the second language. This seems to be the case in the above abstract, where SE is confused because in English he is able to use the expression *red like a lobster*, whereas in German the correct form of it should be *crab-red*. In English, the redness would be compared to the color of a lobster, and in German to the color of a crab. Also, the German expression (crab-red) is quite different syntactically from its English equivalent (red like a lobster).

Excerpt 4 starts with SE's grammatically incorrect utterance. He wants to express that his friends were making fun of him (1). He accomplishes the communicative task with his linguistic resources and is understood, but from a grammatical point of view, his expression is incorrect. MiG recognizes the grammatical errors and corrects them with a single-move, declarative, and non-reduction recast (2). Three errors are corrected in this recast: the past participle form of the verb (*ausgelacht* rather than *gelacht)*, the personal pronoun (accusative *mich* rather than dative *mir)*, and the unnecessary preposition (*an)*. According to Sheen (2006), "reduced recasts and one-change

recasts were related to higher rates of repair than non-reduced recasts and recasts involving multiple changes" (p. 382). This seems to be the case in the conversation between MiG and her tandem partner. MiG's recast (involving multiple changes) may not sufficiently highlight the elements of SE's sentence that are problematic. SE responds to the recast with a partial uptake--only the past participle is corrected, as he continues with his story, which seems at this particular moment of greater importance to him than his grammatical errors. He is eager to tell it because it is something personal, and for him, it is funny (7). He imitates how his friends were making fun of him *ho, ho, ho*, which may be his personal way of expressing laughter, but it is not really a common expression in German. MiG corrects even this "imperfection" with *ha, ha, ha* (4). It is clear that this is a correction and not laughter as the tone of her voice is very factual. It may suggest that MiG is very serious about her role as a teacher and does not want SE to speak less than perfect German. In the following turn (5), SE translates word for word the English idiomatic expression "to be red like a lobster," which, as previously mentioned, has a different form in German (crab-red or red like a cooked crab, but not like a lobster). Translating this idiom from English into German, SE demonstrates that even a quite advanced and experienced language user can put himself into linguistic danger using idiomatic expressions in the L2, and even more, translating these from one language to another. Not only does he translate this idiom from his L1 to L2, but he doesn't know, or forgets, how to say *lobster* in German, so he just keeps this English word in his German translation, which leads to the clarification request from MiG (6), *Like what?* In turn 7, SE repeats the English word, laughs about the story, and then asks MiG how he can say *lobster* in German. His direct request for assistance is not immediately successul since MiG is apparently not sure what *losbster* means. MiG's question *Is it a crab,* suggests that maybe she does not know the English word *lobster*; however, she knows the German expression crab-red, and thus MiG may be guessing that *lobster* may be a *crab* (8). Her attempt to guess the meaning of *lobster* in German is an example of hypothesis testing. At this moment, SE offers his assistance and knowledge to further negotiate the meaning of the unknown word, and explains to MiG that what he is searching for is similar to a crab, but longer (9). This explanation leads to further, this time correct, guessing on MiG's part. Although her guess is correct, MiG is not sure about it, which can be observed in her use of the word *maybe* (*Ah, lobster, maybe*) (10).

This collaboration, and the knowledge, of both learners results in a successful outcome of the negotiation. Once SE hears the German word *Hummer* (lobster), he indicates recognition and acceptance of it (*Yes, exactly. Lobster, yes*) and repeats the idiomatic expression, in the same form as before, with the exception that he replaces the English word *lobster* with its German translation *Hummer* (11). At this moment, MiG provides direct, explicit corrective feedback (12) stating: *We would not use this expression. We would say crab-red. Or better bright red.* MiG not only provides corrective feedback about the idiomatic expression, but also an alternative, saying that *red like a lobster* can be expressed as *bright red.* SE accepts her second suggestion by repeating *bright red* (13).

This excerpt represents the following characteristics of tandem interactions:

1) There is a presence of opportunity for idiomatic learning, which results from conversational context. Although at first the idiom is used incorrectly, its correct alternative form is obtained through the collaboration of both learners. SE learns that the English idiom does not translate directly into German.

2) Mutual learning is present; both tandem partners notice something new. SE is exposed to a new expression in German *krebsrot* and receives an opportunity to reflect on the incorrectness of his direct translation from English into German, since he receives negative evidence. Also, he is able to find out that *krebsrot* may not be as common in German as its

English version (*red as a lobster)*, and different expressions may be preferred (i.e., *bright red*). Additionally, SE is able to hear the German translation for *Hummer* (13). He notices is, and there is uptake of this word. MiG is able to come in contact with the English word *lobster* (which is apparently new to her), and the idiomatic expression *red as a lobster*.

3)   Corrective feedback is constantly provided. No error is left unattended. The grammatical errors and *ho, ho, ho* are corrected either through recast (in case of *ho, ho, ho*), or in the case of the idiomatic expression, through very explicit direct feedback (*we wouldn't say it like this*).

4)   Tandem participants learn through hypothesis formulation and testing. SE produces the following expression *Rot wie Lobsters*. He mixes English and German. MiG provides corrective feedback. After successful negotiation of meaning for the word *lobster*, SE is able to modify his hypothesis to *Rot wie Hummer*. Again, he receives negative evidence and is able to produce the correct form of *knallrot*. As Swain (1995) would state, learners may produce output just to see what works and what does not.

Excerpt 4 demonstrates that the usage and acquisition of idiomatic expressions are highly complex and difficult processes. One can not always translate an idiom from L1 into L2, as SE tries to do. Regardless of these challenges, the tandem learning setting could be the appropriate place for idiomatic hypothesis testing because both learners are equal in this situation, and they do not need to worry about their mistakes or the other person laughing at them, which is highly possible with an incorrect usage of an idiomatic expression in other learning environments. Tandem provides a safe environment to try things out and to learn, as observed in Excerpt 4. Learners view tandem as a perfect place for error corrections, and think that "the job" of their tandem partner is to correct them. This is evident in their questionnaires, and summarized in the chapter on participants' background information. For this reason, tandem may be one of the best environments to learn idioms and to try using them in conversation. The second benefit of tandem for idiomatic learning is that there are no externally imposed time constraints. Idioms can be discussed, compared, and used in examples, as observed in Excerpt 4, and can be observed in Excerpt 5.

