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Abstract

This study describes existing didactic materials for Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language (LaF). Because language proficiency diplomas are set in the context of the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE), the relevant materials are examined in the light of the Common European Framework developed by the Council of Europe. Current FLT trends distinguish between analytic and synthetic syllabuses, whereas all LaF materials are designed as synthetic grammatical-notional syllabuses. The study also shows that although formal written Luxembourgish and native literacy is not common, LaF learners need to develop writing and reading skills in order to learn the language. It is advised that learners’ needs and societal needs be evaluated in order to improve and strengthen LaF materials.
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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTE</td>
<td>Association of Language Testers in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSL</td>
<td>British Sign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACDP</td>
<td>Council of Advancement of Communication with Deaf People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>Common European Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP</td>
<td>European Language Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLT</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaF</td>
<td>Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>Lëtzebuergesch als Friemsprooch</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Aims of this Study
The main aim of this study is to analyse the present situation of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language (hereafter also abbreviated as LaF). The main focus of this study will be on LaF materials, thus the purpose will be to provide the readers with linguistic information on teaching LaF rather than learning the language.

On a narrower level, the purpose of this present study is to analyse current trends in foreign language teaching (hereafter also abbreviated as FLT) and to compare those trends with the foreign language learning objectives set by the Council of Europe’s Waystage 1990 (Ek and Trim 1991). Both FLT trends and learning objectives will be evaluated in relation to LaF materials existing at the moment in Luxembourg. Since research into LaF is limited, this study will also try to review all LaF materials available on the market, evaluating not only course books and LaF proficiency exams, but also assessing current dictionaries, audio-visual materials, and other supports. The intentions of reviewing these materials is first of all to determine whether they match the goals and aims set by the Council of Europe (hereafter also abbreviated as COE) or in current FLT theories.

1.2 Motivations for this Study
Luxembourgish, or Lëtzebuergesch in its native language, has been described as one of Europe’s least investigated languages (Moulin and Nübling, personal communication), thus making it a linguistically under-described language. Although more and more native and non-native linguists seem to take interest in this West-Germanic language spoken by 300,000 people (SIL International 2005), the application of its linguistic knowledge is still relatively low. To date, only an online spell-checker (Mousel, 2003) is available and the most recent monolingual dictionary, however, dates from 1955 (Bruch 1955). Additionally, several other projects have been started such as the Luxembourgish Linguistic Atlas (Moulin, s.d.), a new Luxembourgish monolingual dictionary (see Moulin and Gilles 2003: 319) and even a Luxembourgish interface for Microsoft® Language Interface Package® (see Gaudron 2004, Gomard 2004) is in planning.
Luxembourgish has been described as a “factor of integration”: foreign nationals are more likely to integrate into the Luxembourgish-speaking society than those people who do not speak the language. Apart from the social importance of Luxembourgish, knowledge of the language is the “determining factor” (Josiane Kartheiser, personal communication) for employers when recruiting new employees. If two employees with the same qualifications and skills apply for a job, their Luxembourgish-speaking employer will choose the Luxembourgish-speaking candidate.

More research into the area of applied linguistics in Luxembourgish could hence provide a better overview not only of the language itself, but also of its usage and the consequences of it.

### 1.3 Initial questions

The first question that this study will try to answer is what FLT approache(s) the COE has adopted over the years and whether or not its approache(s) is/are similar to FLT methods used outside of the analysed framework. Because the study is mainly interested in the Waystage level of FLT, it will be examined whether or not Waystage is an accessible target-level for learners at a beginners’ level.

As for the LaF materials, this study will provide a historical view of those and will review with particular reference to their styles, their respective target readerships or audiences, and their linguistic contents. A further analysis will compare those materials with FLT trends to verify whether or not they need altering.
2. The Council of Europe

2.1 Introduction
Since the purpose of this study is to compare didactic materials against *Waystage 1990* (Ek and Trim 1991b), a specific syllabus originated by the Council of Europe, this section will provide a description of both this syllabus and the frameworks and institutions behind it.

Subsection 2.2 will provide information on the Council of Europe itself, and give a short survey of the institution, its history, aims, objectives, and collaboration with other institutions.

Subsection 2.3 will concentrate on the language teaching policies of the Council of Europe, and the focus here will be on the philosophy or ‘vision’ behind learning foreign languages and also on the history up to the present time of the Council’s foreign language teaching policies.

Subsection 2.4 will analyse the *Threshold* level (Ek 1980), which is an intermediate stage between absolute beginners and near-native fluency, and the only level of language acquisition to have been specifically designed by the Council of Europe. The aim is to provide information on what this specific level encompasses, what skills, vocabulary, and grammar items are required to be known, and how the learners are supposed to achieve that level.

Subsection 2.5 will then examine the *Waystage* level, which was designed as a level between absolute beginners in a foreign language and Threshold level. Again, this subsection will examine what linguistic knowledge the learners are required to know, how learners achieve this level, and how they will be able to express themselves in the foreign language after completion of that level.

The specific question, however, of what learners can do at any level will be dealt with in 2.6. This subsection has the aim of familiarising readers with the different levels designed by the Council of Europe (COE) and how this ‘Common Scale of Reference’ is closely linked to the Association of Language Testers in Europe. This
association (the ALTE) will then be described in relation to its so-called ‘can-do statements’, which are a series of short sentences summarising from a learner’s perspective what they can do at each stage in learning a foreign language. The present study will not only provide information on those statements as they have been portrayed in English-language sources, it will also provide a Luxembourgish translation of the various can-do statements for the Waystage level (see Appendix A).

2.2 The Council of Europe

Although state-members of the Council of Europe are also members of the European Union, both organisations are distinctly separate. The COE was founded on 5 May 1949 by the ten member states Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom and its permanent headquarters are in Strasbourg. In relation to their main aims (c.f. Council of Europe 2005), concentration is paid in particular to matters of cultural nature, rather than to those of an economic or narrowly political nature.

Because one of the Council’s priorities is to promote and develop a European cultural identity, Morrow (2004a: 4) writes that “understanding the culture and recognising the values of another country are only possible through language”. Perhaps as a reaction to the situation in North and South America where one single language is seen as an “important feature in the cultural unification” (ibid.) of North America (English), and of Central and South America, (Spanish and Portuguese), the COE backs the idea of multilingualism existing in Europe, where “each nation state, by and large, has its own language” (ibid.). According to Morrow, the culture and values of a nation are thus recognised by the COE through the language(s) spoken in that country. From this emerges the idea of ‘plurilingualism’, which will be discussed and compared with multilingualism in the following subsection.

The aim of the COE in favouring cultural conservation and understanding can thus be realised through foreign language education, and this can also bring with it the promotion of a European identity.
2.3 Language Teaching Policies

The COE has for its aims coined the term ‘plurilingualism’, which is different from ‘multilingualism’. Whereas the COE defines multilingualism as “the knowledge of a number of languages, or the coexistence of different languages in a given society” (Council of Europe, 2001: 4), plurilingualism (Morrow, 2004a: 5) “implies action on the part of government and individuals”. The goal of being plurilingual is to have acquired language skills that enable learners to communicate, even at a beginners’ level, with users of other languages. The language skills are acquired from (foreign) language classes, but also result from individual experiences and skills. Plurilingualism rejects the idea of near-native proficiency in a foreign language, and instead emphasises “[the] develop[ment of] a linguistic repertory, in which all linguistic abilities have a place” (Council of Europe, 2001: 5). Another consequence of being plurilingual is ‘pluriculturalism’, an inter-cultural competence where foreign language learners become aware of and develop a respect for cultures other than the one(s) of their own.

A second aspect of the foreign language policies of the COE is the format of foreign language education. Because near-native fluency is not a primary goal and is certainly not desired within a short period of time, plurilingualism is the development of linguistic skills over a long-term period. The blueprints of today’s language learning credits and units systems were first suggested by Trim et al. in 1973, where in their introduction they write that education is a life-long process, and that already by 1973 it was recognised that in view of, for instance, social mobility, work mobility and flexibility, new skills were expected to be acquired throughout the entire life-span of an adult person. This “long-term part-time study in adult life” (Trim et al., 1973: 2) has been labelled éducation permanente by the COE, and because of the mobile and flexible nature of this éducation, the Council of Europe devised a unit/credit system that could be used for FLT.

The system was to incorporate flexible levels, each of which could be attained by foreign language learners. These levels were to cover a whole range, from advanced levels to beginners’ level, the latter of which was at first called Threshold level, but which was later replaced by the easier and condensed Waystage level. Each level is split up into different units consisting of phrases, items of grammar, and vocabulary.
relevant to a functional category, such as ‘making a request’. As each unit is successfully completed, learners are given credits for their knowledge, with mobility and flexibility in mind; those credits are intended to be transferable to all the various language learning institutions.

Although the achievement of those levels would first be done through formal foreign language education, much attention was also given to promoting learners’ autonomy. Foreign language classes would thus not only provide necessary linguistic knowledge, but they would also teach the learners how to acquire new linguistic skills and how to access linguistic knowledge outside classes or courses. Linguistic life-long learning also means for the COE learning how to learn and learning how to become autonomous.

The first two languages actually taught according to this newly designed system were French and English, since these were the two official languages of the COE and were furthermore considered to be “international linguae francae” (Trim et al., 1973: 4). Other modern languages in mind to be taught that way were Spanish, German, Arabic, Russian, Hungarian, Chinese, Japanese, and Hindi/Urdu. The number of (European) languages covered to date by the current unit/credit system of the ALTE is twenty-four, and there have been some discussions of converging the Japanese language proficiency test towards these scales as well. The scales themselves will be discussed in greater detail in 2.6.

The current literature that brings all the teaching policies under one roof is the Common European Framework (Council of Europe 2001, hereafter also abbreviated as CEF). This is a reference point for foreign language education that provides its readers with an exhaustive number of tables, lists, and figures depicting and documenting the process and the needs of foreign language learners. One table, for instance, portrays a learner’s various communicative activities (ibid: 222), and divides these activities up according to whether they are written or oral, solo or tandem.

While the Common European Framework has been criticised as a producer of mere lists (Heyworth 2004), the framework has been a contributory factor in causing
various syllabuses to be redesigned according to the scales provided and has helped to
determine the needs of learners when they decide to learn a foreign language. Two
levels as an outcome from the Common European Framework will be described
below. The first level will be Threshold and the second will be Waystage.

2.4 The Threshold Level
In terms of chronology, the Threshold level is the oldest language proficiency level
that has been generated by the COE. Other levels such as Waystage or Vantage have
been designed with respect to the Threshold level. In its beginnings, this level was
designed to be “the minimum level, basic level or threshold level in foreign language
competence” (Trim et al. 1973: 95; my italics). However, in their attempt to define
the Threshold level, Trim et al. note that setting up a minimal linguistic competence
level will vary from case to case (ibid.): “the threshold level will have to be based on
other grounds than ‘minimum language needs’” (ibid.). They thus equate Threshold
level with the certificate of the German Volkshochschulverband, which covers a
vocabulary of 1,500 to 2,000 words.

In its essentials, the Threshold level comprises basic vocabulary, basic language
functions and basic grammatical structures, where ‘basic’ indicates “universally
appealing”, whether the language learners are full-time students, workers, employees,
or others. Laura McCormac writes in her dissertation on the application of a
Waystage syllabus to the Japanese language that the Threshold level “was thought to
represent the lowest definable level of general language ability and thus an
appropriate terminal objective for beginners’ language courses” (McCormac 2002: 8).
As for the vocabulary, Trim et al. wrote that it should cover “those situations in
which the majority are most likely to find themselves when in contact with foreign
language speakers” (ibid: 102). Further on, the authors provide an extensive list of
vocabulary items, thematically categorised, accompanied by two grammar lists, the
first covering non-language-specific grammatical aspects, and the second covering
English grammatical aspects. The vocabulary themes presented by Ek and Trim
(1991a; cited in Council of Europe 2001) cover:

“1. personal identification; 2. house and home, environment; 3. daily life; 4.
free time, entertainment; 5. travel; 6. relations with other people; 7. health
and body care; 8. education; 9. shopping; 10. food and drink; 11. services; 12. places; 13. languages; 14. weather” (Council of Europe 2001: 52).

