Exchanging goods on the linguistic market of second phase teacher training: Translanguaging as an (il)legitimate practice

[1*]Patricia Louise Morris

[1] *Romance Language Education, Department of Romance Philology, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany*

*Corresponding Author: patricialouise.morris@uni-goettingen.de

How to cite this paper: Morris, P. L. (2025). Exchanging goods on the linguistic market of second phase teacher training: Translanguaging as an (il)legitimate practice, *Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Language,5(2),*65-89. https://doi.org/10.71514/jssal/2025.175

Article Info

Received: 2025-02-28

Accepted: 2025-07-25

Abstract

This paper examines translingual practices in the second phase of teacher training (Vorbereitungsdienst) for French and Spanish in Germany. Applying an ethnographic approach based on Grounded Theory Methodology, this study analyses observation protocols from classroom visits, subject-specific seminar sessions, and post-lesson debriefings to reconstruct translingual practices in teacher education. The study is framed by Bourdieu's concept of the linguistic market, which illustrates how institutional contexts assign varying degrees of recognition and value to different language practices. By examining the linguistic practices of teacher trainees, this research explores how institutional norms and language ideologies shape foreign language instruction. Findings reveal a paradoxical approach to multilingualism: while teacher trainees (and teacher educators) employ translingual and multimodal strategies, pupils are expected to adhere strictly to the monolingual norm in the target language. This tension reflects broader power structures in education, reinforcing linguistic hierarchies. By critically examining translingual practices in teacher training, this paper contributes to the discussion on language policy, pedagogical norms, and the professionalization of foreign language teachers.

Keywords: Multilingualism, translanguaging, ethnography, teacher training.

Introduction: Navigating Linguistic Norms and Translingual Practices in Teacher Training

The transitional phase between university-based teacher education and professional teaching practice in Germany—the second phase of teacher training (*Referendariat* or *Vorbereitungsdienst*)—has received limited scholarly attention (Gerl

steinach, 2020, p. 88). This phase, which follows on from the university degree programme lasts 18 months. It involves teacher trainees working in schools designing, teaching, and assessing pupils and lessons while simultaneously being observed, evaluated, and graded by professional teacher educators in specialized teacher colleges[1].

Within this context, language plays a pivotal role, particularly in foreign language education, where language functions not only as means of instruction and communication as it is in e.g. sciences. It is also the subject matter and beyond that a professional and pedagogical

[1] More information in English about the second phase of teacher training with a special focus on foreign language teacher educators in Gerlach (2024).

linguistic habitus: Teacher trainees are expected to acquire a specific register, the foreign language teaching jargon, including specialized terminology and formalized expressions appropriate to foreign language educational discourse. This linguistic expectation was highlighted during an initial investigatory visit to a teacher college when the director stated: "What is important to me in terms of language is that the teacher trainees express themselves precisely. I correct them when they say *'Zettel'* (note) instead of *'Arbeitsblatt'* (worksheet)" (1, l. 9-10). This statement underscores how linguistic norms are enforced as part of teacher professionalization, emphasizing linguistic precision and adherence to established terminologies.

This paper examines the role of translingual practices[2] by addressing the following question: How do teacher trainees in the second phase of teacher education navigate, negotiate and regulate translingual practices within institutional linguistic norms and expectations in foreign language teaching? It draws on ethnographic data from classroom visits, subject-specific seminar sessions, post-lesson debriefings, and other training contexts**.** The data analysis is guided by Grounded Theory Methodology (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Although Grounded Theory Methodology has an inductive approach and does not impose a priori categories towards data, it takes the researchers past experiences and theoretical knowledge into account (Corbin & Strauss 2008, p. 32). This is called sensitivity and one of the sensitizing concepts in this paper is Bourdieu's concept of the linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1991). This perspective illuminates how institutional norms, expectations, and power structures shape translingual practices in foreign language teaching. The discussion is further contextualized through sensitizing concepts such as translanguaging as a practical theory of language (Li, 2018) and classroom French (Schädlich, 2022) viewing the linguistic practices in foreign language teacher training not as deficient but as locally meaningful.

The structure of the paper is as follows: the next section outlines the research design and methodological approach, followed by a presentation and discussion of the findings on translingual practices in teacher training. The paper concludes by reflecting on the implications for foreign language pedagogy and teacher education policy.

The structure of the paper is as follows: The next section provides a literature review that introduces the core theoretical concepts and state of the art in teacher education and multilingualism, followed by an outline of the research design and methodology. This is followed by the presentation and discussion of the research findings on translingual practices

[2] This paper draws on the concepts of translanguaging and multilingualism. Rather than plurilingualism (which appears in the data below when talking about curricula), translanguaging allows for a more critical engagement with questions of power, legitimacy, and linguistic hierarchies in institutional contexts. While plurilingualism—as conceptualized by the Council of Europe—emphasizes the dynamic and individual use of multiple languages within a single speaker's repertoire, it often remains situated within normative discourses of competence, progression, and controlled language use. Multilingualism is understood as a broader, umbrella concept that captures the coexistence and interplay of multiple languages in social and institutional contexts. These frameworks align more closely with the ethnographic, practice-theoretical and power-critical approach of this study.

in teacher training. The paper concludes by reflecting on the implications for foreign language teacher education and offering an outlook on future research.

Literature Review: Power and Multilingualism in FLT

This chapter outlines the theoretical foundations of the study. It is organized thematically in four sections: Monolingual norms and ideologies in foreign language teaching, translanguaging and multilingual education, the linguistic market and the white listening subject, and gaps in teacher education research, with a particular focus on the German context. The chapter concludes by clarifying how this study builds on and critically engages with these frameworks.

Monolingual Norms and Ideologies in Foreign Language Teaching

Foreign language teaching has historically been shaped by monolingual ideologies. These emerged as a response to earlier grammar-translation methods and emphasized exclusive use of the target language in the classroom. Over time, more flexible models allowed limited use of the learners' first language (Butzkamm, 1978) which have been taken up by the German curricula (e.g. Ministerium für Schule und Berufsbildung des Landes Schleswig-Holstein, 2016). They promote the concept of "Functional Monolingualism" (*Funktionale Einsprachigkeit*), a variant of the target-language-only principle allowing German as the imagined language of mutual understanding when it comes to grammar explanations or complex discussions. However, this approach still assumed a "shared first language" (Fäcke, 2017, p. 36) between teachers and learners—German as the national language of the education system. Other languages are rarely acknowledged, let alone integrated into pedagogical practice (Heyder & Schädlich, 2014; Morris, 2025).

This reflects a broader historical alignment between language and nation-state ideologies, where the national language is constructed as the neutral medium of schooling (Gogolin, 1994). Multilingual realities are often treated as peripheral, inefficient, or even disruptive. As a result, educational language policy reproduces the division between valued "school languages" and marginalized community languages, reinforcing a narrow conception of linguistic competence (Kropp, 2015).

Translanguaging and Multilingual Education

Recent developments in applied linguistics and educational theory have introduced translanguaging as an alternative to monolingual paradigms. Rather than treating languages as discrete, bounded systems, translanguaging views individuals as making "meaning by drawing from complex, interrelated linguistic-semiotic and multimodal repertoires grounded in deeply valued cultural-historical roots" (García et al., 2021, p. 221)

drawing from an integrated linguistic repertoire. Translanguaging is not only "a practical theory of language" (Li, 2018, p. 9) understanding language as a verb, a practice but also a

and pedagogical concept developed from and for minoritised and/ or migrant communities. Opposing monolingual ideologies, the concept holds a holds a social justice and emancipatory claim.

In addition to linguistic elements, some scholars propose a multimodal understanding of translanguaging, recognizing that meaning making all kinds of semiotic resources (Pennycook, 2017). This perspective can be adapted to the context of foreign language education where Schädlich (2022, p. 85) developed the term of "Classroom French" (*klassenräumiges Französisch*) referring to the specific variety used in classrooms of French as a foreign language. It is shaped by multimodal communication, combining spoken language with gestures, spatial arrangements, and materials like blackboards or worksheets. Rather than viewing a deficient learner language, classroom French is understood as a legitimate linguistic, embodied and material practice, shaped by the unique dynamics of classroom interaction.

