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SUMMARY

Previous research on incidental vocabulary learning has examined how participants gained vocabulary knowledge mostly through reading tasks (Ferrell Tekmen & Daloglu, 2006; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Kweo & Kim, 2008; Peters, Hulstijn, Sercu, & Lutjeharm, 2009; Eckerth & Tavakoli, 2012). Few studies, conversely, have been conducted on how incidental vocabulary can be gained through a communicative task (Newton, 1995, 2013). Even a smaller number of these studies have considered incidental vocabulary learning though communicative tasks in the German language classroom.

Expanding the research of Newton (1995), this study examines how incidental vocabulary can be gained through communicative and reading tasks in three seminars of intensive German with participants from the beginner level. Data from pre- and post-tests were analyzed using a 2x2 repeated measure within subject ANOVA. Results showed significant differences for receptive vocabulary knowledge between pre- and post-test for both groups. Furthermore, the results on receptive vocabulary knowledge showed a significant interaction between the groups, indicating that the communicative task participants gained on average more words than the participants from the reading group. The productive task showed no significant difference for either group. However, it showed a significant interaction indicating that participants from the communicative task were on average better able to use their receptive knowledge of the words in the productive task, while the participants from the reading group could not make this transfer. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that both tasks, reading and communicative, are useful tools for incidental word learning.

Keywords: incidental vocabulary learning, communicative approach, reading in a foreign language
1. INTRODUCTION

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers generally acknowledge two facts: first, one has to know about 8,000-9,000 word families\(^1\) to be proficient\(^2\) in a language (Nation, 2006) and, second, not all of these words can be learned explicitly. Consequently, SLA research has started to explore new approaches to language acquisition. Based on assumptions from first language research literature, it has shifted its attention to how native speakers’ vocabulary knowledge has been acquired incidentally. To explore this assumption, much of SLA lexical research has focused on incidental word learning through reading and found, quite successfully, that vocabulary items were acquired as such. However, while reading can be done outside of a language classroom, the following question remains pedagogically relevant: Can incidental word learning also take place during the time spent in the classroom? This is a significant question, considering that in the communicative language classroom much of the class time is spent on interactive and information exchange tasks.

Communication provides a potential for word learning through the input that the learner receives from the task material or from their communication partners and the output that they have to provide. Thus, during the interaction the learner might encounter new vocabulary words and has to first find out what the words mean in order to respond. Furthermore, communicative tasks provide opportunities for the learner to test and deepen their knowledge of a word and use it in context when talking to a partner.

---

1 These numbers represent the receptive English language vocabulary knowledge of highly educated non-native English speakers (Nation, 2006).
2 Proficient here is defined as the ability to read, watch movies, or take part in a conversation (Nation, 2006).
Nevertheless, only few studies have looked at incidental vocabulary learning through communicative output tasks. Incidental vocabulary learning is defined as the “learning of one thing, e.g., vocabulary, when the learner’s primary objective is to do something else, e.g. to communicate” (Schmidt, 1994). Some studies (Ellis & He, 1999; Newton, 1995, 2013) found that output tasks lead to word learning. The aim of the current study is to explore whether second semester foreign language students of German learn vocabulary incidentally through a communicative opinion gap task. Additionally, the results will be compared to a control group, in which the participants read a story that include the same target words.
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Output and Interaction Hypothesis

Producing the target language through meaningful output is a vital part of learning a language. Communicative tasks push the learners to produce output and give opportunities for meaningful practice (Swain, 1993). Additionally, if the learner is pushed to produce the language, it is probable that he or she might move from semantic to syntactic processing (Swain, 1993). Swain outlines three aspects of language production in his Output Hypothesis: noticing, responding, and hypothesis testing. During communicative interaction, the learners may notice their gap of knowledge, e.g., that they do not know a word. According to Swain, the learner has three ways of respond to the knowledge gap. First, the learners can ignore the gap of knowledge, especially if they still understand the message. Second, they may identify their gap and search through their own linguistic knowledge for an answer. Third, they may identify the gap and pay attention to new input to find the answer. Based on these responses, the learner may form a hypothesis and test it during a communicative exchange.