Although the Threshold level claims to be an open syllabus, it is interesting to note that despite its attempts to offer foreign language courses to as many learners as possible, Ek (1980) writes in his early volume on this particular level that, although Threshold level is intended for learners who will only need a basic language proficiency, the learners ‘prototypically’ spend only a short period of time in the foreign country and their contact with foreigners in their own country is also limited. Ek even specifies that these learners are probably tourists (ibid: 14). The prototypical characteristics of these learners do not reflect, however, the characteristics of people learning Luxembourgish as a foreign language. Learners of Luxembourgish are unlikely to be tourists, because tourists in Luxembourg are given the impression that the country is French-speaking, when in fact, as one can see from road and other public signs, it is a French-writing country. Secondly, tourists, even if they knew that a language called Luxembourgish existed, would be unable to buy any materials outside of Luxembourg to study it (cf. 3).

Learners of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language (LaF), whether beginners or at an intermediate stage, generally live either in Luxembourg or in the bordering regions of Belgium, France and Germany. Unlike Ek’s learners, the learners of Luxembourgish will therefore spend a great deal of time with or among Luxembourgish speakers, whether in the area in where they live, or at their place of work.

As far as speaking, listening, reading, and writing are concerned, these fours skills have been divided up by the Common European Framework, according to whether the linguistic skills are based on production, reception, interaction, and mediation (which includes, for instance, translation or periphrasis). As Heyworth states, “the CEF description allows us to distinguish between spoken production and spoken interaction, and encourages us to look at the skills as being integrated rather than isolated” (Heyworth 2004: 16).

The question of how and what exactly is taught through the programmes can be approached by comparing Threshold and Waystage levels with each other. The
following subsection will attempt to describe Waystage in relation to its predecessor, how both differ and how both complement each other.

2.5 Waystage
Waystage was designed as an intermediate stage of Threshold level. The original work describing this level was Ek and Alexander’s *Waystage: an intermediary objective below Threshold Level in a European unit/credit system of modern language learning for adults* (Ek and Alexander 1977). This intermediate level was first designed as an in-between level for learners wishing to carry on with Threshold level, but as Ek and Trim write in *Waystage 1990*:

“[I]t has clear become that for many learners in the achievement of [the Waystage] level […] is a thoroughly satisfying experience and that, in fact, a large number of them may not feel the need to go much beyond this in the same language.” (Ek and Trim 1991b: 4-5).

It would be interesting to verify the statement above with learners of LaF. The small number of different LaF course books suggests either that there is a low number of advanced LaF learners, or that LaF materials become limited as learners progress. The latter seems the more reasonable answer, and Dr Kristine Horner, a non-native speaker of Luxembourgish, recollects (personal communication) having relied on self-directed learning (i.e. television, personal interaction) in her own advanced level of LaF.

At any rate, Waystage did become a level in its own right for many learners, and *Waystage 1990* was redesigned to reflect this. Amongst the new components in the 1990 volume are learning strategies for learners, such as ‘learning to learn’ (ibid: 60), which allows learners to become aware of and to define their own communicative needs, e.g. to express a wish to read about economics in their foreign language. Secondly, learners become aware of the content of what they learn in their foreign language, then they become aware of how they learn the foreign language, and the last strategy in this category involves self-evaluating one’s level of proficiency.

A next set of strategies that have been introduced are compensation strategies. These include linguistic compensation such as knowing how to ask a question when, for
instance, a learner has not understood a word or a phrase properly. The other compensation strategy is directed to the learner as a “social agent” (ibid: 59), where the learner can “apologise for uncertainty or ignorance as to the accepted code of behaviour”, such as in the phrase: “I am sorry, I didn’t know” (ibid.). However useful apologising can be, it is difficult not to find the behaviour of the social agent patronising and intimidating. One could suggest that in the spirit of the priority given by the Council of Europe to human rights, Waystage should perhaps not only teach learners how to belittle one’s own culture correctly, but also how learners can get a correct feeling for phrases emphasising cultural understanding and acceptance.

As with Threshold level, Waystage is classified into six language functions and eight language notions. The language functions include:

“(1) imparting and seeking factual information; (2) expressing and finding out attitudes; (3) getting things done (suasion); (4) socialising; (5) structuring discourse; and (6) communication repair” (ibid: 15).

Points (1) to (4) are reasonably straightforward; however, what is meant by (5) is how to start and finish telephone conversations and letters, whereas (6) is equivalent to the linguistic strategies mentioned above. It should be noted that (5) is comparatively basic in nature, as anything more linguistically complex with regard to structuring discourse (e.g. drafting an essay, preparing a speech) would exceed the beginners’ level.

As for the language notions, these have been ‘derived from a consideration of what, in general, people deal with by means of language’ (ibid: 22), and consist of:

“(1) Existential; (2) spatial; (3) temporal; (4) quantitative; (5) qualitative; (6) mental; (7) relational, and (8) deixis” (ibid)

*Waystage 1990* also provides information on socio-cultural competence, which includes, for instance, the etiquette associated with eating and drinking and visiting people. Since the book is intended for a readership within Europe, where such etiquette is generally the same, one is left wondering why so much emphasis is given to this topic, as it would be more appropriate to teach languages such as Japanese or Chinese.
From a Luxembourgish perspective, the most doubtful chapter in Waystage 1990 concerns the skill of writing (ibid: 45). Formal writing is not an exercise regularly carried out in Luxembourgish, as most people tend to switch to French when filling in administrative forms. This therefore provides a strong contrast with the Waystage specifications for foreign languages that can be written even at beginners’ level, and where, on an informal level, learners are expected to be able to write ‘simple messages such as greetings and congratulations’ or ‘simple private letters’, which nowadays would also include electronic formats such as e-mails and SMS. Although, thanks to the development of the internet and mobile messaging, people have begun now to write Luxembourgish at this basic level, most of the texts tend to diverge from the official orthography (Règlement 1999), as most speakers of Luxembourgish have not learnt in a formal setting how Luxembourgish is correctly written. Learners of LaF will thus not only infrequently encounter written Luxembourgish in the first place, but if they do, it will be a Luxembourgish with spelling divergences, or regionalisms, for which the current official orthography provides no room (Claudine Moulin, personal communication). For further comments, cf. section 5.

2.6 Language Proficiency Scales

Proficiency levels in the various foreign languages have been codified as the so-called ‘Common Reference Levels’ of the Common European Framework (Council of Europe 2001). Heyworth (2004) states these as:

“At a broad description of what a user of a language can ‘do’ at six different of performance ranging from ‘basic’ (A1, A2) through ‘independent’ (B1, B2) to ‘proficient’ (C1, C2). They function as a reference point both for descriptions of levels/achievements, and for definitions of objectives.” (Heyworth 2004: 8).

Although the CEF developed six levels of proficiency, this does not mean that language courses also consist of six levels. School curricula may well divide the six levels into 12, while private language schools would need only three.

Heyworth also comments that the descriptions at each level have been summarised into short statements, expressed positively in terms of what the learner can do, rather
than *cannot do*, irrespective of whether the level of communication is very basic, or not. These are called ‘can-do statements’, so named after each statement beginning with ‘can’, such as in the Basic User A2 statement: “[the learner] can describe in simple terms of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need” (Council of Europe 2001, cited in Morrow 2004b).

Linked to the can-do statements is the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE), which is anchored in the CEF. Although the COE levels and the ALTE levels differ in name (e.g. COE: Waystage, A2 = ALTE Level 1), both provide about 400 statements, organised according to their level, their areas (general, tourist, work, study), their sections (e.g. shopping), and their skills (e.g. writing). The can-do statements exist in thirteen different languages, which do not however include Luxembourgish. The total number of languages relying on the ALTE framework scale, such as to provide examinations and certificates, is currently fifteen; nine more languages, such as Welsh or Latvian, are “in the course of being placed on the ALTE Framework” (ALTE 2004).

Since the most documented level of LaF is its beginners’ level, Waystage, Appendix A provides the entire range of can-do statements found on the COE Basic User level A2 or ALTE level 1. This particular level will prepare LaF learners for the ZLaF (*Zertifikat Lëtzebuergesch als Friemsprooch* ‘Certificate in Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language’), and Appendix A provides Luxembourgish translations of the summaries of the can-do statements found in Council of Europe (2001: 250-256).

These ‘check-lists’ of statements are not only used for teaching (Heyworth: 2004), but are also used for self-assessment, which is a learning mode highly desired by the COE, as can be seen in 2.3 above. Self-assessment and learner autonomy are important objectives not only for the COE, but also for the European Language Portfolio (ELP). Both developed simultaneously from 1991 to 2001 and, according to Lenz and Schneider (2002; cited in Lenz 2004), “influenced each other in many ways” (Lenz 2004: 22). The ELP proficiency levels consist of three parts, the first being a language passport, which provides an overview of the learners’ linguistic abilities. The second is a language biography that documents the learners’ language-learning history, how they have developed, and what certificates they have obtained.
The final part of the ELP is the ‘dossier’, a portfolio of works produced by the learner. An ELP can thus be used by children or older pupils, but also by adults on the employment market.

Similar to the ELP is the DIALANG language assessment system, which consists of software downloadable from their website (DIALANG: 2005) that provides learners with can-do statements rendered into ‘I can’ statements. Learners decide whether statements such as the C2 listening statement ‘I can follow specialised lectures and presentations, which use a high degree of colloquialism, regional usage or unfamiliar technology’ apply to them or not. Because of the large number of statements in different categories of skill and the possibility to check those statements in various languages, studies such as Takala and Kaftandjieva (q.v.; cited in Council of Europe 2001) and North (1996; cited in Council of Europe 2001) demonstrated the validity of the self-assessment procedure of DIALANG.

Unfortunately, the self-assessment statements, despite being available, for example, in Irish Gaelic, which is another lesser used language in Europe, are currently not available in Luxembourgish. Although these statements in Luxembourgish would not be of any particular help to LaF learners, they would certainly be useful to native speakers of Luxembourgish.

2.7 Summary
As we have seen in this section, the first proficiency diploma in LaF is the Zertifikat Lëtzebuergesch als Friemssprooch, which is based on the Waystage level of the COE. The COE, which has the preservation of European identity as one of its main aims, recognises that knowing and appreciating (European) foreign languages (which they call ‘plurilingualism’) can not only make citizens into ‘good Europeans’, but also make them more valuable in the day-to-day world of work. In order to teach foreign languages, the Common European Framework of the COE has designed several levels of proficiency, two of which are the basic users’ Waystage and the intermediate learners’ Threshold level. Another important factor is the importance given to learners’ autonomy, i.e. learning how to learn, and self-assessment. The latter has paved the way to the European Language Portfolio and DIALANG, which both provide opportunities for learners to find out for themselves the level at which they
stand in the foreign language. For this, the can-do statements of ALTE, which explain what the learner can do as far as language is concerned, have led to ‘I can’ statements, and two studies have confirmed the validity of self-assessment through these statements. As an addition, because the ALTE can-do statements are not currently available in Luxembourgish, I have provided a translation for the Waystage level (Council of Europe level 2, ALTE level 1) in Appendix A.
Can-Do or Can-Don’t?

3. Materials

3.1 Introduction

As previously mentioned above, this section aims to provide a description of all the present materials that are available to learners of LaF. The didactic materials will be summarised and comments will be provided in order to present an extensive review, depicting the present situation of LaF materials and how this situation can be changed. The first type of didactic material analysed will be course books i.e. books that not only describe the grammar of Luxembourgish, but also present it in a structured way by means of lessons and different units. The analysis of course books will more closely examine points such as the intended readership, the style and language used throughout each course book, and the presence of grammar.

The second type of material is audio-visual, which incorporates CD-ROMs, audio CDs, VHS tapes, or any other supports that accompany course books or that can be studied independently. Some of the points analysed with regard to audiovisual materials will be the accents used in the materials, the clarity of speech, and the genuineness of dialogues.