In the German context, translanguaging has been explored mainly in primary and elementary education, as well as in teaching German as a second language (Knappik & Ayten, 2021; Panagiotopoulou & Rosen, 2016; Schnitzer, 2017; Weichselbaum, 2022). However, there is little research on its application in secondary foreign language classrooms, particularly in institutionalized teacher training settings.

The Linguistic Market and the White Listening Subject

Not only translanguaging scholars criticize structuralist and generative linguists for viewing language as a neutral system. Bourdieu (1991) instead emphasises that language is not merely a set of structures but practices that functions as a social and political instrument. In any given social field, certain linguistic practices are assigned greater value, and this value is closely linked to power structures. Those who master the legitimate language gain access to social, economic, and political advantages, while speakers of non-standard varieties face marginalization.

> The official language is bound up with the state, both in its genesis and in its social uses. It is in the process of state formation that the conditions are created for the constitution of a unified linguistic market, dominated by the official language. Obligatory on official occasions and in official places (schools, public administrations, political institutions, etc.), this state language becomes the theoretical norm against which all linguistic practices are objectively measured. Ignorance is no excuse; this linguistic law has its body of jurists—the grammarians—and its agents of regulation and imposition—the teachers—who are empowered universally to subject the linguistic performance of speaking subjects to examination and to the legal sanction of academic qualification (Bourdieu, 1991, 55)

Bourdieu points out that in schools, teachers play a central role as "agents of regulation and imposition". They hold the power to perpetuate and regulate linguistic practices, impose

legitimacy on certain forms of speech, often unconsciously reinforcing social hierarchies. Flores and Rosa (2015) connect this dynamic to the category of race by introducing the concept of raciolinguistic ideologies. The "white listening subject", in the educational context, the teacher, "refers to those who inhabit positions of institutionalized power that are produced and maintained" (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 210). Teachers act as "ideology brokers" (Blommaert, 1999) of linguistic legitimacy, shaping which linguistic practices are recognized as valuable.

These theories are particularly valuable and applicable to the context of second phase foreign language teacher education in Germany, where the dominance of standard German and target-language-only norms may position other linguistic practices—especially translingual strategies—as illegitimate or deviant *and* power hierarchies are visible between different groups: Teacher educators, teacher trainees, pupils etc.

Gaps in Teacher Education Research

There is a striking imbalance in how the two phases of teacher education in the German context are researched. While the first phase—the university-based academic training—has received considerable scholarly attention, studies focusing on the second phase, the so-called *Vorbereitungsdienst*, remain relatively limited (Anderson-Park & Abs, 2020, p. 335; see also Gerlach, 2020). At the same time, the concept of "practice shock" has long been documented in the literature, showing how future teachers' initially progressive and inclusive attitudes may shift toward more conservative, compliance-oriented stances once confronted with the pressures of everyday school life (Terhart, 2021, p. 33).

This gap in research becomes especially relevant when examining how multilingualism is addressed across the different stages of teacher education. While future teachers of Romance languages often express openness toward linguistic diversity and demonstrate an appreciation of multilingual practices during their studies (Benholz et al., 2017; Morris, 2023), these attitudes rarely materialize in classroom practice. In fact, multilingual-oriented instruction remains a marginal phenomenon in the teaching of Romance languages (Heyder & Schädlich, 2014; Méron-Minuth, 2018). This raises the central question of the present study: What happens in the transition between university training and full professional practice? And: How do teacher trainees in the second phase of teacher education navigate, negotiate and regulate translingual practices within institutional linguistic norms and expectations in foreign language teaching?

Although some pedagogical flexibility exists for including school-taught foreign languages in classroom discourse, community languages—particularly those associated with migration—continue to be largely excluded. As a result, foreign language education reproduces what Krumm (2014) terms "elite multilingualism" or what Küppers (2022) refers to as a "two-class" model of multilingualism: one that privileges certain languages while rendering others invisible. This selective valorisation not only reinforces social inequality but also neglects the

unique potential of language teachers to challenge these dynamics—provided that institutional conditions support such efforts.

Contribution of this Study

This study aims to bridge these gaps by applying Bourdieu's theory of the linguistic market to the specific context of translanguaging in secondary school foreign language teaching. It explores how practices deemed illegitimate—such as drawing on students' full linguistic repertoires—are negotiated within the institutional setting of teacher training.

By focusing on second-phase teacher education in Germany, the study contributes to a better understanding of how linguistic ideologies are reproduced or challenged in professional development contexts. It also seeks to extend the application of translanguaging to domains where it has so far received little attention. In doing so, it questions the taken-for-granted monolingual norms in foreign language didactics and opens space for a more inclusive, socially responsive pedagogy.

Methodology

The study presented aims at investigating linguistic and, in particular, translingual practices during the second phase of teacher education focused on the subjects of French and Spanish. The data are part of a larger project that adopts an ethnographic and theory-generating approach.

Design

This paper is the second publication in a five-part study (project) conducted using Grounded Theory Methodology (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). While the first article (Morris, 2025) focused exclusively on interview data, the present paper examines translingual practices based on ethnographic data collected through classroom observations and subject-specific seminar contexts. The ethnographic approach also allows reconstructing how differently linguistic norms apply, depending on the speaker and the setting. The analysis follows the principles of **Grounded Theory Methodology, ethnography, practice theory** and relies on a combination of **sequential analysis and coding procedures** to examine these processes in detail.

Practice theory (Reckwitz, 2003) is a theory for the analysis of social worlds as well as a research programme, which shifts the focus from individuals and structures to practices as the fundamental unit of social analysis. It challenges traditional dichotomies like subject/object and mind/body, emphasizing that social practices are embodied, routinized activities that involve material artefacts and implicit knowledge rather than being purely cognitive or rule-based (Reckwitz, 2003). These practices are not static but evolve through repetition, adaptation, and contextual reinterpretation, making social life both structured and unpredictable. Therefore, practice theory is interwoven and forms the basis for the linguistic theories (presented in the following section of concepts of theoretical sensitivity) understanding language as a verb, a practice, rather than a neutral structure (Li, 2018).

As Blommaert and Jie (2020, pp. 67-68) pointed out, ethnography is very open to different methods of analysis: "Every available method can be used to make sense of your data". In this paper, the frame method and methodology is the Grounded Theory with the aim to build a theory which is grounded in data. In other words, by using ethnographical tools such as describing densely what occurs in the field a theory grounded in data is established. This will (at the end of the project) be a theory about languaging in the second phase of teacher training and it will not only at describe but also explain (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 106) the situation of the *Vorbereitungsdienst* in the subjects of French and Spanish. Differing from classical ethnography were single cases are reconstructed, this theory should be applicable to other situations (Steininger, 2021, p. 116).

Participants & Data sources

The project's data were collected between 2023 and 2025 in the federal states of Lower Saxony and North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. The data corpus consists of twelve interviews with teacher trainees (3x French, 7x Spanish, 2x French & Spanish), as well as four interviews with teacher educators. In addition, classroom visits, other teaching situations, post-lesson debriefings, information events about the traineeship, subject-specific seminar sessions and other field visits were ethnographically documented. The observation protocols that emerged from this process form the core data for the present paper:

Table 1. Data Corpus: Ethnographic Observations

Ethnographic data	Observations of classroom visits & post-lessons debriefings • Subject: Spanisch • Secondary schools (*Gymnasien*), year 6 and year 12 • Lower Saxony (2023)
	Observations of subject-specific seminar sessions in teacher colleges • French (2024, 2025) • Spanish (2024) • Lower Saxony
	Other observations from the field of second phase teacher training • initial investigatory visits (2022, 2023) • information event at the university held by a teacher educator of Spanish (2024) • Lower Saxony

Data Preparation & Analysis

After having collected the data, the field notes were formulated into observation protocols anonymizing persons and locations. After having transcribed[3] and coded the first interviews word by word and line by line, these codes guide the further collection and analysis of data

[3] For the purpose of this paper, the data also had to be translated. Descriptions from the observation protocols were translated into English whereas most of the direct speech in-situ data were kept in italics the original (French, Spanish, German) to highlight translingual practices and specific register features. Translations into English as well as (when needed) information from which language was translated are provided in the brackets e.g.: *Some pupils shout: 'Zu laut!'* (German: Too loud) The teacher trainee then addresses the pupil: *'Puedes repitir?'* (Spanish: Can you repeat?) (2, l. 56).