Michael Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (1980) further supports the need for communicative exchanges in order to acquire a language. In this hypothesis, Long stresses that through repetition, comprehension checks, or clarification requests the learner is able to address his or her knowledge gaps (Gass & Selinker, 2008). Similar to Long, Swain explains that once the learners notice the knowledge gap they can formulate a hypothesis and use communication to test their hypothesis. Based on the feedback that the learners receive from either their peers or their teacher, they can then recognize that their hypothesis is correct or incorrect. In the foreign language classroom, learners
interact with each other during communicative tasks, thus the interaction is typically between two non-native speakers. Past research has shown that significant negotiation of meaning can occur in these non-native speaker interaction (Varonis & Gass, 1985). This is possible because the learners do not feel pressure or intimidation when speaking to a non-native peer.

2.2. Research Studies

Research studies on incidental vocabulary learning through communication tasks are sparse. In two empirical studies, Newton (1995, 2013) implemented communication tasks and measured the acquisition of incidental vocabulary learning. Newton’s (1995) research was based on a case study of an English second language learner from Taiwan, studying in New Zealand. The participant was chosen because he had recently immigrated to New Zealand and scored the lowest on the vocabulary pre-test. Newton administered six communicative tasks over a period of eight days within a second language classroom. This study will highlight here four of the six communicative tasks that Newton implemented. Two of these tasks were split information tasks\(^3\) in which the interlocutors had to exchange information to complete their worksheet and the other two were shared information tasks\(^4\) in which the participants had to solve a problem by consensus. The pre- and post-test assessed receptive knowledge by asking the participant to translate, define, paraphrase, give examples or draw a picture of the words presented.

\(^3\) In the split information task the participants were required to exchange information to complete a worksheet (Newton, 1995).

\(^4\) The shared information task required the participants to solve a problem by consensus (Newton, 1995).
The results of the pre- and post-test showed that the participant gained receptive knowledge of 21 vocabulary words. The results supported Newton’s hypothesis that vocabulary knowledge can be acquired through a communicative task, in which attention is placed on carrying out a task and not on vocabulary learning per se. In addition, Newton investigated if the task type influenced incidental vocabulary learning and found that the participant learned more vocabulary words from the shared information task as compared to the split information task. The researcher explained these findings as a result of greater freedom to participate and to be selective in the information that was discussed during the shared information task. The two shared information tasks were as follows: the students were provided with information on both redesigning a zoo as well as the issue of heart transplants. But they were only required to understand the information given about one of the problems, either with the current zoo layout or the situation of different hospital patients to complete the task. In contrast, the split information tasks were also about a zoo and surgery but the students had to exchange information by asking and answering questions in order to gather missing information and to finish the task. Newton pointed out that, during the split information tasks, the participant had to use all of the target vocabulary to exchange missing information and complete the task, but was often not required to understand the meaning of certain words. That is, the post-test and transcripts suggested that the participant processed some words more deeply than others (Newton, 1995). Newton associated a deeper level of processing with word retention, which depended upon how essential the word was to the communication and what it contributed to the task. Newton provides two-examples from the transcripts of his study. In the first example, from the split information task, Newton shows that the learner
processed the target word on a shallow level by focusing only on the pronunciation of the word (1995). In the second example, Newton explains that a deeper level of processing of words is seen, since the learner talked about the meaning of the word in a specific context (1995).

Newton’s (2013) second study about incidental vocabulary learning through communicative tasks includes the same four tasks as his 1995 study: two information gap⁵ and two opinion gap⁶ tasks. Newton’s research participants were eight low-intermediate level English second language learners with different first languages (Cantonese, Farsi, Indonesian, Mandarin, and Japanese). The participants were enrolled in a 12-week intensive academic English language program at a University in New Zealand. Two groups were formed by the researcher, each containing two male and two female participants. When forming the groups, the researcher ensured that each participant of a group spoke a different first language. With this study, Newton investigated how learners responded to unfamiliar words, the accuracy⁷ of word negotiation between learners, the impact of task type on word negotiation, and whether participants learned the meaning of unfamiliar words through communication tasks (Newton, 2013). Receptive word knowledge was measured using a pre- and post-test in

---

⁵ The information gap task was a two-way information exchange in which the participants were required to share the information. It included a convergent goal orientation and a single closed outcome for all members of the group. Each participant’s contribution was essential to the successful completion of this task. (Newton, 2013)

⁶ The opinion gap task involved a two-way optional information flow, a convergent goal orientation and multiple open outcome options. While the participants shared the same information, they had to reach consensus on a task outcome. All learners were expected to participate, but neither participation nor comprehension was essential for completing the task. (Newton, 2013).