Thirdly, this section will examine any monolingual and bilingual dictionaries available on the market. However, comparisons will also be drawn with dictionaries that are out of print. The dictionaries will be analysed, for instance, according to their number of entries, their introductions and appendices, and their user-friendliness. Additionally, Appendix B will reproduce the entry HOUSE found in each of the dictionaries reviewed. The final type of material will include anything else that may be useful to learners of LaF. This includes various electronic and online resources, but also informal ways of learning LaF, such as the media and the arts.

Apart from the resources found online, it is worthy of note that LaF materials are rarely available outside of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg. Seldom are these found in online bookstores, and people outside of Luxembourg therefore have no option but to order their materials directly from Luxembourg, paying expensive shipping costs. Learners of Luxembourgish living outside Luxembourg have thus a great disadvantage to those learning the language in its native country. As is the case, for
instance, for learners of LaF at the University of Sheffield, there is no other way to have access to materials other than the Centre for Luxembourg Studies and the university library. One suggestion that might be made would be that learners ought to be able to obtain their materials at a discounted price no matter where they are in the world. This would not only increase sales turnover, but also make Luxembourgish a less localised language. The current methods of sale of Luxembourgish LaF materials does not take account of the fact that Luxembourgish is spoken and taught outside of Luxembourg, as well as within the Grand-Duchy.

3.2 Course Books
This subsection will analyse each course book individually, as it is not always straightforward to compare the various points with each other.

*Lëtzebuergesch: Mir schwätze mateneen* (MENFPS 200b) aims at a very well-defined readership, and the introduction tells us that the course book is intended “for teenagers aged between 12 and 16, who are new to the country, so that they can settle down more quickly and more easily in learning to speak our language.” (ibid: i). This is reflected by its depiction, for instance, of older children and in its provision of cartoons showing anthropomorphised dinosaurs. With respect to topics, *Lëtzebuergesch* tends to concentrate around school-related events. Although attempts to depict contemporary topics exist as well, the unit on discussing date and events uses “stars on tour” (ibid: 119). Unfortunately, two of the three stars (Backstreet Boys and the Kelly Family) are no longer popular amongst 12 to 16-year olds. Thus, the intended readership for *Lëtzebuergesch* is slightly misrepresented and the authors would be well advised either to choose topics that are timeless or to update some sections more often.

The course book is written entirely in *Lëtzebuergesch*, with the exception of the summary of vocabulary in the appendix, which provides two-directional lists of words and phrases in Luxembourgish and French. Concerning the style, little can be said as the book gives no instructions for the exercises and grammar points are presented in the form of tables and lists. The topics covered are identity, school, jobs, jobs,

---

1 “Mir schwätze mateneen” ass erschafft gi fir Juglecker am Alter vun 12 bis 16 Joer, déi nei an d’Land kommen, fir datt si sech zu Lëtzebuerg méi séier a méi liicht aliewen, endeems si eis Sprooch léiere schwätzen.” (MENFPS 2000b: i)
nationalities, numbers and time. The grammar aspects dealt with in *Lëtzebuergesch* are determiners, gender, number, verbs and verbal morphology, tense and aspect, spatial and temporal prepositions, verb-second syntax. Although all aspects are explained throughout the book, grammar is not predominant; rather it is used in the exercises provided. Additionally, the course syllabus summary provides “socio-cultural aspects” (ibid: 164), which include pragmatic features such as pronominal T/V distinction and politeness, but also instructive information such as *Wichteg Telefonsnummener* “important telephone numbers” (ibid: 112). These cover emergency telephone numbers used in Luxembourg. *Lëtzebuergesch* seems to be an adequate course book for older children; however, too much emphasis is placed on syntactic exercises and reading texts are rare. The unit *Mir rechnen* (“we’re counting”) (ibid: 107), which teaches the learners how to voice arithmetic calculations in Luxembourgish, is very odd, since the Luxembourgish government officially teaches arithmetic and mathematics through the medium of German and French, and numeracy in any case in a second or foreign language is difficult to achieve and rarely required.

For adults, the government has published *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag* (MENFPS 2000a), which is specifically aimed at adults learning LaF at the Centre des Langues, the languages college of Luxembourg. Josiane Kartheiser (2000) writes that a large proportion of the learners there attend LaF classes for professional reasons, as some proficiency in Luxembourgish either aids in getting a job in the first place, or for improving the status of the job they already have. *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag*, however, does not reflect any style that would relate specifically to professionals. Judging by the course book’s layout and topics, all one can say is that the readers are not intended to be children.

Like *Lëtzebuergesch* (MENFPS 2000b), *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag* is written entirely in Luxembourgish except for the foreword, in which the former Minister of National Education congratulates learners for “taking the first step to learn the Luxembourgish language” (ibid: 3). The foreword is written in French, assuming, as in the previous course book, that the learners have some command of that language. The topics covered are similar to previous course books, and include introductory questions, jobs, places and times, shopping, work and leisure, clothes, communication (i.e.
telephone and invitations), and family. The syllabus summary provides similar grammar points to the ones found in *Lëtzebuergesch* (MENFPS 2000b). However, they are more explicitly mentioned through metalanguage such as *de Possessiv* “the possessive” or *de Passé composé* “the present perfect”. Interestingly, Luxembourgish metalanguage has adopted German terminology for case, but French terminology for tense and aspect. Whereas *Lëtzebuergesch* has an appendix of vocabulary items, *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag* provides the learners with transcripts of the listening tasks found throughout the book, and also with a table containing all the verbs covered in the course book, alongside with their respective non-past and past participle forms.

The final course book that exists for beginners is *Da Lass* (MENFPS s.d.). Similar to *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag*, *Da Lass* is aimed at a more adult readership. The synopsis on the back cover announces that the course book “enables [learners] to speak the Luxembourg language as it is spoken in daily and professional life.” Although instructions are written in Luxembourgish, vocabulary is always explained in French and in some cases in German. The reason why sometimes only German translations are provided remains, however, unclear. Regarding the topics presented in this course book, one’s first comment would be that some information needs to be updated, as the course book still mentions the pre-euro Luxembourgish franc and the Belgian franc (ibid: 115). In addition, the Grand-Duke of Luxembourg is still Jean (ibid: 68), although his son, Henri de Luxembourg, has been head of state since 2001. Apart from those two anachronisms, each lesson provides the learners with bite-sized units, e.g. a main topic such as greetings, grammar points, idiomatic expressions, and some cultural information written in Luxembourgish. The course book could be a good starting point for LaF learners, were there not additional exercises and tasks to be done. Instead, the course book focuses on receptive skills, which is emphasised by the fact that the book complements the VHS tape that comes with it. For a review of this tape and the accompanying audio CD of *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag* (MENFPS 2000a), refer to the section below. In order to summarise the comparisons drawn between the three course books, **Table 1** below provides information analysed in this section.
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### 3. Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MENFPS 2000b</th>
<th>MENFPS 2000a</th>
<th>MENFPS s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>readership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult learners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older children</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>language used</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourgish</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>topics covered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colours</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leisure</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petrol station</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the body</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>grammar points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be &amp; have</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determiners</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Eifel</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present simple</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb-second syntax</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrasal verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modal verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparisons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past participle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>extras</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHS tape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio CD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary of verbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summary of vocabulary</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: + yes, - no, +/- sometimes

Table 1. Comparison Chart between LaF Course Materials

3.3 Audio-visual Materials

The first material to be analysed is the audio CD, which comes with *Lëtzebuergesch fir all Dag* (ibid.). It is a CD of 79 tracks and totalling 73 minutes. The tracks either
consist of short extracts simply for listening to; other tracks, on the other hand, are exercises that favour receptive skills. Learners are expected either to listen to a track and complete gaps, or to match the correct answer to questions. There are two types of tracks that provide no tasks. The first type is entitled *Phonetik* “phonetics” (ibid: 4-5) and provides words (mostly nouns) that contain the same phoneme to which particular attention is given. Of the twelve phonemes depicted, eight are diphthongs and four are consonants. One of the Luxembourgish diphthongs represented is written <au> and is either realised /aʊ/ or /aːʊ/ according to the course book (ibid: 86). The latter sound is, however, realised on the CD as /ɛʊ/, which is the correct transcription of the standard pronunciation of this diphthong. Similar problems arise with the consonants where <ch> or <g> before an <e> or an <i> are realised on the CD as the voiceless alveolo-palatal fricative /ɕ/, but are transcribed in the course book as the voiceless palatal fricative /ç/ (ibid: 72), which is an incorrect transfer from German phonetics. The final mistakes appear in lesson 8 (ibid: 114) where the grapheme <s> representing the sound voiced alveolar /z/ is transcribed as the voiced palato-alveolar fricative /ʒ/, and where the grapheme <z> representing the voiceless alveolar affricate /ʦ/ is transcribed as the voiceless palato-alveolar affricate /ʧ/.

Apart from those errors, the audio CD provides a good variety of listening tasks and dialogues, usually between two persons with different sound pitches, so that learners can easily differentiate speakers. Special care has to be taken, however, for dialogues imitating telephone conversations, as one’s interlocutor can be difficult to understand because of voice modification through the telephone.

The next material is the VHS tape that accompanies *Da Lass* (MENFPS s.d.). It is worth noting that it is the sole course book based on tape, and not the other way around. In fact, dialogues and pictures in the book have been taken from the tape. Although the VHS tape is innovative as it is the only audio-visual material available to date, the look and design is slightly outdated and most spoken texts or films with voice-over are without subtitles, the inclusion of which might have improved comprehension. Although the phrases and grammar points are adequate for beginners of LaF, the films covering Luxembourgish culture require an advanced intermediate knowledge of Luxembourgish.
3.4 Dictionaries

Luxembourgish dictionaries are probably the most important resource for learners of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language. Although in Luxembourg various types of dictionaries are on sale, all of them, with few exceptions, present the same problem – which has already been commented by Kartheiser (2000) – in that they are unidirectional. Apart from the Luxembourgish-French dictionary Luxdico (Lulling 2005), the Luxembourgish-Dutch dictionary Woordenboek Luxemburgs Nederlands: Dictionnaire Lëtzebuergisch Hollännesch (Van Dijk 1998) and the multilingual 6000 Wierder op Lëtzebuergesch (Zimmer 1993), others offer either dictionary entries with Luxembourgish as the source language and the foreign language as the target language, or the other way around. No reason has ever been offered why two-directional dictionaries are not commonly published. Kartheiser refers to this conduct as “one of those idiosyncrasies” of Luxembourgish publishing (Kartheiser 2000: 73).

The Luxembourgish dictionaries of the first type are monolingual. Gilles and Moulin, in their study of Luxembourgish standardisation, write: “the lexicographical tradition of Luxembourg is almost as old as the orthographical tradition and the first books published in Luxembourgish often contained short glossaries” (Gilles and Moulin 2003: 317). The most important monolingual Luxembourgish dictionary so far published has been the Luxemburger Wörterbuch, which integrates, as Gilles and Moulin observe, entries and definitions from previous dictionaries of Luxembourgish, including Gangler’s work of 1847. The Luxemburger Wörterbuch, which appeared in fascicles between 1950 and 1977, was already outdated by the time that the last fascicle appeared. This long delay was caused by the death of the chief editor of the Luxemburger Wörterbuch, Robert Bruch, in 1959. On reviewing the entries in 2005, one finds that there is a great deal of archaic vocabulary in Luxemburger Wörterbuch, and that there is a need to integrate new uses of already existing Luxembourgish words and new loan words from French, German, and English. Nevertheless, this dictionary would be a good addition for learners of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language, as entries not only provide contexts of use, but also give a German translation. One drawback is, however, that the material has been organised according to the precepts of dictionaries of historical German, e.g. F and V are listed together, etc., which makes consultation sometimes difficult, as lateral thinking is required. However, the few remaining copies of this, and of the 2-volume reprint of 1995,
which was re-titled the *Lëtzebuerger Dictionär*, are now available only to researchers. Gilles and Moulin (2003) explain that after their re-publication in 1995, public quarrels broke out because the volumes contained anti-clerical, misogynous, anti-Jewish, and xenophobic entries, which were then considered to be politically incorrect (which was not the case when materials were first gathered in the 1930s).