(interviews and observations) where a detailed step-by-step procedure was less required (Strauss & Corbin, 1996, p. 14). So for the observations field notes, transcriptions and coding was only made for situations which seemed relevant to the research question. After coding these sequences, the codes could be put in relation to each other codes (axial coding) and then compared with the key- and subcategories from Morris (2025) and concepts of (theoretical) sensitivity.

Theoretical sensitivity (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) refers to the researcher's ability to draw on theoretical knowledge to make sense of empirical data. It requires maintaining analytical distance while simultaneously engaging prior experience and conceptual frameworks to guide interpretation. In this study, the interpretive lens is shaped by the researcher's positionality as someone working within teacher education and committed to inclusive, power-aware language pedagogies. Rather than claiming neutrality, this perspective is understood as part of the theoretical sensitivity that informs the analysis. The researcher's academic background, ideological orientation, and professional trajectory inevitably influence the research process—from data collection to interpretation. Positionality is thus not viewed as a bias to be eliminated, but as an integral element of a reflexive and transparent research practice. The concept of theoretical sensitivity plays a central role in this study, as certain concepts repeatedly emerged during the coding process—most notably the linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1991), translanguaging (García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018; García et al., 2021), the variety of classroom French (Schädlich, 2022), as well as the in this project already established category system about linguistic practices in the field of second phase teacher education (Morris, 2025). By applying the Grounded Theory coding procedure—namely open, axial, and selective coding— (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), two central categories were developed:

a) Monolingual norm as means in foreign language teaching

b) Multilingualism as a (teaching) subject for promoting target language orientation

Although Corbin and Strauss (2008, p. 105) recommend the development of a single central category, this study elaborates two interrelated central categories. This decision reflects the complexity of the data and aligns with a more flexible application of Grounded Theory coding procedures. The results draw on the discourse of the special nature of foreign language teaching in relation to language: the participants speak *in* a language and speak *about* language. The category system refers to these two modes of languaging: When it comes to the level of language as a means of communication, the central category a) applies: The monolingual norm serves as a structuring principle in foreign language instruction, shaping both the classroom environment and the expectations of teacher trainees and teacher educators. The teacher trainees and the pupils are expected to speak French or Spanish with each other during the lesson using German as the (imagined) language of common understanding only in specific situations.

At the same time, multilingualism is framed as a thematic focus on a metalevel, intended to support pupils in their orientation towards the target language, i.e. the monolingual norm.

This is where central category b) applies. Other languages than German and the target language Spanish and French should not be used as means of communication and teacher trainees shame themselves whenever this happens (Morris, 2025). These findings indicate the tension between adhering to monolingual norms and incorporating other semiotic resources into foreign language instruction. The categories presented are brought together with the following research findings in the discussion section.

Research Findings: (Il)legitimate Practices

The process of coding and comparing is always an interpretative one, which is why the following chapter not only presents the results soberly but already combines and discusses them with sensitizing concepts from literature. The chapter is also designed to let the data speak for itself, which is why many headings are derived from in-vivo codes.

Two distinct patterns (table 2, left column, below) can be identified: teacher-sided (both teacher trainees and teacher educators) multimodal and translingual practices and the requirement of monolingualism addressed to the pupils.

Table 2. Category system: Synthesis of Morris (2025) and codes established in this paper

Central category a) Monolingual norm as means in foreign language teaching	**Central category b)** Multilingualism as a (teaching) subject for promoting target language orientation
Pattern 1: Pupil-sided practices • "It's good that the pupils didn't slip into German" **Pattern 2: teacher-sided practices** • Multimodalities and the „Solamente hablamos español" • Translingual narrowness: German and the target language • "You could use more specialised terms": Variance within a language and the foreign language teaching jargon	Invisibility of other languages and the ambiguous relation towards English

Pattern 1- Pupil-sided Practices: "It's good that the pupils didn't slip into German":

The expectation to use only the target language (Spanish) in the classroom appears to operate along a spectrum, depending on the context and the (power) position of the speaker. While the monolingual norm is addressed most rigidly to pupils during classroom visits, it is applied more flexibly in subject-specific seminars and interactions among teacher educators and trainees

When observing two consecutive Spanish lessons, of which only the second was visited by the teacher educator, the teacher trainee explains the course of the two lessons at the beginning of the first lesson. She asks the pupils to speak mainly in Spanish in the second lesson and to participate actively while formulating this request in German. In the second lesson itself, the following can be observed during group work:

> A pupil asks the others in German: 'Does anyone have a tissue?'. She is immediately reprimanded by another pupil: 'In Spanish!'. Then the pupil repeats her question: '*Quién tiene un ...?*' (Spanish: 'Who has a...?') All the pupils in the group laugh and one person hands her the tissue. She then says: '*Gracias*!' (Spanish: ‚Thank you!') (3, l.87-92).

This brief exchange, while seemingly trivial, offers insight into how linguistic norms are enacted and policed within the peer group. Notably, the reprimand to speak in Spanish was also delivered in German, reflecting a hybrid linguistic reality in which students internalize the monolingual expectation while not fully adhering to it themselves.

The situation also reveals a tension between classroom language policy and authentic communication. The request for a tissue—practical but unrelated to the lesson content—was initially framed in German, perhaps because such everyday exchanges are not integrated into the classroom's Spanish-language repertoire. If asking for a tissue in Spanish is not normalised in the classroom and no support is provided—such as scaffolding or classroom vocabulary displayed on the wall—then speaking Spanish is restricted solely to instructional matters. The correction, followed by laughter, points to the performative nature of the Spanish utterance: the pupil clearly does not know the word for "tissue" but plays along with the rule, leading to a moment of shared absurdity. This highlights how rigid adherence to the target language can restrict opportunities for authentic, spontaneous interaction and reinforce Spanish as a language of instruction only—not of everyday communication.

The recognition of such monolingual classroom policies are further illustrated by evaluative comments from teacher educators: After another lesson visit (2, l. 149), the teacher educator praises the teacher trainee for the fact that the pupils have not 'slipped' into German ("*Gut, dass die Schüler nicht ins Deutsche abgerutscht sind*"). More than the English word slipping, *abrutschen* has a negative connotation of decline and implies a clear direction of downfall. This reveals once again that speaking in the target language during the classroom visit is the only legitimate practice, at least for the pupils' own practices.

The second pattern, namely the teacher-side practices carried out by teacher educators and teacher trainees, which is in the foreground of this paper, due to the observation focus on situations where teacher trainees were more involved (e.g. subject-specific seminars) than pupils.

Pattern 2: Teacher-sided Practices

Multimodalities and the „Solamente hablamos español"

This section explores the teacher trainees' use of diverse multimodal and translingual strategies to support communication and learning in the foreign language classroom. Although one trainee during a classroom visit requests the pupils in the first-person plural *"Solamente hablamos español"* ("We only speak Spanish"), accompanied by a supportive gesture during *hablamos* (opening and closing the hand), the observation of teacher trainee practices reveal a much more flexible and responsive use of language and semiotic resources.

The teacher trainees make targeted and planned use of their own multimodal repertoire, which seems to be precisely tailored to the learning group and the age of the pupils. In this lesson, the teacher trainee uses her entire body and substantiates words such as *escuchar, hablar, correr* (Spanish: listen, speak, run) with according gestures. Numbers are also

indicated with her fingers complementing the verbal language. When she asks the pupils to speak in complete sentences, this is also underlined physically:

> '*Quiero frases enteras'* (Spanish: I want complete sentences). She stresses *enteras* and spreads out the arms). *'Wir ballern das nicht nur so hin, sondern wollen ganze Sätze'*(German: We don't just blurt it out like that, we want complete sentences) (2, l- 62).