Excerpt 5

Excerpt 5 is a fragment of a conversation between DG and RS. The learners are discussing various idiomatic expressions during this interaction. They talk about the most commonly used, or the funniest idioms in each language, compare them to similar idioms in the other language, and in the process of doing it, learn not only new idiomatic expressions, but also other lexical items and grammatical features.

1 DG: Und dann: Jemandem etwas hoch und heilig versprechen.

(And then: To promise something somebody „high and holy")

2 RS: Heilig?↑ Was ist heilig?

(Holy? What is holy?)

3 DG: Heiliger es el santo.

(A Holy man is "el santo.")

4 RS: Ah. So es ist, mit alles versprechen, oder?

(*Ah. So it means to promise with everything, or?*)

5 DG: Genau. *(Exactly.)*

6 RS: Prometer el oro y el Moro.

(*To promise the gold and the Moor.*)

7 DG: Prometer el?

(*To promise the?*)

8 RS: El oro y el Moro.

(*The gold and the Moor.*)

9 DG: El Moro?

(*The Moor?*)

10 RS: El Moro, es Muslimo, der Muslim, der Gold verkauft. Du versprichst eh..., Gold und der Verkaufer. Das Gold, der Gold?

(*"El Moro," is a Moslem, the Moslem, who sells gold. You are promising eh..,. the gold and the salesperson. Gold, it is „der," „das"?*

11 DG: Das Gold.

12 RS: Und el Moro, como es? Der Muslim, oder Muslima?

(*And the Moor how is it? Der Muslim or Muslima?*)

13 DG: Der Muslim.

14 RS: Also, das benutzen wir viel.

(*We use it a lot.*)

15 DG: Das benutzt ihr? Ok. Das schreibe ich mir auf. Auf jeden Fall.

(*You use it? Ok. I will write it down. For sure.*)

16 RS: Besonders, zum Beispiel in einer Beziehung, wenn die, die... das Paar hat schon Schluss gemacht.

(*Especially, in a relationship, when the, the… the couple already is separated.*)

17 DG: Das was?

(*The what?*)

18 RS: Das Paar. *(The couple.)*. Hat schon Schluss gemacht. *(Has already separated.)*

19 DG: Ja. *(Yes.)*

20 RS: Aber einer von ihnen war sehr verliebt in dem anderen, aber dann kommt diese **decepcion.**

(*But one of them was very much in love with the other one, but then comes this „decepcion."*)

21 DG: Enttäuschung. *(Deception.)*

22 RS: Enttäuschung. Er sagt, oder sie sagt: Me prometi el oro y el Moro y nada.

(*Deception. He says, or she says: "Me prometi el oro y el Moro," and nothing.*)

23 DG: Ah, so. Also, er hat ihr alles versprochen und dann war gar nichts.

(Ah, so. He promised her everything, and there was nothing)

24 RS: Ja. Ja. Enttäuschung.

(Yes. Yes. Deception.)

25 DG: Hm. Das ist cool mit dem oro y Moro.

 (*Hm. This is cool with the "oro y Moro."*)

Excerpt 5 begins with DS bringing up the German idiomatic expression *Hoch und heilig etwas versprechen* (To promise something somebody high and holy). This idiomatic expression includes two adjectives: high (hoch) and holy (heilig). Once the idiom is introduced by DG, RS repeats the word *heilig* with higher pitch, followed by an explicit question about what the word means (2). Although the question is posed in German, the answer to it comes in Spanish, when, in the following turn (3), DG explains the meaning of a related word, *Heiliger* "holy man" as *santo* "saint." RS indicates understanding by saying *ah*, and then he gives his interpretation of the idiom (4), which is confirmed by DG (5). Immediately afterwards, RS finds a similar Spanish idiom *to promise the gold and the Moor* (6). At this moment, the tandem's language is switched to Spanish again. DG seems to be unfamiliar with this expression and with one of the words in it, *el Moro* (7, 9), which she explicitly addresses, asking about it. In turn 10, RS explains in Spanish that *el Moro* means a Moslem (*el Muslimo*), and also RS translates it into German. He then explicitly explains its meaning in this particular idiom (the Moor is the salesperson who sells gold). To do so, he changes the language from Spanish back to German. The same code switching can be observed in turn 3, when DG switches from German to Spanish in order to explain the meaning of *heilig* to RS.

In both of these instances (lines 2-3 and 9-10) learners have code switch into the native language of their tandem partner to explain the meaning of a problematic lexical item. In both cases (turns 2/3 and 9/10) they address comprehension problems. An explicit question is asked about the unknown/confusing word, and as result, its translation is provided. In turn 2, RS asks *Was ist heilig?*, and DS answers *Es el santo* (4). In turn 9, DG asks *El Moro*, and RS answers *es Muslimo, der Muslim…*

In turn 10, a new element emerges in the context of lexical learning between DG and RS-- focus on form. RS asks about the correct article for the word *Gold* in German (10). Translating the meaning of the Spanish idiom into German, RS is able, as Swain would point out, to notice the gap in his knowledge. This noticing of the gap is expressed through *eh* and a short hesitation before using the noun. It is, as if he is leaving a "blank" where the article should go. Not being sure which article to use with the word *Gold*, RS does not use any in his sentence. Instead, he asks DG directly about it (10). DG immediately answers RS's question, supplying the correct article together with the noun (11). It is important to stress that in the context of teaching a Spanish idiom, the Spanish "expert" also learns something about German. The same situation repeats in the next turn. Although he used the word correctly in turn 10, RS indicates that he is still not sure about the correct form of the noun *Moslem* in German (12). He asks about it, testing two possible hypotheses: *der Muslim* and *Muslima*. Again, his request for assistance is directly met when DG provides the correct form of the word, and the article, as well (13). On both occasions, there is no repetition of the correct form, but rather continuation of the content-oriented conversation. The conversation shifts again to the idiomatic expressions, as RS (14) comments that the one he just introduced is used a lot in Spain. This motivates DG to its annotation (15). Typical of a tandem interaction, this conversation is continued, and RS provides an example of a situation in which the idiomatic expression could be

used (16-24). In doing so, RS encounters a lexical problem, using the Spanish word *deception* in his German utterance. We do not know why he is doing it, or if his use of the Spanish word in the German sentence is accidental. Immediately he receives the correct German translation (Enttäuschung) (21). This is the first time when he repeats the received feedback (22). RS repeats the word *Enttäuschung* in turn 24. DG likes the new idiom saying *this is cool with the "oro y Moro."*

In summary, E xcerpt 5 represents an example of opportunities for idiomatic learning. Both learners introduce a new idiom, and are introduced to one, which results in their mutual exchange of knowledge. In the process of talking about these idioms, additional lexis-based and form-based LREs emerge.