Because of this situation, the Government has been engaged in subsidising a new dictionary group. This was founded by the *Conseil Permanent de la Langue Luxembourgeoise* in 1998. Since then, collaborators have been working on a single-volume dictionary, entitled *Lëtzebuerger Handwierderbuch* “Concise Dictionary of modern Luxembourgish”. This incorporates new lexicographical methodologies such as written word corpora. However, almost ten years after its founding and after a considerable turnover of collaborators and linguists, the dictionary has still not been published, partly due to a lack of an adequate governmental budget.

Bilingual dictionaries, on the other hand, are numerous and offer translations into many languages, such as Dutch, English, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Portuguese, Rumanian, and Spanish.

Table 2 below compares four bilingual dictionaries, all of which are currently held by the Centre for Luxembourg Studies at the University of Sheffield. They have been selected because of the non-Luxembourgish languages (German, French, Dutch) with which the learners of LaF in Sheffield are already familiar. Apart from Derrmann-Loutsch (2003) and Zimmer (1993), the numbers of entries have been estimated by multiplying the number of entries on one full page with the number of total pages, whereas the other numbers of entries are mentioned in the volumes.
3. Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>6156</td>
<td>5925</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>35000</td>
<td>19890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source language</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>fr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target language</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>nl</td>
<td>fr</td>
<td>fr de en es pt</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td>lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-directional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introduction to pronunciation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list of abbreviations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plurals</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb forms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other abbreviations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entry in phonetics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb appendix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: + yes, - no, +/- sometimes

d e German, en English, es Spanish, fr French,
l u Luxembourgish, nl Dutch, pt Portuguese

Table 2. Comparison Chart between Bilingual Dictionaries

From the comparison chart, one can see that Luxembourgish dictionaries, including those not presented in Table 2, have more in common with simple word lists, rather than dictionaries published in other languages, which have extended semantic references and word-fields. Most of the dictionaries provide readers with very basic information, such as the gender of nouns and plural endings, although even this is not a general rule, as Lulling (2005), for instance, merely provide the gender of nouns, but omit plurals and any explanation of how plural formation is realised in Luxembourgish. Also absent, for instance, are collocations, and/or various contexts in which the source words can be used, and where the target words can differ from each other.

Although Derrmann-Loutsch (2003) is the only dictionary, alongside with the Luxemburger Wörterbuch / Lëtzteuberger Dixionnär that provides an introduction to Luxembourgish phonology (examples are provided for each Luxembourgish phoneme). To date, no dictionary provides Luxembourgish entries followed by a transcription in IPA.
Here it may be suggested that dictionary collaborators should contemplate including first of all a larger number of entries and providing the gender and plural ending of nouns, as well as a guide to adjectival morphology, which has not been included so far either, and more grammatical explanations and abbreviations. Additionally, more collocations and contexts of usage of entries, and a pronunciation guide to every entry would be useful. A final suggestion that arises from previously mentioned comments is that every bilingual Luxembourgish dictionary should be made two-directional as learners have the need to look up entries in both source and target language.

3.5 Grammars
Gilles and Moulin (2003) correctly observed that “the grammatical tradition of Luxembourgish is less pronounced than the orthographical or lexical one” (Gilles and Moulin 2003: 319). The most concise descriptive grammar has been until recently Bruch’s French-German bilingual Précis populaire de grammaire luxembourgeoise (Bruch 1955, with later re-edits by Leo Senninger). Qualified as a “scientific milestone” (ibid: 320), Bruch’s work was republished until the 1970s and according to Gilles and Moulin (ibid.) thereafter influenced other grammars, such as Schanen (1984), Schmitt (1984), Russ (1996), Schiltz (2004a; 2004b.) or Johannis-Schlechter (2004).

Bruch’s grammar consists of 107 pages each divided into two columns, in order to provide separate French and German versions. Additionally, the volume contains 16 linguistic maps of Luxembourg, depicting geo-phonological variation of lexical items. These maps and others too can be found in Bruch’s linguistic atlas (Bruch 1963), which has been published online (Moulin s.d.). Bruch’s work provides descriptions of phonology and orthography, nominal, adjectival, and verbal morphology, syntax, and word order of verb and noun phrases.

One of the most recent codified grammars of Luxembourgish is Schanen’s Parlons Luxembourgois (2004). It consists of four parts, the first one being a socio-historical introduction to the country and its multilingualism. The second and largest part of all then provides a grammatical description of the language. The third part presents views on the multicultural society of Luxembourg and Luxembourgish idiomatic expressions; and the final part offers a two-directional French-Luxembourgish
dictionary. Unfortunately, in Schanen’s volume the graphic layout is heavy on text, which makes it less accessible than Bruch’s work. The grammar section frequently uses acronyms that are not possible to look up and the grammatical metalanguage chosen is the one used for French, despite that certain concepts of French grammar are not always transferable to a Germanic language such as Luxembourgish. Finally, the volume presents a short index of grammatical items, although there is no index of Luxembourgish items. The table of contents would also have benefited from expansion.

The latest codified grammar to date is Braun et al. (2005), which, although lacking an index of grammatical items and an index of Luxembourgish words, provides the readers with an expanded table of contents. The information is provided in a graphically clear manner, and its main innovation over previous grammars is the addition of a section covering Luxembourgish stress and intonation. One negative comment on Braun et al. (ibid.) might be its decision to add illustrations that remind one of children’s books, and the fact that the grammar is published only in French. Although French has been portrayed as Luxembourg’s lingua franca among Luxembourgish speakers and non-Luxembourgish speakers alike, it is a pity that the grammar is not provided in English, as more and more foreign immigrants to Luxembourg tend to have a better command of English than they do of French. This also provides a general criticism of materials presenting Luxembourgish as a foreign language: not all learners will be proficient in French.

3.6 Other Materials
The final part of this section concerning reviewed learning materials covers all the materials that do not fit into the above categories. They fall into two types: the first type comprises paper resources, whereas the second type deals with electronic/online resources. The paper materials that have not been covered are Luxembourgish phrasebooks, existing in different forms and formats. The first phrase book available was the French-Luxembourgish-English trilingual phrasebook So et op Lëtzebuergesch (“Say it in Luxembourgish”) by Jules Christophory (1973), which was revised and reprinted as Who’s Afraid of Luxembourgish? lëtzebuergesch? Qui a peur du Luxembourgeois? (Christophory 1979). This is similar in content to Parler luxembourgeois, Esou schwätze mir, Living Luxembourgish by Sondag et al. (2002).
The phrasebook comprises lists of everyday vocabulary items and phrases organised thematically. Themes covered are, for instance, food, at the market, “at the cobbler’s”, as well as laundry and dry cleaning. Furthermore, the books provide extensive lists of colloquial phrases, idiomatic expressions, and proverbs. Although the large amount of vocabulary items and phrases covers a large area valid for many situations, it would have been better if those two phrasebooks had come up with audiovisual materials.

The latest phrasebook that has been published is *Ech schwätzen och Lëtzebuergesch* (“I too speak Luxembourgish”) by the Luxembourgish society for support for immigrant workers, ASTI (2005). One part of the book covers Luxembourgish religious and folkloric festivals through French, whereas the phrasebook section deals with specific everyday situations, such as phoning for a medical appointment, registering at the local municipality, discussing holidays. The book presents discussions between a Luxembourgish-speaking person and a Luxembourgish learner, who in the first part of each dialogue speaks in French, after the same dialogue follows in Luxembourgish. The learner of Luxembourgish in this volume is prototypically Portuguese, as names such as Marvelo Gallo or Paulo Ferreira would suggest, and are set alongside recurring illustrations of a blond Luxembourger and a black-haired foreigner. The positive aspect of this rather patronising phrasebook is the audio CD that accompanies it. This is one of the rare volumes that depict the situation of Luxembourgish correctly, as the language is predominantly oral and it is those skills that need to be mainly taught.

The best phrasebook, however, has been published outside of Luxembourg. Although specifically aimed at a German-speaking readership, *Lëtzebueresch Wort für Wort* (Remus 2001) embraces all the features a phrasebook should ideally possess. Not only does this German phrasebook cover many situations in providing vocabulary and phrases, it also includes some basic grammar, practical information for tourists, a two-directional German-Luxembourgish dictionary, and has the option of being accompanied by an audio cassette.

As for electronic resources, there is first the online spellchecker of Luxembourgish (Mousel 2003), which is not intended for LaF learners only. The website not only
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offers the possibility of correcting words, it also provides correct usage of mobile-
ndeletion, a phonological rule which only permits final-$n$ before vowels, dentals and
/h/. The website provides its users with a software, permitting spellchecking from
StarOffice; however, it still requires an online connection to the website server. As far
as Luxembourgish spelling goes, this is the only electronic resource available and one
hopes that an offline version of a Luxembourgish spellchecker will be made available
before long.

Two other online resources are the online versions of the dictionaries. There is firstly
the two-directional French-Luxembourgish dictionary by Lulling and Schanen (2003)
and the multilingual dictionary by Imprimerie Saint-Paul (2003). Both offer not only
the same entries found in the hardcopies of their respective dictionaries, they also
offer the possibility to switch the language of the user’s interface.

The last electronic resource available to LaF learners is a CD-ROM called *101 Languages of the World* (Transparent Language 2002), a multi-language learning
software also including Luxembourgish. The software consists of a phrasebook with
reading and listening materials classified into different topics that either can be
accessed as either, or that can be tested by the user. The software also offers basic
grammar snippets and the possibility to practise speaking Luxembourgish through
visual feedback, for which a microphone is needed. The most interesting aspect to
this resource is that the CD-ROM is available on the international market and can
thus introduce some basic Luxembourgish phrases to learners before they enter the
country. Note that because of the absence of LaF materials outside Luxembourg, one
would highly recommend the resources by Remus (2001) and Transparent Language
(2002) as a taster-session for potential LaF learners.

3.7 Summary
As we have seen in this section, materials for Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language
cover only a small number of textbooks and grammar books. Dictionaries do exist,
and offer several languages. However, only a handful are two-directional, and thus
the remaining ones lack convenience of use for LaF learners. The most helpful
materials for LaF to date are electronic resources of various kinds, as most of them
are available either online, or can be purchased easily abroad. From this, it is hoped
that LaF materials will diversify more in the future and will be made easily available outside of Luxembourg itself.
4. Foreign Language Teaching Theories

4.1 Introduction
Following the analysis of the Council of Europe’s Threshold and Waystage level and having reviewed the materials currently existing for learning Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language, this section will focus on providing information on the different didactic methods used in order to learn and teach a foreign language. Note that in some cases no distinction is made between teaching and learning a language with one particular method, as reviewing a method will comprise providing observations from both the teacher’s and the learner’s point of view.

Firstly, subsection 4.2 will provide an historical sketch of Foreign Language Teaching, using mostly examples from teaching English and French, both having a longer teaching tradition than other modern languages. This subsection will start with reviewing 18th century methods and will provide overviews of the different methods available up to the present time.

Subsection 4.3 will review the different teaching methods portrayed in the previous section, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages for each method, and explaining the different teaching techniques by their socio-historical origins. Furthermore, current teaching trends will be revealed alongside other issues arising from Foreign Language Teaching, such as the different naming techniques. This subsection will depict, as an example, the various names for teaching English to people who do not have English as their mother tongue.

Whereas the previous two sections will deal mostly with English, 4.4 will examine the situation of Luxembourgish taught as a foreign language. This subsection has the aim of reviewing the LaF materials in relation to what has been observed regarding current trends in teaching techniques. It will reveal that LaF materials have partly developed in the same way as FLT materials did in their beginnings.
The following subsection will concentrate on syllabus design. In 4.5, the aim is to familiarise the readers with issues that arise when planning course books, for instance. These issues will be compared to the contents of LaF materials.