This could be interpreted as putting emphasis on her statement by using a variety of resources: with the help of intonation, speed and by stretching her arms, the request can be felt by the pupils with all their senses. Nevertheless, it is translated into German, with an adaptation of the alleged register to the pupils, which becomes clear through the very colloquial *ballern*. The word *ballern* is a highly versatile slang term with multiple meanings, used in the context of shooting or firing, drugs, sports and gaming. It describes a forceful or excessive action, which seemed inadequate (to the researcher when observing) for the Spanish language classroom. She also changes the personal pronoun to 'we', which could be understood as a softening of the request. After a pupil's presentation, she corrects a grammatical error and winks at the pupil. This could also be interpreted as a softening of the criticism uttered.

Another aspect of multimodality are the images, symbols and linguistic chunks found in the classroom, on the board, on worksheets, etc., such as a card detailing a megaphone on it, which the teacher trainee holds up when she does not understand the pupils. She has also added chilli pepper symbols to the exercises on her worksheets, the number of which indicates the level of difficulty of the exercise. In another classroom visit, a board consisting of three units can be observed. On the left-hand side is 'el plan para hoy' (todays plan) and below one can find a graphic organiser detailing the course of the lesson, which is visualized with arrows, speech bubbles, book symbols, etc. In the centre there are pictures of school subjects and during the lesson the teacher trainee adds fixed phrases for talking about these subjects. On the right-hand side, a mind map is depicted. In the centre *'presentación'* (presentation) is written and complemented with chunks for presenting (the lesson plan) such as: *'después', 'luego'* (after, then) etc.

It becomes clear that these practices are highly context-specific and often especially established for the Spanish or French lesson (e.g. the chilli pepper symbol as Spanish classroom-specific practice) as well as the specific class with their needs and age. Even practices of recognition and appreciation after a presentation in the same subject (Spanish) differ greatly at schools that are less than 10 miles apart: In one classroom, pupils bang their fist on the table after a presentation, while in another classroom visit, the teacher trainee reminds the pupils of the commonly established practice of clapping once all together and at the same time. These practices, which may initially seem peculiar or unintelligible to external persons (including those who speak the target language), include the following:

In Year 6 (11-12 aged pupils), where the practice of clapping once is established (the teacher trainee later explains to me that she introduced this practice so that it does not degenerate

into a roaring applause), there are other playful elements: The *pez globo* (puffer fish) is a facial expression in which the cheeks are puffed out resembling a puffer fish. It is used to prevent the pupils from speaking and always starts when the teacher trainee calls out "*comando pez globo!*"(2, l. 50). The pupils were not observed giving calling out *comando pez globo*. Another peculiarity of this course is the stuffed animal named Pablo, which is intended to serve as a Spanish learning mascot and also has the function of giving the pupils the floor: The soft toy is thrown from person to person and only the person holding him is allowed to speak. Another practice, which is praised by a teacher educator in an information event on the Spanish traineeship and is also very specific to classroom interaction (in what other room is speaking to each other so strictly regulated?), is the *Meldekette* (a literal translation from German would be hand-raising-chain*)*, a turn-taking system, in which the pupils themselves are supposed to give each other the floor by choosing the next person whose hand is raised to speak and refer to each other using chunks, which are displayed in the classroom for support, such as *Estoy de acuerdo* (Spanish: I agree).

The last multimodal practice that could be observed after each classroom visit was the distribution of sweets. The teacher trainees are advised and evaluated by the teacher educators after the classroom visits and, depending on the federal state, also graded. All those involved in the traineeship seem to know very routinely that the teacher trainee brings sweets and hands them to the pupils in the following lesson as a reward and as a thank you for their good participation. This does not appear to be a practice specific to Spanish or French, although in some cases it was observed that sweets were brought in from the 'target culture'.

What emerges from these observations is a highly adaptive, embodied, and contextually rich pedagogy that goes beyond monolingual instruction. The teacher trainees draw on translingual and multimodal practices to negotiate meaning, manage the classroom, and engage learners—frequently in ways that blend formal and informal registers, visual and bodily cues, and multiple languages. These practices challenge narrow definitions of target-language-only instruction.

Translingual Narrowness: German and the Target Language

As illustrated above, the pupils in the observed lessons are asked to express themselves monolingually. This practice seems to be so crucial for classroom visits that the pupils even reprimand themselves when another language (in this case German) is spoken. However, it is also known from the previous study (Morris, 2025) that this strict language requirement is more pronounced in classroom visits than in other lessons where teacher educators are not present. The ethnographic data now show that the monolingual norm applies primarily to pupils, but that teacher trainees make flexible use of other parts of their repertoire. The previous section was dedicated to multimodal practices; this section will focus on translingual practices in a narrower linguistic sense, presenting three translingual strategies.

The first strategy depicts the use of fixed idioms (in one language while remaining most of the time in another language) in both the subject-specific seminar and the lesson visits. These

idioms are familiar due to their repetition and can therefore be used in Spanish, even in the first year of learning:

> A pupil raises her hand and the teacher trainee asks her to present her timetable. The window is open and there is a lot of noise coming into the classroom from outside while the pupil is speaking. When she stops speaking, the teacher trainee asks the other pupils: '*Habt ihr das verstanden oder waren die Autos zu laut*?' (German: Did you understand her or were the cars too loud)' Some pupils shout: *'Zu laut*!' (German: Too loud) The teacher trainee then addresses the pupil: '*Puedes repitir*?' (Spanish: Can you repeat?) (2, l. 56).
>
> Shortly before the bell rings, the classroom becomes restless. The pupils pack up their materials, put on their jackets, some reach for their mobile phones: The teacher trainee then says: '*Dos minutos más, el móvil en la mochila! Ok chicos*, (Spanish: Two more minutes, put the phone back in the backpack! Ok you guys), *wann sehen wir uns wieder*? (German: When will we see each other again?) *Os deseo un buen día y nos vemos hoy y martes. Hasta la próxima.*' (Spanish: I wish you a pleasant day and we will see us later and on Tuesday. See you soon!) The pupils shout in chorus: '*Hasta la próxima*! (Spanish: See you soon!)' (2, l. 70).

The practice of saying goodbye and asking for repetition seems to be familiar to the pupils and is practiced in the Spanish language, while the spontaneous conversation about the noise on the street is conducted in German. It seems to be similar to individual words: „*Ihr checkt noch einmal auf eurer 'chuleta', ob da Angleichungsfehler sind*" (You check your 'sheet' again to see if there are any alignment errors) (2, l. 52) or "*Vielleicht braucht ihr eine Unterlage. Schnappt euch euer 'cuaderno' oder euren Block*!" (Maybe you need a surface. Grab your 'booklet' or your notepad) (2, l.25) or "*Ist ja deine 'opinión personal'*" (It's your point of view) (3, l.50). *Chuleta, cuaderno* and *opinión personal* seem to be so concise as task- and classroom-specific Spanish vocabulary that it is preferable to use these terms than to make a monolingual German statement. Furthermore, colloquial German is of interest here, which can be seen in the words *checken* (to check) and *schnappen* (to grab). Adapting the register is possibly intended to suggest closeness to the pupil.