Finally, there are three examples of single-word search in Excerpt 5. These word searches are different from the single-word-learning situations described in the previous section (6.2). In Excerpt 5, the single-word searches are not the main goal of the interaction, but rather the by-product of it. They are short, and learners do not always focus on one-to-one translations. In turn 2, RS asks *What is holy?,* and DG answers *A holy man is a saint*. Her translation is not very exact. RS asks about an adjective, DG answers with a noun. The learners' focus is meaning and communication, and not the precision of their translations. A similar situation can be observed in turn 9, DG asks, *El Moro*, and RS answers, *El Moro, es Muslimo, der Muslim, der Gold verkauft*. The translation includes additional information, crucial for the understanding of the idiomatic expression. In both cases the learners' focus is comprehension and communication, and not as much the single-word search. In other words, as long as the sense of the word is communicated, the exact form does not seem to be necessary. In Excerpts 1A, B, C, 2, and 3, learning a new word was the focus of the interaction. There was a pattern of learning, learners addressed the meaning of the word, and at least its spelling. This pattern does not exist in Excerpt 5.

Excerpt 6

Idiomatic expressions are hard to learn, and even harder to use, because if only one of the elements is changed, the whole meaning of an idiom is changed. Also, if the form of the idiom is correct, but the use not, it could have embarrassing consequences for the non-native speaker, although it may be very entertaining for the native speaker.

Excerpt 6 represents such incorrect use of a very colloquial German expression. This expression appears to be quite easy and its form is uncomplicated; nevertheless, non-native speakers of German tend to have frequent problems with its correct use.

The following excerpt is a fragment of a conversation between MaG and CS. This particular tandem meeting took place in the afternoon in a café, which did not have air conditioning. The temperatures outside and inside were very hot, and the German non-native speaker (CS) wanted to express this discomfort, asking his tandem partner:

1 CS: Bist du heiß?

(Are you „hot"?)

2 MaG: [Laughs]. Eh...

3 CS: Ah, ich habe verstanden. **Hast du heiß?**

(*Ah, I understood. Do you have hot?)*

4 MaG: Nein. Ist dir heiß? Nein. Ein Moment. Ist dir warm? Das Wetter ist heiß, aber es ist mir warm.

(No. Is it hot to you? No. One moment. Is it warm to you? The weather is hot, but it is warm to me.)

5 CS: Bist du warm?

(Are you warm?)

6 MaG: Nein. Ist dir warm.

(No. It is warm to you.)

7 CS: Ist dir warm? Tienes calor? Tienes calor en Español.

(Is it warm to you? "Tienes calor?" In Spanish it is "tienes calor.")

8 MaG: Tienes calor. Si.

(Tienes calor. Yes.)

Excerpt 6 starts with CS asking his tandem partner if he is "hot." In German, the expression "du bist heiss" (you are hot) has a sexual connotation. In this example, this expression was used inappropriately. One could assume that CS does not mean to ask his tandem partner if he is *hot* in a sexual sense, but *hot* in terms of temperature (1). This question causes MaG to laugh. His first answer (laughter) is followed by hesitation, as expressed by *eh,* and a pause. At this moment, CS suspects that there is something wrong with his previous utterance. He claims that he understands the reaction of MaG, and he then attempts to self-correct by rephrasing his question as *Hast du heiss?* (Do you have hot), which appears to be a translation of the Spanish *tienes calor?* (3). CS may be testing whether the German expression is similar to the Spanish one. However, CS fails to produce the correct expression, which this time results in the explicit negative feedback *no,* followed by an example (4). Almost at the same instance, MaG starts to reflect on his own output and his L1. He wants to have time to do it, saying *moment*. MaG reflects on his L1 and comes to the conclusion that the weather may be hot, but the more correct form of asking a question in German related to how one's body temperature is, would be expressed with the adjective *warm*, and not hot. Although both forms are correct, MaG tries to find the best one. CS understands the concept of *warm* instead of *hot*, but still uses the incorrect structure, exactly as he started this exchange. It suggests that he notices the adjective (which MaG has made quite salient through his metatalk), but does not notice the recast structure (which is not so salient). In turn 5, CS uses a subject + copula+ adjective construction (you are warm*)* instead of the impersonal dative construction (it is warm to me). For the second time, he receives corrective feedback in the form of an explicit no and a recast (6) and an explicit *no*. This results in immediate uptake, followed by CS's Spanish translation of the German expression (7).

Excerpt 6 represents the following features of tandem learning:

1)   It is an example of how a correct form of an expression can be used in an incorrect context. More precisely, the used expression, *you are hot*, has a sexual connotation that was not intended by CS while talking to his tandem partner. In this particular example, it initially caused some amusement for MaG. Secondly, explicit corrective feedback, followed by metatalk, was provided. It is important to stress that although the misuse of the idiom caused

mild amusement during this particular tandem meeting, it could have more serious consequences (such as insulting somebody or being taken as a sexual invitation) in a different context.

2)   These data introduced a new element of tandem learning (which will be further addressed in the "focus on form" chapter); that is, the interaction caused MaG to analyze his L1, which means that the tandem method not only provides opportunities for L2 learning, but it is an opportunity for reflections on one's native language.

This reflection on one's native language may be observed as well in the next excerpt, which will address another form of complex lexical learning--the learning of proverbs.

6.4 Proverbs

The opportunities for language learning in tandem are almost unlimited; everything depends on learners and their individual needs. For this reason, all lexical features can be addressed, if needed. As learners advance and become ready for linguistic "adventures," they increasingly become interested in idioms and proverbs.

All participants, whose data are analyzed in this dissertation, were at least at the lower intermediate level and could communicate quite well in their L2. For this reason, most of them were interested in learning more sophisticated lexical items, such as low-frequency words, idioms, and proverbs.

Idiomatic expressions and proverbs were used only during some tandem meetings, which seem consistent with the regular use of these items, since most native speakers do not employ them in every conversation.