The final subsection, 4.6, will provide the readers with two case studies from the United Kingdom and will provide information on the types of syllabus, teaching methods and various other related issues to teaching Welsh and British Sign Language (hereafter also abbreviated as BSL) to non-natives. Both those languages and Luxembourgish have the following characteristics in common: they are used by only a small number of speakers, they are mostly left unwritten by the native population, and they have been granted status of national languages of their respective country. This subsection will draw together information on how language teaching is conducted, what issues have arisen and what each language can ‘learn from the others’.

4.2 History of FLT

This subsection aims to provide an overview of how foreign languages have been taught up to the present day and it will mainly concentrate on the teaching of modern European languages, such as English, French, and German. The teaching of modern languages began about the time that teaching classical languages, such as Latin, proved insufficient for or contrary to the needs of politics and trade. The first materials to teach French as a foreign language in England were designed for merchants trading with France at a time when French was no longer spoken in England. The first textbooks teaching French as a foreign language were books containing exemplified dialogues and various lists of vocabulary items. One book, printed by William Caxton (c. 1422-91), is known only by its subtitle, Tres bonne doctrine pour apprendre briefment fransoys et engloys or Right good lernyng for to lerne shortly frenssh and englyssh. It is a bilingual textbook with one column written in French and the other one written in English, consisting of dialogues, vocabulary, but also short poems. Howatt writes that these “polyglot dictionaries and phrasebooks […] were a popular device for acquiring a ‘survival knowledge’ of foreign languages in Renaissance times” (Howatt 2004: 14).
Whereas the teaching of modern languages was in the first instance a matter of teaching nobility, the grammar-translation method provided a way of teaching a foreign language to the emerging middle-class. Its origins lie in Prussia where, at the end of the 18th century, a new methodology of foreign (modern) language teaching had emerged from classical language teaching. According to Howatt (ibid.), students who would already have a baggage of classical language, now had to learn a modern language. The same academic rigidity as the one for Latin was needed, especially, as Howatt notes, that girls (!) were better in modern languages than boys were. However, because boys “excelled at classical languages and the more linguistic side of […] grammar” (ibid: 154), Johann Christian Fick (among others) based his modern language teaching on principles identical to those of classical language teaching. Comparing Latin with any modern language taught with the GT, one could cite Johnson as follows:

“[L]earning Latin helps building intellectual powers. Occasionally this argument is expressed in its ‘pain is good for you’ form – Latin is so hard, and it hurts so much, that it must be doing you good!” (Johnson 2001: 117)

The grammar-translation method consisted of presenting the learners first with grammatical rules that are followed by examples, which finally end with exercises, which require translating from and to the target language. Except for their exercises, Howatt points out (ibid), some materials bore more resemblances to reference books than to textbooks. For example, Weisse in his textbook of 1888 took “great joy in life [in] exception-hunting” (Howatt 2004: 158), and the book itself is described as “an organizational nightmare”, “densely packed”, and “children were expected to learn this nonsense” (ibid).

The grammar-translation method concentrated mostly on written proficiency. This can be verified in the preface of *A Compendious German grammar* (Whitney 1900):

To the very great majority of those who learn German, ability to speak is an object inferior in importance to ability to understand accurately and readily the language written or printed: and the attainment of the former is properly to be made posterior to that of the latter. (Whitney 1900: iii)
Only later on, learning methods concentrated on oral proficiency, such as the audio-lingual method. Modern language teaching has received support from developments in phonology and phonetics, to which the names of Henry Sweet (19th century) and Daniel Jones (20th century) can be mentioned. Following a behaviourist approach, learners no longer used textbooks only, but were using headphones and microphones. The teacher was more of a coordinator in a language laboratory, playing and stopping tapes, while the learners were listening to extracts and repeating key phrases as drills.

Later, in 1955, developments by Austin and Searle led to communicative language teaching, where the main emphasis was on the different tasks one could undertake with language. Language was no longer perceived as a set of rules, nor as a behaviour, but as a group of speech acts and communicative functions such as asking for something, suggesting something, or promising something. This led to the increase of interest in notional categories to which the Threshold Level, which comprises lists of functions as seen in section 2, is no exception.

Regarding the development of materials, language courses have mostly consisted of course books up to the present day, although audio-visual materials have occasionally been used in lessons. Whereas tapes/CDs have become popular from the 1960s onwards, the 1980s have seen an increase of videotapes, nowadays substituted by DVDs. Although audio-visual materials provide diverse input in the target language, they are mostly perceived as gadgets and timewasters.

Thanks to the popularisation of the internet, self-directed learners have the possibility to engage, for instance, into learning languages online, at their own pace, or take on tandem learning with a user of the target language.

Moreover, teaching English nowadays, for instance, has also raised the issue of purpose. Whether the learners need a certain degree of proficiency in another language depends on whether it is for professional reasons, for instance, or whether it is to understand literature in the foreign language. Teaching English has now given way to ESP, English for Special Purposes, which are courses designed for specific learners, teaching them specialists’ vocabulary, for instance. More teaching issues are dealt with in the following subsection, alongside a review of different methods.
4.3 Review of FLT Methods

Reviewing the different foreign-language teaching methods will proceed according to the main emphasis on teaching. As the name states, the emphasis of the grammar-translation method was on grammar. Language is seen as a set of grammatical rules and knowing how to use a foreign language equals to knowing the entire set of rules. As seen already above, the grammar-translation method was developed in order to give modern languages, traditionally viewed as a subject for girls, the same prestigious status as the classical languages. In the grammar-translation method, the main stress is on writing and reading the language, rather than on speaking and listening to it, thereby making it comparable to a dead language. Although the method can be organised into easy targets/lessons in the beginning, learners can lose interest rapidly if the grammatical rules become more difficult and if every lesson follows the same rule-example-exercises routine.

Similarly, the audio-lingual method can present a dull routine if every lesson consists of repeating words and phrases. Language is perceived as an acquired behaviour and the emphasis of the audio-lingual method on fluency can lead learners to become mere parrots, repeating only the same string of words. Furthermore, because the method rejects the teaching of grammar, this can leave students unable to express themselves freely. This, for instance, is the case, for learners of beginners’ Welsh following the Wlpan course, which teaches Welsh through imitating their teacher. In effect, one of the first sentences in Lesson 1 of Cwrs Wlpan y Gogledd (University College of North Wales 1990) is Parot dw i ‘I’m a parrot’.

With Chomsky’s theories of child language acquisition, language becomes a set of acquired structures and grammatical rules. Teaching foreign languages emphasised on teaching structures, which permitted words, like building blocks, to be assembled and interchanged freely if the grammar was correct, such as shown in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We</th>
<th>buy</th>
<th>books in the shop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>bread at the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>letters at school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Language Bricks
This, however, leads to the problem that not all grammatical sentences are correct. They also depend on whether they are used in their correct context. Contextual usage is closely linked to using language appropriately. Language is a communicative competence (Hymes 1970; cited in Johnson 2001), and Newmark already in 1966 (cited in Johnson 2001) commented that learners might be able to express grammatical sentences (“structurally competent”), but also be unable to use them correctly (“communicatively incompetent”). In his well-known example, he quotes three communicatively incompetent ways of asking for a match to light a cigarette: *Have you fire?*, *Do you have illumination?*; and *Are you a match’s owner?* (Johnson 2001: 183)

In this way, it has been suggested that syllabuses should be based neither on grammatical points nor on different structures, but on functions, notions, or situations where a learner is required to use the target language. Prototypical situations would be, for instance, buying a train ticket, or ordering meal. Although each situation would require a set of somewhat limited vocabulary, it would include a range of different structures that would be grammatical, but also appropriate to the situation.

Thus from the 1970s onwards, course textbooks have emerged that are designed around different situations and functions. The Threshold level is one of many examples. This trend in syllabus design probably explains why most beginners’ textbooks always start with personal information and introductions and why certain topics such as family, career, and holidays are always bound to come up.

Appropriateness of language usage, however, raises the issue of authenticity of language. If asking, “Have you fire” when asking for a match is not what a native speaker would say, why and in what way does this legitimise not using this sentence? Current FLT trends, perhaps especially in English, have come to realise that learning a foreign language is not always learning somebody’s language. Learning English used to equate with learning the English spoken by the British people or by the American people, but in light of English as a *lingua franca* in many countries where no language group has English as their mother tongue, English is just an international language, perhaps to be spoken colourlessly.
This raises the issue of the naming technique of how to designate the teaching of English to people who do not speak it as their mother tongue. The different names have been categorised into two sections: the ‘English as’ section, such as ‘English as a Foreign Language’ or ‘English as Second Language’. The second section is ‘English for’ such as ‘English for Speakers of Other Languages’. A difference occurs very often, depending on whether the language is taught by U.S. American or British people. A further distinction arises when the language is taught to migrants to the English-speaking country or when it is taught abroad.

Finally, it has been recognised that English is spoken by more non-native speakers over the world than by natives speakers and thus the idea that only native-speaking teachers know best has declined.

Luxembourgish, however, is mostly spoken by its native population. Whether similar issues or different issues arise from that point of view will be seen in the following section.

4.4 FLT Methods for LaF

The teaching of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language began in the early 1970s, when the University of Miami (Ohio) was founded in the Luxembourgish town of Differdange in 1971-1972. As Jules Christophory (1998) writes of the university:

“İls demandent des cours de luxembourgeois, de plus en plus de banques en demandent, des ambassades, le British Ladies’ Club, l’American Women’s Club, tout le monde veut son cours de Luxembourgeois.” (Christophory 1998: 146)

Before this ‘boom’ for learning language, Christophory published two volumes, So ët op Lëtzebuergesch and Nous parlons Luxembourgeois. Both volumes offered the readers some 30 pages of grammatical explanations (taken from Bruch 1955), but mostly consisted of lists of vocabulary and phrases to be used in different categories. Astonishingly, his grammar section remained a chief reference until Schanen’s grammar (2004), as Christophory himself notes in December 1998:
“Et je suis un peu triste de constater qu’au bout de trente ans, il n’y a pas encore mieux en matière de grammaire sur la langue luxembourgeoise et que cela n’a pas vraiment servi d’exemple à des publications plus détaillées et plus scientifiques.” (Christophory 1998 : 146)

However, the main aims of Christophory’s volumes were not to teach grammar, nor were they designed as didactic materials, but rather they were intended for learners “to communicate with people [and] to break the ice” (ibid.). This bears resemblance to very early manuals used to learn French and English, which presented phrases, dialogues, and vocabulary lists as well. This raises the question as to whether or not didactic materials to teach a language to foreigners all follow similar paths. It might be worth asking whether every language course that is currently taught first started as a mere ‘phrase-book course’. The answer to that might be in surveying language courses that have gained popularity only in the past 20 years, such as Māori, Welsh, or British Sign Language (BSL).

According to Guy Bentner, Luxembourgish is primarily taught as an oral language. Moreover, he writes:

“La communication est leur objectif principal et tous les cours pour débutants mettent l’accent sur la langue orale et fonctionnelle, c’est-à-dire celle qu’on utilise pour faire ses courses, passer ses examens médicaux, nouer des relations sociales avec ses voisins, etc.” (Bentner 1998: 151)

If one examines the didactic materials, however, a great deal of importance is given to reading skills. Although the importance of knowing how to write Luxembourgish is debateable, LaF learners are expected not only to speak the language but also to be able to read it. One issue arising from this is that Luxembourgish has been undergoing spelling changes from the early 20th century onwards. After people got used to the official orthography reform in 1975 (Arrêté 1975), an amended version was endorsed in 1999 (Règlement 1999) and there are talks that the 1999 orthography was made official although not yet completed (Kartheiser, personal communication). This means that books published before 1999 are spelled according to the ‘old’ orthographic rules and had to be re-written (much to the publisher’s glee). Moreover,
learners who learnt Luxembourgish before 1999 would have to learn the new orthographic rules. Most of the native Luxembourgish population, on the other hand, has hardly learnt the orthography at all. With the recent increase of Luxembourgish writing in e-mails and SMS, native speakers write Luxembourgish idiosyncratically. This raises the question whether LaF learners are well enough prepared to understand non-standard spelling or even dialectal texts. However, this is not only an issue for reading non-standard/non-Standard Luxembourgish, but also for understanding it. Kartheiser (personal communication) correctly writes that Luxembourgers are not used to an LaF population. Whether a native speaker of the Northern Òsling dialect will accommodate towards a more central accent when speaking to a LaF learner is difficult to assess. However, LaF materials or at least teachers are suggesting that such issues should be taken into consideration.