⁷ Accuracy of word negotiation was defined as any response that provided relevant information about the meaning of the word, regardless of the amount or level of specificity of this information (Newton, 2013).
which the participants were instructed to translate or define words. Additionally, four hours of video and audio recordings were transcribed and analyzed. The results showed differences in negotiation patterns based on the task type. Participants spent more time focusing on aspects of spelling and pronunciation in the information gap task, while in the opinion gap task they spent more time on negotiating the meaning of words (Newton, 2013). Furthermore, in both tasks the participants were able to provide accurate information on word meaning to each other, but they negotiated the meaning for only a small number of unfamiliar words (Newton, 2013). In conclusion, Newton pointed out that words, which were negotiated for meaning, showed a higher chance of retention, nevertheless his data suggested that participants learned many more words that were not negotiated (Newton, 2013). Newton explains that the attention of the learners and researchers was focused on dialogic exchanges attending to communication problems and thus non-problematic interactions were disregarded. A non-problematic interaction is an interaction in which the learner acquires the meaning of a word without a communication break down or a clarification request.

Significant to Newton’s research studies is that his participants were second language learners. Conducting vocabulary studies with second language learners increases the risk of environmental variables such as the exposure of vocabulary words in the everyday lives of the participants. Newton administered a delayed post-test in both of his studies, which was implemented three days after the last task in the 1995 study and one day after the last task in the 2013 study. During the time of the last task and the delayed post-test, the participants might have received additional exposure, repetition and deeper word processing through their everyday lives or by talking to their peers outside
of the classroom. Another limitation of Newton’s 1995 and 2013 study was the small size of participants. His case study from 1995 and the 2013 study with eight participants provides only a small and individualized set of data.

The current study is built upon Newton’s 1999 research to investigate if and how much incidental word gain occurs using a communicative task. The task chosen is an opinion gap task because Newton’s results showed that participants learned more words incidentally during this type of task than during the information gap task. The participants in this study will have access to the same information and they can choose which information should be discussed. Furthermore, an opinion gap task will allow each individual to participate in a conversation without taking turns to exchange information, as is the case in an information gap task. In the current study, the results of incidental vocabulary gain through the communicative problem-solving task will then be compared to the results of a reading only task. This comparison is done to investigate if a communicative output task can lead to more acquisition than an input reading task.

2.3. Input and Production Tasks on Vocabulary Learning

The following section provides a brief overview of research studies on aspects of incidental vocabulary learning through input reading tasks as well as a review of two studies, one addressing incidental vocabulary learning through reading and the other study comparing input and productive-based tasks for vocabulary acquisition.

The current study includes a reading task for the control group since input tasks, such as reading, have been shown to be beneficial in terms of vocabulary learning (e.g. Eckerth & Tavakoli, 2012; Ferrell Tekmen & Daloglu, 2006; Kweon & Kim, 2008;
Peters, Hulstijn, Sercu, & Lutjeharms, 2009; Pigada & Schmitt, 2006; Rott, 1999; Swanborn & Glopper, 1999). A positive aspect of reading tasks is that learners can spend as much time as they need to process unknown words or even re-read sentences and paragraphs. However, the difficulty of providing adequate reading texts is that learners need to understand 95-98% of the words in the text to be able to infer the meaning of unknown words (Rott, 2011). Furthermore, learners might not notice the unknown word during reading or notice it, but are unable to infer its meaning due to insufficient clues (Rott, 2011). Another possible limitation is that the learner might misunderstand the lexical item due to cognates or similarity in its lexical form with another word (Laufer, 2003). In order to ensure that L2 readers assign the correct meaning to the word form, research has explored the effect of glosses and access to a dictionary. Glosses and dictionaries allow learners to look up the meaning of a word, its phonological attributions, and possible collocations. Nevertheless, the question remains of how many words students can look up in a dictionary without interfering with the text comprehension. Furthermore, the use of a dictionary or glosses might cause the students’ attention to simply look at the meaning of the word to understand the content of the text as opposed to pushing him or her to process the word at a deeper level.