In the previous section, I focused on the use of idiomatic expressions, this section will discuss proverbs. According to the Longman Dictionary of American English (1997), a proverb is "a short statement that most people know, that contains advice about life" (p. 643). Proverbs are addressed in tandem in two ways: they arise accidentally from context (Excerpt 8) or learners pre-plan their study for their meetings (Excerpt 7). It is important to point out that only proverbs and idiomatic expressions were prepared at home by some tandem participants in order to discuss them with the other learner during their meeting. It may be due to the fact that learners perceived them as more difficult to teach and to learn. Additionally, it could suggest that tandem learners are interested in learning proverbs and idioms, and view them as worth their time. This section will start with an interaction between MG and JE, during which learners utilize flashcards in order to discuss German and English proverbs.

Excerpt 7

It is important to highlight that MG and JE were interested in learning as much as possible during their tandem interactions. For this reason, they occasionally prepared a more formal set of educational materials (e.g., flashcards with proverbs and idiomatic expressions) which were utilized and discussed during their meetings. Excerpt 7 represents a learning episode stimulated by the use of the flashcards. It starts when JE asks MG if a certain proverb would be used in German:

1 JE: Man sagt dann: „Man sollte das Fell des Bären nicht teilen eher man ihn erlegt hat?"

(*Do you say: You shouldn't divide the skin of the bear before you have killed him?*)

2 MG: Moment. Warte mal, ich glaube das ist...

(*Moment. Wait, I think this is...*)

3 JE: Sagt man das?

(*Do people say it?*)

4 MG: Ich glaube, das sind sehr gebildete Sachen. Sachen, die man nicht ständig sagt, aber die im richtigen Moment passend wären. Hm... Ich habe dieses, glaube ich, noch nie verwendet, aber .... was würde ich statt dessen sagen? Warte mal, lass mich mal kurz überlegen. Ich würde sagen...

(*I think, they are very sophisticated things. Things, which are not used every day, but they would be proper at the right moment. Hm…I have never used this one, but...what would I say instead? Wait, I have to think for a while. I would say…*)

5 JE: Zum Beispiel, also wenn jemand sagt, sie haben eine neue Wohnung, aber sie haben sie noch nicht.

(*For example, if somebody says that they have a new apartment, but they still don't have it.*)

6 MG: Genau. Das stimmt. Freu dich nicht zu früh. Das sagt man in dem Zusammenhang.

(*Yes. It's right. Don't be too happy too early. You could say it in this context.*)

7 JE: Ja. Genau. (*Yes, exactly.*)

8 MG: Oder noch besser: "Noch ist nicht aller Tage Abend." Das sagen wir eigentlich.

(*Or even better, "The day is not over yet." Actually, we say it.*)

9 JE: Noch ist nicht aller Tage... [Talks very quietly]

(*The day is not over...*)

10 MG: Noch ist nicht aller Tage Abend. (*The day is not over yet.*)

11 JE: [Writes it down]

12 MG: Soll ich es dir aufschreiben?

(*Should I write it down for you?*)

13 JE: Stimmt das so? (*Is it correct so?*)

[JE shows MG what she has written.]

14 MG: Noch ist nicht aller Tage Abend. Ja. Das ist wirklich ein Sprichwort das wir oft sagen. Das heisst, der Tag ist noch lang.

(*The day is not over yet. Yes. This is really a proverb that we use a lot. It means, the day is long.*)

15 JE:Hm.

16 MG: Es kann immer noch was passieren.

(*Something can still happen.*)

17 JE: Genau. Wir würden sagen: Don't count your chickens before they've hatched.

(*Exactly, we would say: Don't count your chickens before they've hatched.*)

18 MG: Don't count your chickens before they've hatched. Ok. Jut.

[Writes it down]

19 JE: Man kann auch sagen: don't get too excited yet. Das ist nicht idomatisch, aber man sagt das.

(*You could say also: don't get too excited yet. This is not an idiom, but you can say it.*)

20 MG: Kannst du es mir aufschreiben? Oder warte, ich mache es selbst.

 (*Could you write it down for me? Or wait, I will do it myself.*)

[Writes it down]

21 JE: Don't get too excited.

22 MG: Freu dich nicht zu früh.

(*Don't be happy too early.*)

Excerpt 7 starts with JE reading from the flashcard the German idiom *You shouldn't divide the skin of the bear before you have killed him,* and asking MG if it is used in German(1). It is an example of a situation when the NNS relies on native speaker's linguistic and/or socio-cultural expertise. Presumably, JE understands the idiom because she is not asking about its meaning. JE's question is related to the use of this particular expression in modern German. She demonstrates a high level of metalinguistic awareness, having the ability to understand that learning idioms from a book does not guarantee their proper use, or more exactly, that knowing the form and/or meaning of an idiom does not guarantee its proper implementation. As Gass and Selinker would point out (2001), JE's metalinguistic awareness allows her "to consider language not just as a means to express ideas or communicating with others, but also as an object of inquiry" (p.302).

MG signals that she needs time to think about the question, saying, *wait*. (2). Finally, MG admits that she has never used this proverb herself because, as she points out, *some expressions are very sophisticated* and can be useful, but only in a very exact context (4). Although MG has never used this particular proverb before, she tries to come up with an example of its possible use. JE tries to help out, and she is able to provide an example of a situation in which the above expression could be used (5). This is a very important contribution, which immediately helps MG to come up with other, more common, expressions which could replace this seemingly low-frequency proverb (6, 8). JE repeats and writes down one of them, which, as MG points out, is used. In the following turns, MG provides further explanations about the introduced proverb *The day is not over yet,* trying to clarify its meaning (14, 16). MG focuses on this particular proverb because, according to her, it is often used in Germany. Finally, in turn 17, JE provides a similar English proverb: *Don't count your chickens before they've hatched.* The same procedure is employed: MG repeats the new proverb and writes it down (18). Finally, one more expression related to the meaning of the previously discussed proverbs is introduced (19), *don't get too excited yet*. In the same conversational turn, JE points out that although it is not an idiomatic expression, it is used in English. MG writes it down (20).