The interpretation that certain words work better in the target language due to the classroom and specific foreign language teaching context and the fact that certain linguistic practices are ritualised can also be reconstructed for the observed subject-specific seminar sessions, as in this data excerpt from the beginning of a French seminar session:

> A loud conversation about the weather and the traffic starts in the corridor between the teacher educator Charlotte Baumert and two teacher trainees Marie and Annika. Marie starts the conversation in French and they continue to speak French as they enter the room. '*Qu'est-ce qu'il fait froid, le chauffage est allumé* ? (French: It's really cold here, is the heating on?)', asks Charlotte Baumert as she enters. She greets me and continues: '*Aujourd'hui, on n'est pas nombreuse, beaucoup de personnes sont malades. Et Mademoiselle Jansen fait du ski.*' (French: Today, there aren't many of us, a lot of people are ill. And Miss Jansen is skiing) Annika: '*Ah, ist sie auf Skifreizeit*?' (German: Ah, is she on a skiing holiday?) Charlotte Baumert: '*Das sagt man nicht, es ist ja kein Urlaub. Man sagt Skifahrt.*

> *Ach, haben Sie die Haare geschnitten*?' (German: You don't say that, it's not a holiday. It's called a ski trip with the school. Oh, did you cut your hair?) Annika: '*Ja, schon vor Weihnachten*!' (German: Annika: 'Yes, I did before Christmas! Charlotte Baumert: '*Ach, ist mir gar nicht aufgefallen. Meine Mutter hat immer gesagt, kurze Haare sind modern. Naja. Weiß ich nicht. Ouf, c'est vrai qu'il fait pas chaud* (German : Oh, I didn't even notice. My mum always said that short hair is fashionable. Well. I don't know. French: Phew, it's true that it's not quite warm in here!) She rubs her hands together (8, l.3-15).

Firstly, it is important to note that, unlike the classroom visits where the target language of instruction is Spanish or French, the language of the subject-specific seminars tends to be German. Nevertheless, it was observed several times that as soon as the weather, the temperature or the air quality in the room was discussed, the language switched to French or Spanish, even though the previous content had been discussed in German. This is an interesting counterpart to school lessons, where everything should take place in the target language and activities that are not strictly spoken a part of the lesson (organisational matters, jokes, etc.) are often formulated in German. However, what initially seems contradictory could also be interpreted as ritualization. Just like *Hasta la próxima* and *Puedes repitir* or *No pasa nada* in class, *Qu'est-ce qu'il fait froid* or *Est-ce que vous pouvez fermer la fenêtre* can be understood as ritualization, while more didactic conversations take place in German.

Thus, spontaneous translingual practices repeatedly take place in various settings of the 2nd phase, whereby sometimes single words, sometimes whole phrases of different language and physical practices are also used. It is noticeable that the language changes, if they are to be interpreted as such, are often initiated by teacher trainees and the teacher educators join in:

> The break ends when Moritz Vogt, the teacher educator, begins to explain the task. The trainee teachers are to create individual exercises on the text extract for the various requirement areas. The oral task given by Moritz Vogt as well as the instructions on the whiteboard are in German. Valeria: '*Con quién*?' (Spanish: With whom?) Moritz Vogt: '*Con la pareja*' (Spanish: With your partner) (7, l. 223-229).

The second translingual strategy is the direct translation realised by the teacher trainees and teacher educators. They often repeat their statement in the other language: At school, *un dibujo* is translated as *ein Bildchen* (a little picture), *en voz baja* becomes *murmeln* (mumble). In the subject-specific seminar, it's vice versa: first the French teacher educator says something in German and then quickly repeats it in French: "*Gesundheit. À vos souhaits*!" or again first in French, then in German: "*Vous avez fini?* [...] Then present what you have discussed. *Je suis tout ouïe.* I'm all ears! (6, l.91-92) These direct translations can be interpreted in different ways: In school, it may be about ensuring understanding. In order to simplify the explanation of the tasks, trainee teachers translate it entirely or just individual words into German. It is also possible that the comprehension process should be accelerated and another way of making oneself understood (by using, gestures, pictures or paraphrases) would take longer. In relation to the subject-specific seminar, other interpretations are more

obvious: when reacting to a teacher trainee's sneeze, the reaction is quick, almost automatic in German. The French follow-up *A vos souhaits* could be one of the phrases that are used ritualised in schools and subject-specific (French) seminars. The teacher educator also works as a teacher herself and may want to be a good language role model for the teacher trainees and therefore use these phrases in particular in the seminar sessions. '*Je suis tout ouïe'* could be understood in a similar way. The teacher educator wants to show the teacher trainees how to incorporate an idiomatic expression into French lessons; the teacher trainees actually react openly and with surprise to this and announce that they will now also say this in French classes in school (6, l. 91-99).

The third translingual strategy refers to the setting of teaching grammar. The data paragraph below presents a situation where a translation of *prefijo* with *Präfix* occurs in an otherwise monolingual discussion in Year 12 (17-18 aged pupils):

> After the discussion, the pupils go back to their seats and mistakes are corrected. The first mistake that Luisa (trainee teacher) points out is that **inconocido* was said instead of *desconocido* (Spanish: unkown). Luisa asks what is wrong with **inconocido*. Many pupils raise their hands. Luisa takes the turn of the person who made the mistake. The person now corrects themselves. Luisa then explains that the prefix was wrong. She speaks Spanish throughout the interaction, but then translates *prefijo* with *Präfix* (3, l. 111-115).

The translation of *prefijo* with the German word *Präfix* seemed redundant to the researcher at first as it is so similar in form and pronunciation. Pupils who do not know the word *prefijo* will not be helped by *Präfix*. The interpretation quickly arises that the translation into German is a practice that happens almost automatically, because the fact that grammar is taught in German is one of the core statements of the concept of *Funktionale Einsprachigkeit* (functional monolingualism), which is highly normative as it prevails curricularly but scientifically has not been discussed or elaborated in the last decades. Teachers seem particularly justified in leaving the target language when discussing cultural content and grammar. This data extract shows the absurdity and closure associated with the concept of *Funktionale Einsprachigkeit*. Instead of continuing to paraphrase in Spanish, using the less academic German word *Vorsilbe*, negotiating together what *prefijo* means or resorting to multimodal practices (such as pointing, crossing out, circling on the board), the space for negotiating content is closed here and the situation is ended. It is also noticeable that the error is no longer discussed in its context and that there is no correction of the group discussion in terms of content, only in terms of language. The point in the discussion, which was actually *desconocido* no longer plays a role here.

In all cases, translingual practices take place which contradict an ideal of purity. Still, it is always only a kind of multilingualism that includes the target language and German as an (imagined) language of common understanding. This is why the code was named *translingual narrowness: German and the target language.*

"You could use more specialised terms": Variance within a Language and the Foreign Language Teaching Jargon

The fact that we can nevertheless speak of an extremely multilingual scenario is due to the use of multimodal practices described above, as well as the variance in the register *within* a language. This section will focus on this variance. Of particular interest here is the specialised language of foreign language didactics, which is particularly evident in subject-specific seminars at the teacher college and in debriefings after classrooms visits. In a Spanish seminar session, the teacher trainees simulate a final oral examination, where the focus is on thematic deviations from the curriculum and the pupils' ability to apply the strategies they have learnt about a different topic. The group work between the three teacher trainees takes place in a separate room and after the teacher educator comes in and asks the teacher trainees to come to the end, one of the teacher trainees initiates a feedback round. The trainee teacher is given feedback on how she has done the simulation of her final exam. The first feedback is as follows: 'It was good, but you could use more specialised terms, e.g. the words internationalisms and synonyms/antonyms'. At this point it becomes clear (just as in the example from the introduction) that the teacher trainees are expected to have a certain educational language habitus. A kind of pedagogical and language-didactic specialised language (here in the form of linguistic terms) is expected and obviously also tested. This educational language variety appears in these data primarily in relation to other educational professionals and shows that, just as the use of the target language is flexible depending on the class level and context, there is also a variance in register in German. The above examples of the colloquial use of German, such as the words *ballern, checken, schnappen* versus *Präfix (*in place of *Vorsilbe)*, make clear that the teacher trainee in Year 6 speaks very differently to the pupils than later in the debriefing with the head teacher and the teacher educators.