In their seminal study, Horst, Cobb, and Meara (1998) investigated whether or not learners can acquire word meaning from context. Their study was a partial replication study of Burgess (1972) *A Clockwork Orange* research. Horst et al. used a 109-page book to investigate, first if reading a simple novel can increase word knowledge, second if words that occur more frequently in the text or in the language are more likely to be learned, and third if learners with more vocabulary knowledge learn more words (1998).
The participants were 34 low-intermediate students from two intensive English classes at a University in Oman. The entire story was read aloud by the teacher, while the students followed along in their books. It took six class sessions of about one hour each to read the entire text. Reading the text out loud provided opportunities for incidental word learning by precluding opportunities for intentional word learning. In other words, the participant’s attention was focused on the events of the story and this allowed the text itself to function as a support for the learning of new words (Horst et al., 1998). The texts were collected after each session to prevent the students from looking up words outside the classroom sessions. There were 45 target words, described as base words and included for example “furniture” and “companion”. The word knowledge of the target words was tested one week before the experiment via a pre-test with 45 multiple choice and 13 word association items. The pre-test results showed that an average of 22 words were already known by the students, leaving 23 words available for possible incidental learning. The results from the post-test showed a mean gain of 4.62 (SD 4.08), meaning that the participant’s average pick-up rate of a new word was one in every five. In addition, the word association items on the post-test showed a mean gain of 1.28 and the authors suggested that this “fairly modest difference is more substantial than it appears” since it may represent a more complex type of word knowledge than recognition of correct multiple-choice definitions (Horst et al., 1998). Furthermore, the researchers found that sizable learning gains occurred when words appear eight times or more (Horst et al., 1998). The overall frequency of words in the English language did not account for learning gains, which suggests that “high frequency words were not necessarily learned more readily” (Horst et al., 1998). Finally, the researchers found that a higher knowledge
of vocabulary helped in acquiring new words, but the relationship was not strong (Horst et al., 1998). As a whole, this research study showed that the participants were able to acquire a small amount of vocabulary words incidentally by focusing their attention on the story.

While Horst et al. (1998) focused on reading and listening, Shintani’s 2011 study focused on listening (input) and speaking (output). She was interested in comparing input and output tasks as it relates to vocabulary learning. Her participants were thirty-six students from a private English school in Japan between the ages of six and eight. She divided her participants into three groups to measure vocabulary acquisition: one group received input, one group participated in an output task, and the last group was the control group. Her research questions investigated if both input and output-based activities lead to learning new vocabulary, as well as if one type of task leads to more newly acquired words than the other.

The input-based group had three different tasks. In the first task, the students listened to the teacher’s commands and then chose an item from a deck of cards that corresponded to the command. In the second task, the students heard a sentence from the instructor and had to find the pair of cards that corresponded to the sentence. For example, with the phrase “The polar bear needs the battery”, the students had to find and pick up the cards showing a polar bear and a battery (Shintani, 2011). The last task for the input-based group was a picture bingo game in which the students had to identify the card that corresponded with the word that the teachers said.

The exercises for the output-task group included five different tasks. The first task was a “listen and repeat exercise” where the students were presented with eight
flashcards that each had a target vocabulary item. In the second, third, fourth, and fifth
tasks, the students did different activities but had to name the flashcards one by one. All
of the students said the word on the flashcard out loud and if a student provided the
wrong answer the instructor gave feedback using recasts. The control group also
received three activities: English songs, total physical response, and alphabet practice;
however this group was not exposed to any target words. The vocabulary gain was
measured in regards to two different aspects, production and comprehension, both of
which contained a pre-, post- and delayed post-test. The testing material included a
multiple-choice listening component, a category task test also called a listen-and-do
task, a discrete-item production test, and a two-way information-gap task. The researcher administered each test. The results of the tests showed a significant difference
in word knowledge from the pre-, to post-test as well as for the delayed post-test for the
input-based and productive-based groups. The control group did not show a significant
difference from the pre-, to the post-, and delayed post-test. There was no significant
difference found between the input-based and productive-based groups in regards to the
multiple-choice, discrete-item production and two-way information test. However, the
input-based group significantly outperformed the productive-based group in the post- and