In summary, the proverb from the flashcard stimulated metatalk related to proverbs and their use in English and German. Both tandem partners actively contribute to the creation of new knowledge. JE discovers that the German proverb *Man sollte das Fell des Bären nicht teilen eher man ih erlegt hat* is not frequently used in modern German and that there are better alternatives (*Noch ist nicht aller Tage Abend)* to express the same idea. MG is able to learn the English proverb *Don't count your chickens before they've hatched.* JE and MG may even be learning something new about their L1; MG's statement *I have never used this expression before* suggests that during the

tandem interaction she was forced to reflect on her native language and its use. This is a very different learning situation when compared to the foreign language classroom, where learners are in most instances discouraged from using their L1. In a traditional instructional setting, there is often a strong separation between learners' L1 and L2; whereas in tandem, both languages are equally important in the process of one's learning. Learners are constantly making connections between them. For this reason, they notice linguistic and lexical features not only in their second language, but also in the first one, as observed in Excerpts 4, 5, and other further discussed examples.

Learning proverbs with a native speaker of one's L2 has one more advantage. The native speaker can tell directly if a proverb is still used in the modern version of the L2 or if other alternative forms would be more appropriate. Since most of the proverbs were created many centuries ago, some of them may be a little archaic today. That is, they are understood by most native speakers, but their modern use may be very limited or they may have been replaced by newer forms. Learning proverbs and idiomatic expressions from a book does not provide learners with the direct access to native speakers and their linguistic experiences in their use. For all the above reasons, addressing proverbs during interaction with a native speaker is very beneficial, regardless of whether they arise from the pre-planned activity (Excerpt 7) or spontaneously.

In summary, in this section I described the learning of proverbs during tandem interactions. As previously mentioned, the learning of idioms and proverbs is more complex and difficult than the acquisition of a single word because the meaning of the whole expression is not the sum of the meanings of its parts. For this reason, the learning of proverbs and idioms can be confusing, but an accurate L2 speaker should be familiar with the full range of existing lexical items, even if their learning presents some challenges. As Arnaud and Savignon (1997) pointed out, "Knowledge of rare words is a valuable tool as it enables an L2 learner to access the meanings (…) effortlessly and immediately, without having to devote too much energy to lexical guessing" (p.159).

The tandem method allows learners the exposure to authentic language use, and the occasional, sometimes incidental, exposure to idiomatic expressions or proverbs. Although the introduction of the multiword phrases during tandem may be incidental, tandem learners frequently tend to pause and pay attention to these complex structures. As observed in previously discussed excerpts, they have prolonged discussions about idioms and proverbs in order to better understand their meaning and usage. One could argue that this intensive metatalk makes learners more aware of them.

As Hucking and Coady (1997) concluded, multiword phrases constitute a significant part of ordinary language use, but they are not learned well through purely incidental exposure and should be addressed directly. The tandem method allows learners such direct addressing of multiword phrases, which is often not the case in a traditional classroom. Arnaud and Savignon (1997) concluded that the foreign language classrooms were inadequate for the acquisition of multiword phrases because (a) the non-native foreign language teachers did not always have sufficient knowledge of idiomatic expressions; (b) incidental exposure during lessons to multiword phrases was insufficient for their acquisition; (c) in the foreign classroom setting, there was an occasional "lack of awareness of the nature and importance of complex units leading to reduced attention to them" (p.168). The tandem learning method provides learners with (a) a competent native speaker, who is familiar with many proverbs and idiomatic expressions in the L1; and (b) incidental or pre-planned contact with idioms and proverbs during tandem meetings. Such contact frequently results in direct and explicit addressing of them. When comparing both environments, advanced language learners may have more opportunities for intense, prolonged contact with multiword phrases during tandem interactions when compared to the traditional classroom setting.

The tandem environment allows students to spend a lot of time on difficult lexical items, as observed in the above excerpts, and which can be also observed in the next few conversations related to the instances of complex lexical learning in tandem. In Excerpts 8, 9, and 10, I will focus on multi-word learning: learning of similar sounding/looking words or learning of seemingly easy, but still confusing L2 lexical items.

6.5 Multiword lexical learning

Chapter 6, related to lexical learning processes observed during tandem interactions, started with examples of relatively simple, single-word learning. As observed in Excerpts 1-3, this type of situation is not very difficult for tandem learners. The non-native speaker can easily ask for the unknown word or its translation (verbally or non-verbally), and the native speaker usually is able to provide a quick answer. Often, both learners learn the same lexical item in their respective native language.

This is not always the case when learners want to address multiple words in the same conversational turn, or words which are confusing for them because of their form or sound similarity. According to Laufer (1997), "there is a wealth of evidence that L2 learners confuse words that sound and/or look alike."(p.146) These words can be difficult for learners, and their learning requires more negotiation/clarification of meaning than learning of a single word. Addressing multiple, or confusing/difficult, lexical items in the same conversational turn represents more challenges for both learners, as shown in the next three excerpts. As result of it, learners are not always able to discuss and learn these items in both native languages at the same time, as it was observed during single-word learning exchanges. Complex issues require more attention, and tandem learners focus, in most cases, only on one language when discussing them. Additionally, when addressing multiple words in the same turn, learners do not always focus on their exact translation (as they do when learning single-words in tandem). In case of complexer lexical discussions, learners' focus seems to be on understanding and communication, rather than on the exact translation of each single word.

Excerpt 8

The following excerpt is a fragment of a conversation between DG and RS. It is important to point out that RS majors in English and wants to become an English teacher. Although during the time of data collection for this study he spoke German very well, his knowledge of English was much stronger. On some occasions a linguistic transfer from English into German could be observed in his utterances. Prior to this excerpt, RS explained to his tandem partner a Spanish idiomatic expression. Specifically, he explained how to express the discomfort one has when there is something in one's eye. This prompted DG to pose the following question:

1 DG: Como se dice blinzeln?

(*How do you say to blink?)*

2 RS: **Será, no ver nada**.↓

(*It would be "not to see anything."*)

3 DG: Ha?

4 RS: **No ver nada.**

(*Not to see anything.*)

5 DG: No, blinzeln ist wenn du so machst...

(*No, to blink is used when you do so...*)

[Opens and closes his eyes a few times]

6 RS: Parpadear. (*To blink.*)

Ah, blinzeln. Und blinken?

(*Ah, to blink. And to use the turn signal?*)

7 DG: Blinken ist wenn du Auto fährst und dann blinkst du mit ..... , mit dem.... , mit

(*To signal is when you drive a car and then you signal with the..., with the..., with*)

Wenn du abbiegst, dann blinkst du.