However, it is also noticeable during the subject-specific seminar session that this educational language is not purely monolingual and that certain technical terms are used more in German or more in the target language:

> Moritz Vogt, the teacher educator, explains the principles he is concerned with: teaching should not be based on linguistic means but on competence and content. He mentions the keyword *Lexikogrammatik* (German: lexicogrammar) and then asks the question: '*Was brauchen die Schüler, um am Ende die ‚tarea final' zu bewältigen?* (German, Spanish in single quotes: What do the pupils need to master the 'target task'?' (4, l. 27).
>
> Charlotte Baumert states the following when planning a potential lesson together on the topic of literature work/text and media skills: '*Wir werden gleich noch gucken in 'activités avant, pendant, après', aber da sind wir noch nicht.'* (German, French in single quotes: We'll have a look at 'pre-, while- and post-activities' in a moment, but we're not there yet) (6, l. 121-122).

So while *tarea final*, and *acitivités avant, pendant, après* (and the word *preparación* in another place) appear here as foreign language didactic vocabulary in otherwise German-language statements, most of the other special terms are discussed in German. They refer to federal

and state curricular guidelines or are even direct quotations from them: *Kompetenzorientierung*, *dienende Funktion* (concerning vocabulary and grammar). Other words refer to German-language literature and specialised discourse, such as the terms *Lexikogrammatik* or *Erschließungsstrategien*. Other words were used repeatedly, but even the ethnographer, who is also a lecturer and researcher in foreign language education, did not understand them at first. For example, the metaphor *steinbruchsartig* (quarry-like), which appears again and again in the context of textbook work and means that not every task from the textbook has to be worked on and that one only has to take a few tasks like stones from a quarry. Another example is the word *implementation*, which was repeatedly used in a French seminar session when talking about the country-specific core curriculum. The teacher educator keeps comparing the old and the new core curriculum and the fieldworker understood at some point that *implementation* means the implementation of intercultural communicative competence. This lack of clarity shows that this is a very specific technical jargon that can only be understood by a small group: French and Spanish teachers in Germany or perhaps only in the 2nd phase of teacher training in Lower Saxony.

Invisibility of other Languages and the ambiguous Relation towards English

When reconstructing translingual practices in the observed classrooms and training contexts, a notable absence emerges: languages beyond the target language (French or Spanish) and the instructional language (German) are rarely acknowledged. This absence is not incidental—it reveals the workings of symbolic power within the linguistic market (Bourdieu, 1991) of teacher education. This section will focus on this complex.

In an informal exchange (6, l. 69-75), a teacher educator invited the researcher to give a seminar lecture. When the researcher mentioned a focus on multilingualism, interculturality, and transculturality, only "interculturality" was received with interest; "multilingualism" was ignored and dropped from the conversation. This situation illustrates how institutional discourses prioritize officially curricularly grounded concepts while marginalizing other approaches and topics. The discomfort with multilingualism became more explicit in another exchange with her colleague from the Spanish department of the teacher college. She remarked: "I don't understand why you research multilingualism in the *Vorbereitungsdienst*—trainees get in trouble if they don't stick to monolingualism."

Against this backdrop, it is telling that the only languages beyond German, French, and Spanish mentioned across the data are English and, once, Italian. English, however, holds an ambiguous position.

> Charlotte Baumert to the teacher trainees: *‚Ich habe in einer Austauschsituation auch mal gehört, dass ein französischer Schüler meinte: Ich habe einen ‚*brother*‘. Die anderen Schüler*innen haben ihn natürlich verstanden und fragten: Und wie alt ist dein ‚*brother*‘?‘* (German, English in single quotes: In an exchange situation, I once heard a French pupil say: I have a 'brother'. The German pupils understood him, of course, and asked: And how old is your 'brother'?) She pronounces the word brother with a strong French accent:

> *bradère*. The teacher trainees laugh. She resumes: *‚Die Schüler bekommen eine ‚prise de conscience' durch diese Aktivitäten. Sie lernen, dass man auch verstanden wird, obwohl man Fehler macht!'* (German and French in single quotes: The pupils 'become aware' through these activities. They learn that you can be understood even if you make mistakes!) (8, l.47-53).

"*Ich habe einen* brother"—was interpreted as a linguistic error, but also used by the teacher educator to promote an appreciative approach towards mistakes: despite the error, the meaning was understood. In this instance, English is treated both as an accessible linguistic resource and a sign of linguistic interference. In another case, a teacher educator explicitly corrected a trainee's use of the English term "mediation" insisting on its French equivalent "*médiation*" (8, l. 109-115); '*Braucht man denn immer das Englische*?' (German: Do we always need English?) (6, l. 129). Moritz Vogt also takes up this discourse and, after his seminar session, presents the analysis that the 2nd and 3rd foreign languages are dying out due to the omnipresence of English in schools (7, l. 301). These moments do not simply reflect didactic preferences, but reveal underlying anxieties about linguistic purity, prestige and hierarchies between languages and the legitimate use of language within foreign language education.

In the entire ethnographic data material, there is only one situation involving languages other than German, French, Spanish or English. The competency model of the new core curriculum for the federal state of Lower Saxony is analysed and discussed here:

> At the top of the model are the terms plurilingual competence and intercultural competence. Charlotte Baumert points to the terms and asks what is meant by *plurilingual competence*. Marie immediately brings up the keyword *Mehrsprachigkeitsdidaktik* (multilingual didactics): It's about a '*Verknüpfung zwischen verschiedenen Sprachen. Wenn zum Beispiel ein Schüler eine andere Muttersprache hat, sagen wir (zögert) Italienisch, kann ihm das im Französischunterricht helfen, um Wörter zu verstehen'* (German: It's about a link between different languages. For example, if a student has a different mother tongue, let's say (she hesitates) Italian, this can help them to understand words in French lessons'). (8, l. 117-125).

This data excerpt shows that plurilingual competence is understood by the teacher trainee Marie as an individual aid aimed at improving the learning of the target language, French. The fact that she specifically chooses Italian as an example—rather than the more frequently occurring community languages such as Arabic, Turkish, Kurdish, Russian, or Ukrainian—may have linguistic or typological reasons and aligns with the Romance Studies discourse on intercomprehension (Meißner, 2016) between different Romance languages. However, it can also be interpreted as an indication that other (less prestigious) languages are not perceived as resources, and that she deliberately selects a language where the "connection" is more obvious in order to reinforce her argument about resources. In doing so, plurilingual competence is reduced to the understanding of individual words.

These dynamics are interpreted as more than isolated practices. They point to a broader institutional logic that continues to privilege what Krumm (2014) calls “elite and poverty multilingualism,” while rendering community and migration-related languages invisible. The orientation towards prestigious languages taught in schools (e.g., Italian or English) reflects what Kropp (2020) identifies as the “school language effect”. The resulting “two-class multilingualism” (Küppers, 2022) divides languages and pupils into those deemed educationally legitimate and those silently excluded.

The assumption that German is always considered the "mother tongue" of all pupils is also evident in another instance—during a discussion about rhetorical devices in upper secondary French lessons (8, l. 145-150). It is stated that working on rhetorical devices in German lessons is entirely appropriate because it is the pupils’ native language, whereas in French lessons, this would be far too difficult—even though the words are quite similar: *métaphore (Metapher), parallélisme (Parallelismus), énumération* (enumeration in English, *Aufzählung* in German). This highlights that the so-called mother tongue is not understood as a transfer resource in the sense of a multilingual didactic approach, thereby portraying French as difficult and exotic.

Rather than interpreting these absences as accidental, they should be understood as effects of institutionalized language ideologies that shape what is sayable, hearable, and teachable in the context of foreign language education. All stakeholders seem to know that some languages have less worth on the linguistic market of school and teacher training. Making these dynamics visible requires attending not only to what is present in the data, but also to what is systematically left out.

Discussion: The linguistic market of 2nd phase teacher education

Foreign Language Teacher Trainees on the Linguistic Market

The central finding of this paper is that the monolingualism norm, which was presented as rather rigid in the interviews (Morris, 2025), is very soft in the data: monolingualism in the sense that only one variety of the target language is taught is not the case. Teachers (i.e. teacher trainees and teacher educators) translanguage repeatedly between languages, within languages and with the help of multimodal practices. In this way, whether consciously or unconsciously, they distance themselves from an ideology of purity.