LaF materials nowadays have integrated teaching of grammatical aspects in placing them in the different topical contexts that have been discussed in the subsection 3.2 above.

4.5 Syllabus Design
As already mentioned, this subsection deals with how syllabuses are designed, what issues are involved and what decisions have to be taken, and how the LaF course books have been designed on that basis. The first decision to take is about the defining of the word ‘syllabus’. Whereas a curriculum is “concerned with making general statements about language learning, learning purpose and experience, evaluation, and the role of teachers and learners” (Nunan 2004: 3, citing Candlin 1984), a syllabus is concerned with putting the curriculum instructions into use. Nunan (op cit.) writes that this usually involves modifying the curriculum’s statements in order to match the current situation.

Designing a syllabus for a language teaching class thus means selecting the content of the lessons, and these can incorporate “phonology, grammar, functions, notions, topics, themes, tasks” (ibid: 159). The latter item, however, along with activities, can be part of the methodology, depending on whether a syllabus is viewed broadly or narrowly.
Whereas designing a syllabus used to consist of drawing up a list of grammatical features that had to be acquired, communicative views in the 1970s designed syllabuses around what learners could do in the target language. Nevertheless, both grammatical and communicative syllabuses are seen as product-oriented (ibid: 11), as they focus on language seen as a set of products, which are the aim for learners. Nunan writes that a tendency nowadays is to design process-oriented syllabuses in which the content does not focus on notions or grammar, but rather on learning tasks and activities.

Product-oriented syllabuses often tend to be organised as synthetic syllabuses, in which different parts of the language are taught separately. The acquisition process is thus viewed as a process of accumulation (ibid: 27). Analytic syllabuses, on the other hand,

“are organised in terms of the purpose for which people are learning language and the kinds of language performances that are necessary to meet those purposes.” (Wilkins 1975: 13; cited in Nunan 2004: 28)

Additionally, the content of analytic syllabuses is not necessarily graded in terms of difficulty, thus texts of various degrees of difficulty are also presented to learners (Nunan 2004: 28).

A final point when designing a syllabus involves the so-called ‘needs analysis’, in which information gathered from and about learners can determine what kind of syllabus to create. This involves gathering data, for instance, on the learners’ language portfolio (i.e. which languages they already know), their reason or purpose for learning the language, the amount of time they will spend in the target language’s country or community, or their preferred learning method. The last point is of particular interest, as Nunan writes that learners coming from a traditional educational background sometimes share conservative views of language-learning and prefer grammatical-based syllabuses with explicit instructions to more communicative-based approaches. This can be confirmed by the author as one of his peers in an Italian beginners’ course used to complain about those Spillereien ‘language games’ and ‘group activities’, whereas all they wanted was to get a list of vocabulary to learn
and tables of verb forms to learn off by heart. Similarly, a friend, who went to a British grammar school, withdrew from their Welsh beginners’ course because they felt frustrated that no grammar was explained and that learners were not encouraged to ask for grammatical clarification. It is thus important, Nunan writes, for the syllabus to be negotiated with the learners, although this can present several issues. Either it is a higher authority, such as an educational commission, that wants to decide on a specific syllabus (and thus integrate it in its curriculum) or teachers themselves prefer deciding on which syllabus to use. Even some learners themselves refuse to have a say on the syllabus content, yielding authority to ‘experts’ or teachers.

As for the LaF syllabus of MENFPS (2000a), one can see that it is a product-orientated syllabus since it is based on grammar, notions, and functions. Most activities usually concentrate on one aspect, making it thus a synthetic syllabus. Considering not only course books, one wonders whether learners’ needs have been fully analysed. Although their linguistic background is usually acknowledged inasmuch as learners are grouped together according to their mother tongue (Kartheiser 2000), LaF materials have been developed with the assumption that the learners are able not only to understand French to a certain degree, but are also literate. It is worth mentioning regarding this last point that designing a syllabus should also take into consideration the learner’s literacy. As an example, a friend of the author was teaching TESOL to a group of Asian women of whom one Bangladeshi woman was illiterate. Teaching her English not only meant teaching her the language, but also teaching her how to read and write in a first instance. This issue might be worth investigating for the case of Luxembourgish. In an informal discussion, Kartheiser mentioned teaching Chinese learners and it would be appropriate to examine whether or not Chinese learners, for instance, are literate enough to deal with the Roman alphabet. It is also noteworthy to raise the question as to whether or not it is important for LaF learners to have a command of written Luxembourgish, bearing in mind that written Luxembourgish is currently not as prevalent as German or French.

It is interesting to note that it is the Luxembourgish Ministry of National Education and Professional Development that decides on what to include in the syllabus of LaF
materials. However, it is uncertain if applied linguists have been consulted before designing course materials. Furthermore, there is a feeling that the language policies of Luxembourgish in general are discussed *sub rosa*. It has come to one’s knowledge, for instance, that the Luxembourgish spelling rules are still in the process of being amended and that new LaF materials are in preparation to be redesigned according to Waystage specifications, but none of these have been published until to date.

Before a verdict is given on LaF materials, the following section will provide a comparison between a brief overview of the current teaching methods and the syllabus of Welsh and British Sign Language (BSL).

### 4.6 Case Reviews: Welsh and BSL

This subsection intends to illustrate how Welsh and British Sign Language (BSL) are taught in Wales and in the UK respectively. Information on both languages’ teaching methods relies mostly upon my own first-hand experience; however, they are nonetheless verifiable from different sources. Both are worthwhile subjects for examination as they present similar teaching and learning issues as LaF does.

Regarding Welsh, most of its courses are taught in Wales alone, making it a highly localised language, not only for speaking the target language, but also for learning it. Similarly to Luxembourg, learners experience the problem that not the whole population of the country speaks its national language: not all Welsh people speak Welsh, not all Luxembourg residents speak Luxembourgish. As opposed to Luxembourg, however, the Welsh government and local administrations have adopted a bilingual policy and thus Welsh can be read on public signs and publications. Interestingly enough, before the Welsh Language Act came into effect in 1993, pro-Welsh demonstrators used Luxembourg, “which is a trilingual country” (personal communication²), as a model to follow, in order to stage a protest.

As for the teaching materials of Welsh, they are present in a much higher number than the LaF ones, although most of them are in English and thus assume that learners of Welsh are either native speakers of English, or have a high command of English.

---

² Many thanks to my Welsh teacher, Nia Llwyd, for having told me this anecdote.
Similar to LaF, Welsh as a foreign language can be a problem for extra-national immigrants, who would thus not only deal with Welsh, but with English too. Apart from being written for English-speaking readers, Welsh presents the problem that there is a distinction between North-Walian Welsh and South-Walian Welsh, differing mainly in pronunciation of the graphemes <u> and <y> and secondly in lexis and syntax. The main Welsh language course in Wales, the Wlpan course, exists thus in two versions: one northern course and one southern course. This subsection will mainly concentrate on experiences from the northern course book *Cwrs Wlpan y Gogledd* (University College of North Wales 1990).

The beginners’ Wlpan course is mainly audio-lingual, as learners are encouraged to repeat sentences and structures after their teacher. As Prosser said in a colloquium:

> “The emphasis on the Wlpan course is very much on oral work. The only written aspects consolidate what has been done which will lead to a further oral response later on.” (Prosser 1998: 76)

As a syllabus, the Wlpan course is a product-oriented syllabus, of which much importance is given to grammar and readily available phrases (e.g. I like…, Can I have…). However, as already mentioned in the subsection above, grammar is not overtly explained:

> “The course is divided into sixty units and each unit introduces a series of new grammatical patterns and in the course every important pattern and structure is introduced. Having said that, formal grammar is as much as possible avoided. Our aim is to produce speakers of the language, rather than people who can speak about the language.” (Prosser 1998: 76-8)

Some learners have felt that not enough grammar was explained and, on many occasions, some rules had to be clarified more than once, because no part of the lesson was explicitly devoted to that grammatical rule.

The Wlpan course is divided into two main parts. The first part covers the grammatical points and key sentences with exercises, and the second part provides a
series of audio dialogues in form of a ‘soap opera’ based in a hospital. Learners have the chance to listen to the *opera sebon* on tapes and read the dialogues in their course book.

As for British Sign Language (BSL), only recently a curriculum has been designed by the Council of Advancement of Communication with Deaf People (hereafter abbreviated as CACDP) and de-dialectalisation or standardisation of signs are still in process. BSL is the latest recognised official language of the United Kingdom, alongside with English, Welsh, Scots Gaelic and Irish Gaelic. It is a (natural) sign language inasmuch as conventional and arbitrary signs are used in order to communicate with others. BSL is the “first or preferred language of 250,000 [deaf or hearing impaired] people” (BDA 2005) in the UK and an additional 120,000 hearing people use it as well. Learning of the language has risen after the endorsement of the Disabilities and Discrimination Act in 2004, which states that public places, for instance, should provide support to communicate effectively with Deaf people. However, BSL is not a legalised language (ibid.).

Moreover, although transcription methods for sign languages have existed since the 1960s (Stokoe *et al.* 1965), BSL remains mainly non-written, despite the rise of a sign language alphabet called SignWriting (SignMatters 2005).

BSL courses exist throughout the UK and those offering accreditation, especially when learning BSL towards interpreting certificates, follow the syllabuses of the CACDP. Like Welsh, the focus in beginners’ BSL is not grammar. The CACDP designed a functional-notional syllabus, organising the language content according to different topic areas, vocabulary and language functions. Appendix C reproduces the course content and the language content of one topic area from the syllabus of BSL level 1 (CACDP 2003). The syllabus emphasises which signs are to be learned, although grammatical aspects, such as question formation in BSL or the use of classifiers remain absent. The correct production of a sign is thus more important than BSL word order or non-manual linguistic features, such as eyebrow raising or head tilting.
As for the actual BSL classes taken by me, lessons consisted of getting sheets with vocabulary lists written in English. The teachers would then go through the list and translate each item, followed by the learners copying the teacher. Little emphasis was given to producing learned signs in a conversation or a narrative despite both being part of the examination (CACDP 2003: 14-5).

As a summary of this subsection, Welsh and BSL are taught as community languages and show differences in their syllabuses. Whereas the Welsh course book emphasises phrases and exemplified structures to be learned, the syllabus of British Sign Language stresses notions and functions. Although the Welsh course enabled using important structures and several vital grammatical aspects, the amount of vocabulary was negligible and as a result led to the production of a high number of ‘welsh-ified’ English words. On the other hand, BSL introduced a good number of phrases and vocabulary to the learners, and everyday items could have been easily signed. However, fluency was weak and learners were mostly insecure about how to sign complete sentences resulting in signing BSL in an English word order, which makes the sign language ungrammatical (Sutton-Spence and Woll 2002).

4.7 Summary
As we have seen in this section, LaF materials started along a path very similar to that of the early foreign-language teaching materials for French and English i.e. as phrasebooks with dialogues and vocabulary lists. Nowadays, LaF is taught through a synthetic product-based syllabus, which consists of emphasising grammatical aspects with different notions and topics. LaF materials thus assume a learning curve coinciding with grammatical structures and learners are hardly presented with any natural texts. This section has shown not only how syllabuses can theoretically differ, but also, it has provided two examples of different syllabuses. The syllabus for beginners’ Welsh has concentrated mostly on grammar and structures, whereas BSL has stressed functions, topics, but also vocabulary. Neither the courses provided the learners with any naturally occurring texts.
5. Discussion

5.1 Introduction
This section of this present study intends to draw information together and compare the outcomes from the theories developed by the Council of Europe, the materials developed for Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language, and the trends in Foreign Language Teaching. Whereas 5.2 will concentrate on comparing COE theories with LaF materials, in 5.3 the former theories are compared to FLT trends, whereas finally in 5.4 LaF materials are compared to FLT theories and current syllabus designing. A final judgment on the three matters will be passed in subsection 5.5.