(*When you make a turn, then you use the turn signal.*)

8 RS: Blinken und blitzen.

(*To use the turn signal and to flash.*)

9 DG: Blitzen ist wenn du zu schnell fährst, dann wirst du geblitzt.

(*To flash is, when you are driving too fast, then they „flash" you.*)

10 RS: **Aber blitzen ist auch das, oder ?**

(*But "to flash" is also this, or?*)

[RS opens and closes his eyes]

11 DG: Nein, das ist blinzeln.↑

(*No, this is to blink.*)

12 RS: Und blitzen?

(*And to flash?*)

13 DG: Blitzen ist wenn ein Messgerät irgendwo auf der Strasse steht und du fährst

zu schnell mit dem Auto, dann blitzt es dich. Dann musst du eine Geldstraffe zahlen.

(*To flash is when there is radar on the street, and you are driving too fast,*

then you are being "flashed.." Then you have to pay a ticket.)

14 RS: OK

Excerpt 8 is initiated by DG, who wants to know how to say in Spanish *blinzeln* (to blink) (1). The question is expressed in Spanish, even though the unknown lexical item is in German. RS translates the verb incorrectly, as to be blinded/not able to see anything (2). There are a few signs that he is not sure what to say. First, RS's falling intonation, which could signal that he is not so sure of himself in this particular context. Second, he chooses to use the verb *será,* which could be utilized in Spanish to express a future time or something one is not sure about (e.g., a guess or a hypothesis). RS's answer (*not to see anything*) is received with *ha?* (3). The use of *ha* suggests that there is a problem. In turn 4, RS repeats his previous, incorrect answer. It may suggest that he has

understood *ha* as an indication of a problematic hearing. RS's repetition of the incorrect translation of the German verb *blinzeln* leads DG to conclude that he had no understood her question (i.e. that RS has not understood the word *blinzeln)*. In response to it, DG uses nonverbal communication to help explain what she means (5). She opens and closes her eyes a few times, to demonstrate nonverbally the meaning of the verb *blinzeln*. At this moment (6), RS provides the correct Spanish translation (parpadear-to blink). Although there are some difficulties at the beginning of the negotiation, both partners succeed in communicating and learning from each other, using both the verbal and the nonverbal means of communication. DG accomplishes her goal and hears the correct Spanish translation of *blinzeln*, and RS "accidentally" is exposed to the German version of it. More precisely, RS notices what *blinzeln* means.

After acknowledging that to blink is *blinzeln*, RS asks what *blinken* would mean in German (6). Knowing that RS is majoring in English and his knowledge of this language is much stronger than his German, one can understand that there is potential for confusion because English and German can often be similar.

Blinken in German means to use the turn signal, but the similar English word *to blink* has two meanings: to open and close one's eyes (German *blinzeln*) or to use the turn signal (German *blinken)*. For this reason, RS's confusion could be related to negative transfer from English into German. DG uses an example to explain the meaning of the word *blinken* (to use the turn signal), (7). In the next turn, RS adds one more similar word to the discussion. This time he wants to know what the difference would be between the German words *blinken* and *blitzen*. Since the word *blinken* was explained before, DG concentrates on *blitzen* (to flash), and again through the very common example of being "flashed" through the police radar, she tries to explain the meaning of this particular verb (9). However, RS still seems to be confused, asking whether *blitzen* (to flash) means to blink (10). He does not use the German verb *blinzeln*: RS communicates its meaning non-verbally. DG provides explicit corrective feedback. First, she rejects the hypothesis that *blitzen* could mean *blinken,* saying *no*. Second, she provides the translation for the non-verbal use of the verb *blinzeln* (11). RS is still confused about these three verbs. He asks one more time for the explication of *blitzen* (12), which is provided (13). DG explains, this time with more details, the meaning of the word *blitzen*. RS acknowledges his understanding with an *OK* (14).

Excerpt 8 represents the following features of tandem learning:

1) Excerpt 8 represents an opportunity for lexical learning and clarification of meaning of three very similar German verbs. This exchange is not initiated by RS in order to learn these verbs; it is DG who wants to know the Spanish translation for the verb *blinzeln*--her explicit word search starts the whole process. Since RS is not able to translate the German verb *blinzeln* correctly into Spanish, negotiation of meaning takes place, verbally and non-verbally. Once the meaning of *blinzeln* is clarified, considerable effort goes into resolving RS's problems with regard to the verbs *blinken* and *blitzen*, which are confusing for him. RS is comfortable with posing multiple questions to clarify the meaning of these verbs. As Gass (1997) stated, linguistic negotiations are likely to happen between individuals whose status (or power relationship) is similar. In tandem, both partners are equal. For this reason, most tandem learners are not embarrassed about asking questions or correcting each other.

2) Conversational interaction allows learners to notice the gap in their knowledge. DG's request for a translation of the word *blinzeln* is the result of noticing the gap in her knowledge. She is also able to notice the gap in RS's knowledge of German, as he is unable to accomplish the translation task. One may wonder if RS also notices the gap in his

knowledge at the same moment, since the tone of his voice is definitely falling while incorrectly translating the verb *blinzeln* (to blink with one's eyes) as *not to see anything*. Surely, there is some confusion since RS not only provides the incorrect translation, but also repeats it. His next question, about the connection between the verbs *blinzeln* and *blinken* suggests that he has noticed his linguistic problems (6). As Swain and Lapkin (1995) would state, learners notice their linguistic deficiencies attempting to produce the target language (DG is not able to say *parpadear* in Spanish). It may direct their attention to something they need to learn about their L2 and trigger cognitive processes that may generate linguistic knowledge, or consolidate the previous knowledge. In the case of RS, hearing that his hypothesis about the meaning of the word *blinzeln* is incorrect directs his attention to this particular verb and to other similar sounding verbs. According to Swain (1998), noticing, hypothesis testing, and metatalk may represent learning in progress.

3)   Although this excerpt addresses three very similar German verbs, possibly only one of them is new to RS, *blinzeln. Blinzeln* is a relatively low-frequency verb in German--its meaning is limited only to the action of opening and closing one's eyes. RS has been previously exposed to the other two verbs (since he produces them on his own during this excerpt), but without context he is not able to distinguish them from each other. It is also possible that RS has misunderstood the meanings of *blinken* and *blitzen*. His interaction with DG and talking about these verbs may help RS to distinguish them.