Notably, this applies above all to the teachers, but not to the pupils, who are not supposed to ‘slip into German’ under any circumstances, especially during classroom visits. They are supposed to produce monolingual practices. This also reveals who holds interpretative authority in the classroom and has the power to impose language norms and restrictions: teacher trainees, who, however, are not entirely free in their actions due to their own positioning within power structures and still being subject to examination themselves. By analysing linguistic practices in this way, the hierarchy of people within the second phase of teacher training can be clearly traced. Bourdieu's theory of the linguistic market can thus be

extended: It does not only matter which linguistic goods are exchanged, but also who the speakers are. If it is the teacher trainees, then translingual practices are permitted because they themselves and the teacher educators determine the market. If it is the pupils who want to speak German, they are reprimanded (sometimes by their own classmates). This analysis is very much in line with the concept of the white listening subject (Flores and Rosa, 2015), who have worked out that it is not only the linguistic good (i.e. standard and prestige varieties in Bourdieu) that matters, but also who is speaking

The fact that teacher trainees occupy a dual role—both evaluating pupils' practices and being evaluated themselves—becomes evident in situations of classroom observations like under a magnifying glass. In this context, the monolingual norm applies much more strictly to pupils than in lessons that are not observed by teacher educators. The linguistic market therefore varies in different situations of the second phase, depending on who is participating in it at a given moment.

The Foreign Language Teaching Jargon

The concept of classroom French (Schädlich, 2022) and Spanish can also be taken further here: the term foreign language teaching jargon is proposed here to say that teachers (teacher trainees and teacher educators) master a very specific language variety, which consists in particular of adapting practices depending on the situation (topic and addressees). Classroom French and Spanish is part of this, a variety characterised by multimodal features such as walking around or pointing to the blackboard, the use of special cards, stuffed animals or specially invented signs (1x clapping, puffing out cheeks). In other settings, i.e., outside the classroom, entirely different practices emerge—for example, when discussing foreign language didactics at the teacher college. These discussions are carried out using a specific vocabulary within academic language practices that are both formal and but still translingual (e.g. *tarea final, activités avant, pendant, après, Kompetenzorientierung, steinbruchsartig*).

Rethinking Routinized Practices and the Persistence of the Language Teacher Habitus

At the same time, some ritualised practices of foreign language teaching jargon need to be questioned. If translanguaging (García & Li, 2014; Li, 2018) is to serve as a research-based and pedagogical approach or analytical tool in foreign language teaching (in the German context), then its emancipatory potential must be considered. Emancipation can mean breaking out of established linguistic norms and ideologies and recognising pupils' translingual repertoires as an integral part of foreign language learning. However, breaking free from established linguistic norms and ideologies can also mean questioning traditional practices, such as teaching grammar in German. In the data (including interview data from the project), teacher trainees repeatedly complain about pupils' lack of German proficiency and grammatical knowledge, with pupils language being described as "*Gossendeutsch*" (Gutter German) (Laura, 15). After all, "the school language is only the mother tongue for children from educated classes" (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 30). This suggests that a more

appropriate approach would be to adopt broader linguistic and multimodal practices when discussing grammar, rather than simply translating *prefijo* as *Präfix*.

It has become particularly clear with the teacher educator Moritz Vogt that he frequently implements more innovative approaches in his own teaching and within the Spanish seminar, but the teacher trainees continue to orientate themselves towards methods such as vocabulary tests in which individual lexemes are learnt in isolation. He is also more flexible in his approach to grammar instruction: "Even in Year 6, you can already teach grammar in Spanish—everyone understands *regla* and *gramática*!" (4, 214-217). This illustrates how a foreign language teaching habitus extends throughout a teacher's entire educational biography, with certain norms persisting despite new approaches and formats in both first and second phase of teacher training.

The Pupils' Languages: Missing Positions

The central category "b) Multilingualism as a (teaching) subject for promoting target language orientation" (see Table 2) could only be explored to a limited extent in this contribution. However, this is itself an important finding: if the ethnographic data reveal little multilingualism (beyond varieties of German, the target languages French and Spanish, as well as multimodal practices), this speaks volumes about the second phase of teacher education in the subjects of French and Spanish.

Apart from the above-mentioned implementation of single English words or phrases and the hypothetical case of an Italian native speaker, the pupils' other languages play no role in the situations observed. From a statistical point of view, it clearly can be assumed that some pupils who speak languages other than German and English attend foreign language lessons in the 2nd or 3rd foreign language. This certainly includes languages that are less prestigious than German, English, Spanish or French. The fact that this does not occur in the data corpus may be a coincidence. In agreement with Morris (2025), however, it can be assumed that it is a structural problem: The pupils' community languages are often not considered relevant for foreign language teaching, the teacher trainees are not aware of this multilingualism or they exclude these languages due to their own lack of proficiency. With the help of the Missing Positions in the Methodology of Situational Analysis (Clarke et al., 2018), this aspect could be analysed and discussed in subsequent contributions.

Conclusion and Outlook

This study has demonstrated the importance of a critical power analysis in understanding the linguistic norms and ideologies prevailing in the second phase of teacher training. It has been demonstrated how translingual and multimodal practices are integral to the everyday realities of foreign language teacher training, even as monolingual norms remain institutionally dominant—particularly for pupils. By applying concepts such as the linguistic market and the white listening subject, it becomes evident that not only the language used but also the speaker's position determines what is considered legitimate. Teacher trainees

occupy a dual role as both language enforcers and regulated subjects, revealing the layered power dynamics of the second phase of teacher education.

These findings highlight the need to rethink habitualised teaching practices and open space for genuinely inclusive, translingual approaches that reflect learners' full repertoires. As Gerlach (2024, p. 14) argues, changes in habitus can only occur at a structural level. Therefore, language awareness should be fostered at all phases of teacher training, including among teacher educators and university lecturers. Throughout all levels, the linguistic hierarchies and as consequence devaluation mechanisms of pupils speaking certain varieties within the linguistic market should be critically examined. In foreign language education, this means that future teachers should move away from the still-prevalent ideal of the native speaker (Schmenk, 2022). Instead, university language courses should focus on equipping prospective teachers with the skills to use their full multimodal linguistic repertoire (in the target language) to engage students from diverse linguistic and social backgrounds.

Further research may reconstruct pupil-based practices, which have only been marginally addressed in this paper. Beyond that, future observations could specifically focus on lessons that explicitly address multilingualism. Another aspect that emerged in the data, albeit too infrequently to be analysed in detail, is the role of linguistic varieties within the target languages. How are non-European, non-standard varieties of French and Spanish treated? Are teacher trainees encouraged to teach Castilian and Hexagonal norms? Are different varieties represented in the classroom through audio materials and literary works, and if so, how are they framed? Finally, more attention should be given to the languages spoken by the pupils. These languages remain invisible in the current dataset, a gap that traditional Grounded Theory methods tend to reinforce. To address this missing position, future research will apply the postmodern extension of Grounded Theory—Situational Analysis by Clarke et al. (2018). This approach will also engage with the paradox that foreign language education promotes multilingualism as a goal (in the cases of English, French, Spanish etc.) while simultaneously restricting it as a precondition (concerning the pupils' community languages).

Conflict of interests

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research.

References

Anderson-Park, E., & Abs, H. J. (2020). Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung im Vorbereitungsdienst. In C. Cramer, J. König, M. Rothland, & S. Blömeke (Eds.), Handbuch Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung (pp. 332–338). Verlag Julius Klinkhardt. https://doi.org/10.35468/hblb2020-038

Benholz, C., Reimann, D., Reschke, M., Strobl, J., & Venus, T. (2017). Sprachbildung und Mehrsprachigkeit in der Lehrerbildung – eine Befragung von Lehramtsstudierenden

des Zusatzzertifikats „Sprachbildung in mehrsprachiger Ge- sellschaft“ an der Universität Duisburg-Essen. Zielsprache Deutsch, 1, 5–36.

Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), Language, power and social process: Bd. 2. Language Ideological Debates (pp. 1–38). De Gruyter Mouton.

Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2020). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide* (2nd edition). Multilingual Matters.

Butzkamm, W. (1978). Aufgeklärte Einsprachigkeit. Zur Entdogmatisierung der Methode im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Springer.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.). Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Wie die Kultur zum Bauern kommt*. VSA.

Clarke, A. E., Friese, C., & Washburn, R. (2018). *Situational analysis. Grounded theory after the interpretive turn*. Sage.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Fäcke, C. (2017). *Fachdidaktik Französisch: Eine Einführung*. Narr Francke Attempto.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *85*(2), 149–171.

García, O., & Li Wei (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kxp/detail.action?docID=4000846 https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *18*(3), 203–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1935957

Gerlach, D. (2020). *Zur Professionalität der Professionalisierenden: Was machen Lehrerbildner*innen im fremdsprachendidaktischen Vorbereitungsdienst? Giessener Beiträge zur Fremdsprachendidaktik*. Narr Francke Attempto.

Gerlach, D. (2024). The (im)possible mission of language teacher educators in Germany: Identity formation, development, and practice in institutionalised settings. *TESOL Journal*, *15*(4), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.878

Gogolin, I. (1994). *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Waxmann.

Heyder, K., & Schädlich, B. (2014). Mehrsprachigkeit und Mehrkulturalität: eine Umfrage unter Fremdsprachenlehrkräften in Niedersachsen. *Zeitschrift Für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht*, *19*(1), 183–201.

Knappik, M., & Ayten, A. C. (2021). Was ist die beste Sprache? Zur Rassismusrelevanz der Ungleichmachung von Sprachen. In K. Fereidooni & N. Simon (Eds.), *Pädagogische*

Professionalität und Migrationsdiskurse. Rassismuskritische Fachdidaktiken: Theoretische Reflexionen und fachdidaktische Entwürfe rassismuskritischer Unterrichtsplanung (pp. 233–266). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-26344-7

Kropp, A. (2015). Vorsprung durch Vorwissen: Das Potenzial von Transferleistungen für die Nutzung herkunftsbedingter Mehrsprachigkeit im schulischen Fremsprachenunterricht. In S. Witzigmann & J. Rymarczyk (Eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit als Chance. Herausforderungen und Potentiale individueller und gesellschaftlicher Mehrsprachigkeit* (pp. 165–183). Lang.

Krumm, H.-J. (2014). Elite- oder Armutsmehrsprachigkeit: Herausforderungen für das österreichische Bildungswesen. In A. Wegner & E. Vetter (Eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit und Professionalisierung in pädagogischen Berufen: Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zu aktuellen Herausforderungen im Bildungsbereich* (pp. 23–40). Budrich UniPress.

Küppers, A. (2022). Sprachenlernen in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft. Oder: Braucht eine offene Gesellschaft ein offenes Fremdsprachencurriculum? In A. Bergmann, C. O. Mayer, & J. Plikat (Eds.), *Kolloquium Fremdsprachenunterricht: Band 68. Perspektiven der Schulfremdsprachen in Zeiten von "Global English" und Digitalisierung: Welche Zielsetzungen sind für Französisch, Spanisch, Russisch & Co. (noch) zeitgemäß?* (pp. 103–132). Peter Lang. DOI 10.3726/b19377

Li Wei (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Meißner, F.-J. (2016). Interkomprehension. In E. Burwitz-Melzer, G. Mehlhorn, C. Riemer, K.-R. Bausch, & H.-J. Krumm (Eds.), *UTB: Vol. 8043. Handbuch Fremdsprachenunterricht* (6., völlig überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, pp. 234–240). A. Francke Verlag.

Méron-Minuth, S. (2018). *Mehrsprachigkeit im Fremdsprachenunterricht: Eine qualitativ-empirische Studie zu Einstellungen von Fremdsprachenlehrerinnen und -lehrern. Giessener Beiträge zur Fremdsprachendidaktik*. Narr Francke Attempto. http://www.narr-shop.de/mehrsprachigkeit-im-fremdsprachenunterricht.html

Ministerium für Schule und Berufsbildung des Landes Schleswig-Holstein (2016). *Leitfaden zu den Fachanforderungen Französisch. Allgemein bildende Schulen/ Sekundarstufe I.*

Morris, P. L. (2023). "es wird zwar gesagt: ‚Unterstützen Sie Mehrsprachigkeit', […] aber ich weiß einfach nicht wie"– Eine Interviewstudie mit türkeistämmigen angehenden Französischlehrkräften. *k:ON - Kölner Online Journal für Lehrer*innenbildung*, 2, 134–152. https://doi.org/10.18716/ojs/kON/2023.s.8

Morris, P. L. (2025). Zwischen dem Einhalten einer monolingualen Norm und dem Einbringen mehrsprachiger Ressourcen: Eine Heuristik zur Analyse sprachlicher Praktiken im vorbereitungsdienstlichen Französisch- und Spanischunterricht. *FLuL Fremdsprachen Lehren Und Lernen*, *54*(1), 89–104. DOI 10.24053/FLuL-2025-0007

Panagiotopoulou, A., & Rosen, L. (2016). Sprachen werden benutzt, „um sich auch gewissermaßen abzugrenzen von anderen Menschen“: Lehramtsstudierende mit Migrationshintergrund plädieren für einsprachiges Handeln im schulischen Kontext. In T. Geier & K. U. Zaborowski (Eds.), *Studien zur Schulund Bildungsforschung: Vol. 51. Migration: Auflösungen und Grenzziehungen: Perspektiven einer erziehungswissenschaftlichen Migrationsforschung* (pp. 169–190). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Pennycook, A. (2017). Translanguaging and semiotic assemblages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *14*(3), 269–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2017.1315810

Reckwitz, A. (2003). Grundelemente einer Theorie sozialer Praktiken. Eine sozialtheoretische Perspektive. *Zeitschrift Für Soziologie*, *32*(4), 282–301.

Schädlich, B. (2022). Unterrichtssprache(n) – Sprache(n) im Unterricht: Beobachtungen zum Umhergehen als mehrsprachige Praktik des Französischunterrichts. *Zeitschrift Für Rekonstruktive Fremdsprachenforschung*, *3*, 73–88.

Schmenk, B. (2022). Das Native-Speaker-Konstrukt im Fokus. Kritik und Kontroversen. *ZFF Zeitschrift Für Fremdsprachenforschung*, *33*(2), 163–188.

Schnitzer, A. (2017). *Mehrsprachigkeit als soziale Praxis: (Re-)Konstruktionen von Differenz und Zugehörigkeit unter Jugendlichen im mehrsprachigen Kontext*. Dissertation (1. Auflage). *Bildungssoziologische Beiträge*. Beltz Juventa.

Steininger, I. (2021). Grounded Theory als Forschungsstil im Fremdsprachenunterricht: Zur Rekonstruktion sozio-kultureller Prozesse durch ein kodifizierendes Verfahren. *Zeitschrift Für Rekonstruktive Fremdsprachenforschung*(2), 110–123.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1996). *Grounded theory: Grundlagen qualitativer Sozialforschung*. Beltz PsychologieVerlagsUnion.

Terhart, E. (2021). „Lehrerbildner“ – auf der Suche nach einer verlorenen Profession. *Zeitschrift für Schul- und Professionsentwicklung*, *3*(5), 26–37. https://doi.org/10.11576/pflb-4775

Weichselbaum, M. (2022). „Dann rede ich mit ihr heimlich auf Türkisch“ – Elementarpädagogische Praxis in sprachlichen Differenzverhältnissen. In Y. Akbaba, T. Buchner, A. M. Heinemann, & D. Pokitsch (Eds.), *Pädagogische Professionalität und Migrationsdiskurse. Lehren und Lernen in Differenzverhältnissen: Interdisziplinäre und Intersektionale Betrachtungen* (pp. 323–345). Springer VS.