5.2 COE Theories and LaF Materials
Because learners of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language can get their proficiency tested according to regulations set by the ALTE, LaF materials are partly influenced by the foreign language teaching policies agreed by the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe has developed several language proficiency levels roughly divided into beginner, intermediate level, and advanced level. Although the ALTE has developed six distinctive language levels, in which learners could be tested, Luxembourgish offers four of those. Note that this is not to be perceived as a letdown, as no language examinations in the ALTE framework offers six different diplomas, the maximum being five, such as in English, French, or Italian. On the other hand, Basque and Welsh, for instance, only offer one and two examinations/diplomas respectively.

The issue for LaF learners trying to achieve the advanced LaF diplomas is the lack of didactic materials existing for that level. As already seen in section 3 above, some course books have been designed for beginners and early intermediate learners, however, no course book has to date been planned for LaF learners who intend to attain near-native fluency. In a personal conversation, the sociolinguist Kristine Horner provided details on her personal experience of learning LaF, revealing that the further LaF learners go, the less materials there are. At that moment, either teachers have to create their own materials or learners have to become more autonomous and engage in self-directed learning. This latter point would certainly be valued by the
Council of Europe, which commend learners’ autonomy, but without appropriate
guidance from the teaching body, this cannot be easily achieved. Up to the present
time, however, it cannot be asserted whether or not LaF teachers teach their students
how to learn autonomously and how to assess themselves.

As for the ‘can-do’ statements conceived by the ALTE, it is unclear whether or not
translations in the language in which every examination can be taken is useful or not.
However, considering the present availability of those statements in other languages,
there is no reason to have them not translated into Luxembourgish. This would not
only trigger the publication of the can-do statements, but also the publication of the
curriculum and syllabuses for Luxembourg as a Foreign Language and to decide
what notions, structures, topics and activities are to be done over the years.

However, the Waystage Level not only provides information on how to teach pure
linguistic forms, but also suggests teaching socio-cultural competences, which
include, for instance, the distinction between the second person pronoun du and dir.
Although this is a clear case of T/V-distinction in Luxembourgish, no study has so far
concentrated on the usage of those pronouns. Another non-linguistic, socio-cultural
competence are the behaviours and actions expected during a job interview or when
resigning. As a comparison, a CV in Luxembourg, for instance, is expected to include
the full personal information of the applicant including their date of birth and
marriage status, and very often a passport photograph. In the UK, however, CVs tend
to leave personal information out and some companies prefer anonymised CVs.
Moreover, when resigning in the UK, for example, an employee is supposed to hand
in their resignation letter in person, whereas in Luxembourg, the resignation letter is
expected to be sent via recorded delivery.

It is very likely that socio-cultural competence in LaF is already taken for granted as
the existing materials merely teach the language and when providing non-linguistic
material, they merely include cultural information regarding, for instance, (religious)
festivals in Luxembourg as seen in ASTI (2005). It is uncertain whether authors
assume that non-linguistic behaviour is the same everywhere or whether cultural
knowledge is already anticipated since learners might have already learned another
language before.
A final point is the position adopted by Ek and Trim regarding being exposed to the spoken foreign language (Ek and Trim 1998: 69). As far as spoken English is concerned, they suggest learners should be exposed to and be able to understand a variety of norms including “regionally coloured norms” and “principal non-native varieties” (ibid.). Native accents include Scottish, American, Australian, and RP, whereas “non-native” ones, on the other hand, have not been defined and any guess would be trivial.

LaF materials, on the other hand, merely provide learners with a standard pronunciation and no “regional colour” is depicted. As already mentioned in sections above, whether this prepares learners to be able to deal with non-standard accents is difficult to ascertain.

5.3 COE Theories and Current FLT Trends
As we have already seen above, the Waystage level and the Threshold levels fall into a line of notional-functional syllabuses. Rather than stressing the aspects of grammar, such as the grammar-translation method or structures or the audio-lingual method, the Council of Europe stresses language notions and functions. The reasons for this can be put into the context of when the Threshold Level was designed. Conceived in the 1970s, teaching trends at that time saw language as a competence within a specific situation. Learning a Modern Language becomes categorised in using the language in a restaurant, at the station, in the office, for instance.

Furthermore, Waystage and Threshold can be described as product-oriented syllabuses, inasmuch as they stress the content of the teaching, which is similar to syllabuses stressing grammar or structures. As seen in the section above, current syllabuses tend to concentrate on tasks and activities; process-oriented syllabuses can thus concentrate on ‘real-life’ situations. This problem-based learning provides learners with a broad range of language levels, whereas the Waystage level, for instance, only provides language input easy enough for learners to understand. This raises the issue whether the Waystage level prepares learners to communicate effectively after achievement of the level. The can-do statements write, for instance, that learners “can express likes and dislikes in a familiar context” (Council of Europe 2001: 252), however, will this help learners if they are confronted with foreign
Another interesting point is that both Nunan and the Council of Europe agree on knowing the learners’ needs in order to learn/teach them a modern language. However, whereas the Council of Europe does not mention the teaching of grammar as one way of learning, Nunan correctly observes that some learners may come from a traditional language learning background and those will expect to be (explicitly) taught the grammar of the target language.

### 5.4 LaF Materials and Current FLT Trends

As previously seen, LaF course books concentrate on teaching and practising structures and vocabulary, while the stress always remains on grammar and the lesson’s topic. There is no obvious trend that LaF materials will follow an analytic syllabus or will be mostly process-oriented. The course books still provide a number of tables explaining grammatical rules or providing lists of verbal forms. Although vocabulary is sometimes provided with French and German translations, it is incorrect to assume that every LaF learner has a good command of either language. It is recommended that a survey be done in order to find out whether or not the possibility to include English translations is viable. Another possibility would be to provide Luxembourgish items with easy Luxembourgish explanations using a basic vocabulary.

The development of LaF materials is a very recent phenomenon and no specific authority has been created yet in order to promote the creation and the reviewing of different materials.

If we return to the issue of learner’s needs, it is interesting to note that LaF materials have not adapted to the linguistic situation in which Luxembourgish exists. Luxembourgish is predominantly an oral language and although a *koinè* has been developing for the last century, many speakers still speak Luxembourgish with a regional accent. Written Luxembourgish does exist, but tends to be mostly written idiosyncratically. LaF materials, on the other hand, teach a standardised
Luxembourgish, devoid of most regionalisms. Although LaF learners will not fail in making themselves understood, the question whether or not LaF learners are able to understand regional accents and misspelled Luxembourgish remains unanswered.

Another issue is whether or not teaching grammar explicitly is viable depending on the learners. Kartheiser (2000) writes that French LaF learners, for instance, have trouble understanding grammatical notions such as *Dativ* or *Akkusativ*. Instead, they are referred to as *complément d’objet indirect* and *complément d’objet direct*, which are presupposed to have been learnt before. However, not every learner comes from a background where grammar of one’s mother tongue is taught. Furthermore, presupposing that Chinese LaF learners are familiar with Indo-European linguistic terminology is unwarranted. These are yet more arguments in favour for rebalancing activities and tasks in the LaF syllabus.

One suggestion would be to teach LaF as an oral language using a mixture of oral activities and phrase book structures similar to Christophory (1979) and Sondag *et al.* (2002). Surprisingly, few materials have been developed using recent technology such as audio books, DVDs, CD-ROMs or online courses. These would be of particular interest for learners who wish to learn the language independently or to simply give them a taste of the language.

**5.5 Summary**

As we have seen in this section, LaF materials are intended to be used in order to pass ALTE tests, however, several issues arise from this. The first issue is that the ALTE’s can-do statements are not available in Luxembourgish, which hampers the encouragement of the use of Luxembourgish. Secondly, although LaF materials exist at a beginners’ level, their number decreases the further learners advance. As for the existing materials, however, it can be noted that LaF writing and reading skills are arguable to date, whereas oral skills and exposure to natural (e.g. regional) texts are lacking.
6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary
Because learners of Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language (LaF) have the opportunity to take language proficiency tests housed by the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE), the issue rises of whether or not learners are able to perform the various actions stated in the ALTE’s can-do statements of their specific levels. Because of the higher number of LaF materials designed for beginners, this study is interested in the specific level of Waystage (ALTE Level 1), which is the second level developed by the Council of Europe (COE).

Section 2 shows that the Waystage level has been created as a halfway level before the achievement of the Threshold Level, which is the first level created by the COE. Language proficiency levels were created in order to standardise modern language learning in order for learners to get transferable accreditation across the member states of the COE. The motivations lie in the COE’s wish to promote (a) a European cultural identity and (b) ‘plurilingualism’, a coined term similar to multilingualism without, however, the requirement of achieving near-native fluency in the target language. Furthermore, this section shows that the COE’s targets in modern language teaching are not grammatical rules and not to a great extent structures, but functions of language and notions, which have both been classified and listed in the COE’s main body of text, the Common European Framework (Council of Europe 2001). The reasons for choosing a functional-notional approach not only lie in the context of the teaching methods of that time, but perhaps also in the fact that a list of functions and notions are easier to translate in other languages, whereas grammar and structures will vary cross-linguistically.

Section 3 provides a review of the current materials available to LaF learners. Although materials, such as course books, dictionaries, grammars, phrase books and various audio-visual materials exist, their quantity is low. Furthermore, materials such as dictionaries are not fully developed and present difficulties such as their displeasing uni-directionality or their lack of providing elementary information such the plural morpheme for each noun. Another issue that arises is the assumption that
LaF learners are already familiar with French or German; hence, learners can only access Luxembourgish first via those two languages even though there is a possibility that their command of English is better.

Section 4 provides a historic overview of the different teaching methods that have existed for modern languages such as the grammar-translation method or the audio-lingual method. In addition, a history of LaF teaching is provided, presenting not only how materials have changed over the years, but also what issues are to be considered in planning those materials. An overview of syllabus design offers views on current theories and trends in creating course outlines and the section closes with an outline of the syllabuses of Welsh and British Sign Language (BSL).

Section 5 tries to account for the Waystage level within syllabus design and LaF materials are being reviewed not only in the light of Waystage, but also in the framework of current teaching trends.

6.2 Further Research
From this paper, several further research topics have arisen. As already previously mentioned, researching the Luxembourgish language has usually involved researching formal linguistics, such as its phonology or morphology. However, this study is concerned with applied linguistics, which is an under-researched topic area in Linguistics. This can be explained by the only recent development of formal LaF teaching. However, it is hoped that further research into LaF will be carried out as a much clearer view remains to be achieved. This will not only increase the development in Luxembourgish linguistics, but it will also improve the teaching and learning of Luxembourgish as a non-mother tongue.

As a topic suggestion, one could investigate LaF learners’ profiles, which include, among other things, their linguistic background, their purpose for learning the language, their educational background, and (language) learning methods. As a second topic, a study could keep track of learners outside their language classes and this could, for instance, investigate the viability of teaching Luxembourgish literacy, since LaF learners are comparatively more literate than native speakers are. A final topic could research the practicality of providing LaF learners with materials with
English comments, and question the presupposed (good) knowledge of French or German.

6.3 Personal Notes
Teaching Luxembourgish as a Foreign Language has not only given me the opportunity to learn about my mother tongue’s grammar and research it, it has also left me with unanswered questions regarding *how* to teach it and what research has been done in that field. As an MA dissertation, my study does not intend to give rise to groundbreaking results; in fact, it has been suggested (David Heath, telephone conversation) that some points are “obvious” to the point where “people roll their eyes”. However, considering LaF as a new research topic, some arguments, considered perhaps as “common knowledge”, need to be written down in order to be questioned later.