4)   The focus on lexical items represents a temporary shift from the communicative-oriented conversation to the discussion of these three lexical items. Once the task is accomplished, the conversation shifts again to the communicative setting and the previously discussed topic is continued. As mentioned in the introduction to Excerpt 8, learners were discussing idioms prior to their focus on these three verbs. Such situation demonstrates that tandem learning can create opportunities for LREs within the context of "real" communication.

Excerpt 9

Excerpt 9 is a fragment of a conversation between NoS and SoG. The learners talk about SoG's visit to a pizzeria on the day prior to their tandem. According to SoG, although he was hungry and enjoyed the pizza, it was not very good.

1 SoG: Also gestern war die Pizza gar nicht so…[SoG makes an „unhappy" facial expression.]

(And yesterday the pizza was not so...)

2 NoS: Nein? *(No?)*

3 SoG: Na ja, die war gross, aber, *(Yes, it was big, but,)*

4 NoS: Es hat nicht **Geschmack, Geschmeck.** *(It didn't have taste, tasted.)*

5 SoG: Geschmack. (*Taste.*)

6 NoS: **Geschmeck.** *(Tasted.)*

7 SoG: Geschmack.*(Taste.)*

8 NoS: Aber es hat dir nicht **geschmackt,** geschmeckt? *(But it didn't taste to you?)*

9 SoG: Geschmeckt schon, aber der Geschmack war, sagen wir, so lala.

(It did, but its taste was, let's say, just ok.)

10 NoS: Das ist der Geschmack. Und so lala? Sagt man das?

(This is the taste. And "so lala"? Do you say it?)

11 SoG: So lala, das heisst nicht so gut.

(„So lala" means not so good.)

12 NoS: Nicht so gut. So lala.

(*Not so good. So lala.*)

13 SoG: Ja, es war nicht lecker. Der Rest war auch so lala.

(Yes, it was not very tasty. The other things were also not so good.)

     This exchange starts with SoG's comment that the pizza he ate the previous day was not so… (1). He does not use any adjective in his sentence, which makes it a little abrupt, but he is still understandable since his facial expression does not look very happy. SoG's facial expression "fills in" for the missing adjective and completes the sentence. NoS seems surprised and asks *no?* SoG explains that the pizza was big, *but* (3). The word *but* ends his conversational turn because at this moment his sentence is finished by NoS (4). Trying to say that the pizza did not have taste or did not taste good to him (her sentence could mean any of these two possibilities), NoS comes across her own linguistic limitations not knowing which form to use *Geschmack* or *geschmeck* .Since she produces two forms, NoS is testing a hypothesis. SoG repeats the noun *Geschmack,* which is one of the possibilities (did not have taste) (5). There may be an explanation of why he focuses on this possibility. The first used word, the noun *Geschmack* (the taste) was used correctly. The second word *geschmeck* was not. *Geschmeck* does not exist at all in German, and it could mean either: an incorrect variation of *Geschmack*, or possibly, the past participle which is not *geschmeck* but geschmeckt. SoG focuses on the correct use of the noun (the taste) by his tandem partner. NoS does not repeat *Geschmack,* instead, she repeats only the second, incorrect option *geschmeck* (6). SoG repeats again the noun *Geschmack* (7). He focuses on the noun (the taste--the pizza did not have taste); whereas NoS on the verb (did not taste good). A verb fits her sentence structure better than a noun since NoS uses *Es hat nicht,* which normally should be followed by the past participle (geschmeckt) (4,8). In turn 8, NoS introduces self-correction as a part of this negotiation of meaning. She repeats the original utterance (from line 4), but adds this time a "t" to the ends of both words. She is again testing a hypothesis. She creates an incorrect noun (*Geschmackt*) and a correct past participle (*geschmeckt*) (8). Adding the "t" to the end of these words shifts SoG's focus to the past participle form. In turn 9, SoG uses the participle –*geschmeckt,* while answering NoS's question, *Did it taste to you?* (8). In addition, he uses the related noun, stating that although the pizza had flavor, the taste was not good. In this answer, SoG uses both lexical items (the noun and the past participle), which were the cause of the previous confusion (9). In the following turn (10), NoS repeats the noun and the corresponding article, acknowledging the previous efforts of her tandem partner (since he previously has used the noun *Geschmack* three times). Secondly, she asks about the expression used by SoG --*so lala,* which apparently was new for her. NoS wants to know if it is really used in this form in German (10). SoG explains to her the meaning of this idiomatic expression (11), and NoS repeats both: SoG's explanation *nicht so gut*, as well as the corresponding idiomatic expression *so lala* (12). This repetition of both lexical items in the same turn is an example of learner connecting her previous knowledge with the new one. It represents an opportunity for learning. In turn 13, SoG uses the idiom *so lala* again to talk about other things that he ate, providing one more opportunity for NoS to hear it and to see how it can be used.

Excerpt 9 is an example of a lexical learning situation during tandem interaction. This learning situation is initiated by NoS's confusion about the correct form of the past participle *geschmeckt.* Accidentally, instead of the past participle, she produces a correct noun form (the taste), which apparently, is also understood by SoG as such. Tandem partners manage to work out their different perceptions and understand each other after a few conversational turns of apparent misunderstanding. NoS is able to notice the difference between the noun *Geschmack* and the related past participle *geschmeckt.* In addition, she is able to have contact with a new idiomatic expression, *so lala*, which has been used spontaneously by SoG during their conversation. Processes similar to these described in Excerpt 8 are observed: noticing the gap, hypothesis testing, and negotiation of meaning. In the process of communication, NoS is able to discover her linguistic deficiencies: she is not able to produce the correct form of the past participle *geschmeckt.* Noticing the gap in her knowledge motivates NoS to test a hypothesis about the correct form of the participle. Her first approach is not successful: NoS produces the correct noun *Geschmack* and the incorrect form of the participle *geschmeck.* Her tandem partner focuses on the correct noun, repeating it. His feedback does not help NoS with the correct form of the searched participle. For this reason a second hypothesis is tested in turn 9: NoS adds a "t" to both, previously produced words. Doing so, she creates an incorrect noun *Geschmackt,* and the correct form of the past participle *geschmeckt.* The German native speaker responds, using *geschmeckt*, and NoS is able to obtain confirmation with regard to her hypothesis.

It is important to stress that the primary focus of this conversation is neither lexical learning, nor focus on form. It is communication. SoG is talking about his experience at the pizzeria, and even in this short excerpt, interrupted by the temporary shifts to the LREs, the communicative purpose is the main goal. We are able to obtain the information that the pizza was big and that its taste was not very good. Finally, we know that the other aspects of this restaurant visit were not very good either. Even when occasionally interrupted, the conversation always shifts back to communication. This is an example of incidental, contextual learning in tandem. As mentioned in chapter 3, one can distinguish between two types of context: learning context (learning environment) and textual or discourse context, in which a particular word can be found. Learning in tandem is strongly connected with the first one, since learners' life and their experiences are the context and the topic of their interactions. This is also one of the strengths of tandem interactions. Learning in tandem occurs in an authentic context. It is not forced, and students do not have to perform role-plays. As van Lier (2000) pointed out, learners are "immersed in an environment full of potential meanings," which become available for them as learners "act and interact with their environment" (p. 246). The interaction between active learner and the environment leads to learning. "To look for learning is to look at the active learner in her environment." (p. 246-247)

6.6 Conclusion

In Chapter 6, I have shown the complexities of lexical learning in tandem, which range from instances related to single-word learning to complex discussions about idioms and proverbs. Lexical learning in tandem is strongly related to authentic language use and often results from context, as observed in all discussed excerpts. Idiomatic expressions, proverbs, and words with similar form proved to be challenging for learners of different native languages. Nevertheless, the tandem learning environment allowed learners to address these difficulties and to clarify their doubts. The assistance of the other learner (tandem partner) was always crucial in these processes. Finally, it was observed that during tandem interactions one cannot isolate the lexical learning from the grammatical or the intercultural aspects of such a learning environment. The tandem method is

a holistic approach to language learning, and there is a constant interplay between the grammar, lexis, and culture, as well as between the learners and their environment.

As Hulstijn (1997) concluded, contextual learning is of great importance for successful lexical acquisition, especially when it allows learners to elaborate on new words. It facilitates their retention. Examples of extensive negotiations of meaning and/or elaboration on lexical items were frequently observed in described excerpts. As van Lier (2000) pointed out, negotiation of meaning is highlighted as being a strong indicator for learning opportunities. Tandem interactions provide opportunities for learners' negotiations, as observed, for example, in Excerpts 4, 8, 9.

Finally, all observed excerpts represent collaborative dialogue. Learners converse and doing so, they produce utterances that can be responded to—by others or themselves. As Swain (2000) would stress, "what is said, is now an objective product that can be explored further by the speakers or others" (p.102). "It is language learning (knowledge building) mediated by language (semiotic tool)" (p.104). Through dialogue, learners regulate their activity, and create opportunities to reflect on their own language, and on the language of their tandem partner. These features of collaborative dialogue (and tandem learning as an example of it) can be observed in all conversation presented in this dissertation. In all excerpts, learners engage in problem solving and/or knowledge building. In Excerpts 1-9, learners focus primarily on their lexical problems. In the next chapter, learners focus on form in their exchanges.

The whole thesis is to be found only for members and licensees in the material database on www.tandem-fundazioa.info, 'Research' area.

4. Tandem en el mundo / Tandem in der Welt / Tandem worldwide

4.1.   Tandem with MitOst
European Cultural Foundation

According to their website, "The European Cultural Foundation facilitates and catalyses cultural exchange and new forms of creative expression. We share and connect knowledge across the European cultural sector and advocate for the arts on all levels of political decision-making."

One of the new projects is called 'Tandem', it is a cross-border project like 'Mugaz Gain'
http://www.tandemcity.info/euskara/eu24_mugaz-gain.htm

Resume of Tandem with MitOst:

ECF is a catalyst that builds bridges through culture. We have long focused on strengthening

collaboration within countries, between countries and across Europe.

We will continue to invest in the next generation of cultural organisations and actors in EU neighbourhood countries by helping develop their capacities and build networks through to 2012 and beyond. This process aims to enrich Europe by connecting the voices, skills and potential of those who often feel disconnected with the rest of Europe.

Our European Neighbourhood programme works in close collaboration with local partners. We are specifically focusing on the Arab-Mediterranean region, Moldova, Turkey, Ukraine and Belarus during 2010 – 2012.

The programme aims are to build a network of individuals and cultural organisations working for change in specific neighbourhood countries (mentioned above) who are hubs within their artistic communities; to stimulate co-development among the hubs and connections with EU-based art communities and political institutions and to enable the hubs to articulate their policy needs at all levels – from regional to European.

Programme activities:

- Organise regional meetings between European Neighbourhood partners and guests from the EU

- Develop and launch a new exchange scheme for skills exchange and partnership development across the EU and the European Neighbourhood - specifically Moldova and Ukraine (see below)

- Providing start-up funding for regional hub initiatives – also when in conjunction with local communities

- Organise regular capacity building programmes and networking opportunities in the neighbourhood region

Tandem in partnership with MitOst
New exchange scheme - Tandem

We recently launched a new scheme called Tandem in conjunction with partners. It is an opportunity for cultural professionals from European Union countries and cultural professionals from Moldova, Turkey and Ukraine to exchange skills, network, and get a fresh insight into developing partnerships. **The deadline has now closed for the scheme with Moldova and Ukraine, but will open for the scheme connecting with Turkish and EU cultural professionals in early April 2011.**

For more details see:
http://www.eurocult.org/activities/neighbourhood

5. Die TANDEM-Stiftung / TANDEM Fundazioa

5.1.   Update of Mailinglist

Tandem Fundazioa maintains a (not very invasive) mailinglist with about 4 sendings per year about teacher trainings, publishing and contents of 'Tandem Neuigkeiten', scholarships etc.:

http://tandemcity.info/en_newsletter.htm

We will update it according to the following procedure:
you have received a mail inviting you to renew the subscription answering 'yes'. Together with this TN, you receive another reminder.
If you do not answer, your adress will be deleted.

5.2. Das Letzte: Tandem Yukatekisch

Nun ist auch der Sprung nach Chiapas gelungen:
http://www.mex-euro.de/showthread.php?tid=1895&page=1