My dissertation intends to innovate research topics in Luxembourgish linguistics. Studies have been written on Luxembourgish phonology, morphology, lexis, and on language use. However, how many studies has Luxembourgish linguistics seen on adult language learning, child language acquisition, aphasia, metaphors, or language and gender? I thank Josiane Kartheiser for having voiced issues on LaF and I hope there will be more studies on it to come.
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Appendix A
Can-do Statements in Luxembourgish

Waystage: Council of Europe Level A2, ALTE Level 1:
D’Feeëgkeet, mat einfachen Informationen eens ze ginn an ufänken, sech a bekannte Kontexter ausdrécken.

z.B.: Kann un enger deeglecher Conversatioun iwwer viraussobar Themaen deelhuelen.

ALTE skill level summary
ALTE Résumé vum Feeëgkeetsniveau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lauschteren/Schwätzen</th>
<th>Liesen</th>
<th>Schreiwen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ALTE social and tourist statements summary
ALTE Résumé vun den sozialeschen an touristeschen Aussoen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lauschteren/Schwätzen</th>
<th>Liesen</th>
<th>Schreiwen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka Goûten an Dégoûten an an engem bekannte Kontext ausdrécken endeems engem einfach Sprooch gebraucht gëtt wéi “Ech hunn ... (net) gären”.</td>
<td>Kann einfach Informationen an engem bekannte Gebitt verstoën, wéi z.B. Iessensetiquetten, gewéinlech Menüen, Strooseschélder a Bancomatsmessagen.</td>
<td>Kann déi meescht Formulairen ausfëllen, déi iwwer perséinlech Informationen handelen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALTE work statements summary
ALTE Résumé vun den Schaffaussoen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lauschteren/Schwätzen</th>
<th>Liesen</th>
<th>Schreiven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kann einfach Wënsch</td>
<td>Kann déi meescht kuerz Rapporten oder viraussobar Gebrauchsanweisungen an engem bekannte Gebitt verstoene, à Condtioun, dass genuch Zäit ginn ass.</td>
<td>Kann eng kuerz a verständlech Notiz iwwert e Wonsch schreiwe fir Aarbeschtskolleegen oder eng bekannt Kontaktspersoun an enger anerer Firma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ausdrécken, déi zur eegner Aarbecht passen wéi “Ech wëll 25 ... bestellen”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALTE study statements summary
ALTE Résumé vun den Étudesaussoen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lauschteren/Schwätzen</th>
<th>Liesen</th>
<th>Schreiven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kann einfach Meenungen ausdrécken wéi “Ech sinn net d’accord”.</td>
<td>Kann d’Hauptbedeitung vun engem vereinfachte Buch oder Artikel verstoene endeems ganz lues gelies gëtt.</td>
<td>Kann eng ganz kuerz an einfach Erzielung oder Beschreibung schreiwen wéi “Meng lescht Vakanz”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B  
Dictionary Entries for HOUSE

Actioun Lëtzebuergesch (2000)

**Haus** (*n*), pl. **Haiser**, maison


**Haus** *n* Haus *n*, (Haiser) **im Haus** am Haus  
**von Haus zu Haus** von Haus zu Haus  
**ins Haus gehen** an d’Haus gehen  
**bei uns zu Hause** bei äis doheem nach Hause gehen

heemgoen **wann kommst du nach Hause?**  
wo **ist er denn zu Hause?**  
Wou ass hien dann doheem?

Luxemburger Wörterbuch (1950-1977)


grusst H. = **das frühere St. Georgsstift**  
streiten, die zu einer Familie, einem Haus gehören); 3) im bes.: «Bauernhaus» - häufig im Verb. mit Haff (s. d.); 4) «Hausinsassen, Familie» - en as aus engem gudden H. (aus guter Familie) – d’ganz H. weess et, war op de Been u. ä.; 5) «Firma, Kauf-, Gasthaus» - da’s e gutt H.; 6) «Auge eines Hammers, einer Axt, einer


Lycée Michel Rodange (1982)

Can-Do or Can-Don’t?

House Haus n., colloq. Parlament ënnerbrengen, ~hold Stod m, Haushalt m, ~keeper Haushälterin f, ~keeping Haushaltung f, ~wirtschaft Haushaltung f, ~warming den Héil ophänken, ~wife Hausfra, ~work Hausarbeit f

Rinnen (1988)

maison Haus n. (pl. Haiser) – je suis à la m.: ech sinn doheem – je vais à la m.: ech gin heem, ech gin an d’Haus – elle entre en m.: hatt geet op eng Plaz f. (als Déngschtmeedchen n.) je suis de la m.: ech sin aus dem Haus, ech gehéieren zum Haus – il est fait comme un brûleur de m.: hie gesäit aus ewéi e Landsträicher m., Brandstéfter m. – faire sa m., se faire une m.: sech arichten – je reste à la m., je garde la m.: ech bliwen doheem, je garde la m.: ech versuergen d’Haus n. – il tient m.: hien huet eng oppen Dir f. – elle tient la m.: si féiert de Stot m. – les maisons empêchent des voir la ville: vun elauter Beem pl. m. (gesäit hie) kee Bësch m. méi gesinn – un ami de la m.: en Hausfrënd n. – du pain fait à la m.: hausgebake Brout n. gens de la m.: Gesënner n. – îlot, rangée de maisons: Haiserblock m., Rei f. Haiser – maitre, maîtresse de la m.: Hausmeeschter m., Hausmeeschtesch f. – règlement de la m.: Hausreglement n. – m. d’accouchement: Maernité f. – m. d’aliénés. Geweckenhaus n. – m. d’ammeublement: Miwwelgeschäft n. – m. à appartements: Appartementshaus n. – m. d’arrêt: Prisong m. – m.en bois, en brique: Holz-, Zillenhaus n. – m. de champêtre: Baurerenhaus n., Weekend m. m. scolaire: Schoulgebai n. – m. de chasse: Juegdhaus, Juegdhaischen n. – m. de couture: Moussegeschäft n. – m. de convalescence: Erhuelungsheem n. – m. sur cour: Hamndergebai n. – m. de dieu: Gotteshaus n. – m. d’eduction: Erzéiungsheem n. – m. d’enfants: Kannerheem n. – m. d’editions: Verlag m. – m. d’expédition: Expeditiousgeschäft n. – m. d’exportation: Exportgeschäft n. – m. unifamiliale: Eefamiljenhaus n. – m. forestière: Fieschterhaus n. – m. de garde: Gardhaischen n. m. de garde-voie: Gardhaus n. – m. d’habitation: 66
Wunnhaus n., Haus n. – m. d’importation: Importgeschäft m. – m. individuelle: Eegenheem n. – m. de jeu: Spillbank f. – m. jumelée: duebelt H. n. – m. de location: Haus mat Wunnénge fir ze verlounen – m. de maître: herrschaftlecht Haus n. – m. mère: Mutterhaus n. (rel.), Haaptgeschäft n., Stammhaus n., Stackhaus n. – m. mitoyenne: Stierfhaus n., Haus, wou ee gestuerwen as – m. pénitentiaire: Prisong m. Strofanstalt f. – m. préfabriquée: préfabrizéiert Haus n., Fäerfeghaus n. – m. de poupées: Poppenhaus n. – m. public, de tolérance: Bordell m. – m. de rapports: comme en fr. – m. de repos: Pensioun f., Altersheem n. – m. de retraite: Alterheem n. – m. de santé: Privatklinik f., Geckenhaus n. – m. spécialisée: Fachgeschäft, spézialiséiert Haus n. – m. de sport: Sportsgeschäft n. – m. de ville: Stadhaus n., stater Haus n. – m. voisine: Nopeschhaus n. – façade de la m.: d’Fassad f. vum Haus n. – murs de la m.: Hausmaueren pl. f. – toit de la m.: Hausdaach m., Daach m. vum Haus n. – un mensonge gros comme une m.: eng faustdéck Ligen f. – la Maison Blanche: d’Wäisst Haus n. (USA) – m. centrale: Haaptgeschäft n., -gebai n. – m. de la culture: Veräinsgebai n., Kulturhaus n. – je fais la jeune fille de la m.: ech zerwéieren, ech spillen Hausmeechter m. – la m. du roi: d’Kinnekshaus n. – la m. de Lorraine: d’lothréngesch Familjen, Grofen-, Kinnekshaus n. – pâté, tartes m.:hausgemaachte Pati m., Taart f. – une bagarre m.: eng fatzeg Kläpperei f.; maisonnée Stot m., d’ganz Haus n. – toute la maison était là: d’ganz Haus n. wor do, d’ganz Famill f. wor do; maisonette Haischen n. (pl. Haisercher)

Van Dijk (1998)

Haus (n) (Haiser) huis (het)

Zimmer (1993)
Appendix C

Extract from BSL Level 1 Syllabus (CACDP 2003: 3-5)

Course Content

Length of Course
Minimum contact time should be 60 hours, excluding assessment.

Rationale
In the course of their daily lives, Deaf people meet members of the wider community who do not have the basic skills necessary to communicate with them. This can lead to frustration on both sides. The situation can be improved by encouraging more members of the community to develop basic skills in BSL or ISL [= Irish Sign Language].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Areas</th>
<th>Language Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meeting People</td>
<td>Addressing, greeting and taking leave of another sign language user. Understanding and producing fingerspelling (the manual alphabet) to denote names of people and places. Strategies for asking for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exchanging Personal Information</td>
<td>Simple question forms. Asking for and giving personal information about home and work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describing People, Animals, Objects and their Location</td>
<td>Describing people, animals and objects. Giving descriptions in relation to size, colour and shape. Describing rooms and locating objects in a room. Asking for and giving information on the whereabouts of people, animals and objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People and their Lives</td>
<td>Describing people you know. Giving information. Giving information about people who know/are familiar with (friends, family, etc.). Asking for information about other people. Describing activities of people you know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Food and Drink</td>
<td>Giving information about refreshments, meals and mealtimes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Number and Quantity  The general use of numbering systems for counting people and things; specific numbering systems used for age, money and telling time.

9. Calendar  Giving information about when activities/events occur. Asking for information about when activities/events occur.

10. Feelings  Expressing feelings about different topics. Asking others about their feelings. Giving and asking for opinions.


Language Content

1. Meeting People

Language Functions
Addressing, greeting and taking leave of another sign language user. Understanding and producing fingerspelling (the manual alphabet) to denote names of people and places. Strategies for asking for clarification.

- Introducing oneself to a Deaf person.
- Holding a short conversation with a Deaf person (3 minutes).
- Asking for and giving simple personal information.
- Fingerspelling the names of self and others.
- Asking for repetition and/or clarification.
- Finishing a conversation.
- Using polite conventions for taking leave of a person.

Suggested Topics/Activities

Meeting familiar people  Greetings, e.g. *All right?; How are you?; Haven’t seen you for a while.*

Meeting unfamiliar people in familiar surrounding (e.g. the sign class or in the Deaf club)  Introducing oneself, e.g. *Hello, I’m pleased to meet you; My name is...; What is your name? Where are you from? Etc.*

Meeting unfamiliar people in public places shops, cafés, offices, etc.  Asking if they require assistance, e.g. *What do you want? What would you like me to do? Can I help?*
Can-Do or Can-Don’t?  C. Extract from BSL Level 1 Syllabus

Requesting clarification  When a response or question isn’t understood, e.g. *Again please; Sorry, I don’t understand; What was that sign?*

Leave taking  Ending an interaction politely, e.g. *Thank you; I must go; Pleased to meet you; See you again; See you later.*

Notes

- What are the different ways Deaf people greet each other, e.g. people they know or do not know, in formal or informal situations?
- Think about cultural differences. What questions would be polite to ask a sign language user but wouldn’t normally be asked of an English speaker?
- Think about how questions are structured in BSL/ISL.
- What facial expressions are used when asking questions?
- Watch how Deaf people shape letters when fingerspelling. The shapes are often different from those shown on the alphabet charts.