8. The multiple-choice listening test asked to participants to listen to an audio-recoded
word and choose the corresponding picture from six pictures. The test contained 40
questions that included 24 target items and 16 distractors.
9. In the listen-and-do task the participants listened to a sentence and decide in which of
four given situation (fruit and vegetable, kitchen, bathroom, and zoo) each sentence had
been said (Shintani, 2011).
10. In the discrete-item production test the participants named each flashcard with 24
target vocabulary items.
11. In the two-way information-gap task the participant and researcher had a different
sheet showing 24 pictures of objects. The participants were asked to name the objects
and the researcher checked for correctness. Matching and difference in picture and object
were marked with symbols on their own (Shintani, 2011).
delayed post-test of the listen-and-do test. The researcher accounted this difference to the fact that the teacher predominantly provided the target words in sentences for the input-based group, whereas the productive-based group received the target words in an isolated manner. This finding indicates that participants perform better on tests that are the same type as the instruction that the participants receive (Shintani, 2011).

A limitation to Shintani’s (2011) study is that individual words were presented during the listening tasks. The vocabulary items were presented and practiced in a decontextualized way, which might explain why the results of the study showed no significant difference between the input- and output tasks. If the words were to be learned within context the results for the input and output tasks might have been different. The context might help the learners to connect the words with previous knowledge and give them a situation in which the item could be used, thus allowing for a deeper level of processing.

To summarize, theoretical concepts outline that output has a strong potential for learning. Swain’s Output Hypothesis (1993) and Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (1998) provide the theoretical processes of learning. As outlined above, studies on input tasks, such as reading and listing, resulted in incidental vocabulary gain. Nevertheless, not a lot of research has been conducted about incidental word learning through a communicative output task. The few studies addressing incidental word learning through output tasks have resulted in unclear findings.
2.4. Motivation of the Study

Considering the unclear findings of incidental vocabulary learning through communicative output tasks, the aim of this current study is to develop more insight into incidental vocabulary learning. Furthermore, while the research reviewed above has focused on English for second language learners, the current investigation looks at German foreign language learners. Expanding upon Newton’s (1995) case study about incidental vocabulary learning through task-based interaction, this study examines incidental vocabulary learning through a communicative problem-solving activity. Accordingly, the current study is set up with an experimental group that completed a communicative output task and a control group with an input reading task. The control group with an input reading task served as a reference to compare the results with the experimental group. The results for both groups were measured and compared via a vocabulary pre- and post-test.

2.5. Significance of the Study

Research on incidental vocabulary acquisition through communicative tasks is needed considering that the communicative language teaching approach is the most popular approach within the language-teaching context. In addition, a comparison between an input reading versus a communicative output task is beneficial in terms of finding out if students’ incidental vocabulary learning benefits more through one or the other. Considering that classroom language teaching is set up to facilitate communicative interaction between learners, teachers can include previously unfamiliar vocabulary words into these communicative tasks so that learners can negotiate the meaning and
acquire the new lexical items. The participants in past research studies, including Newton’s research, were often times second language learners who learned the language while living in the country where it was spoken. Therefore, in the current study the participants are foreign language learners who learn the language while attending college.

2.6. Research Question:

Based on the review of the above mentioned literature and previous studies on incidental vocabulary acquisition the following research question has been developed:

1. Does a communicative output task lead to more incidental word gain than an input-based reading task?
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURE

3.1. Participants

The participants for this study came from three second semester German classes at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Data was collected in the beginning of the eighth week of the Fall 2012 term. Taken together there were 29 participants, 10 participants in the control group and 19 participants in the experimental group. Of these 29 participants, 18 were male and 11 female. All participants were undergraduates between the ages of 18 to 33 with a mean age of 22. Six of them spoke more than one language fluently since they grew up in a bilingual home, including two students who came to the US when they were seven and eight years of age. In addition, seven students had learned another language before they started to take German.

The uncontrolled aspects of this study, besides the knowledge of another language, included the motivation and reason for learning German. Through a background questionnaire (appendix B), the participant’s motivation for learning German was explored. For ten participants, taking German was simply a required university elective; twelve participants were taking the course because they believed the language to be useful to their personal development; the third most common reason, as indicated by eleven participants, was for educational purposes.

3.2. Materials

The following materials were used to conduct the study: (I) a Background Questionnaire (appendix A); (II) a pre-test containing twelve distractor and eight target words (appendix B); (III) a materials package for the experimental group which consisted
of a communicative task with instructions on how to complete the task, including a map of downtown Stuttgart and a voice recorder (appendix C and D); (IV) a materials package for the control group, which consisted of a reading text and a separate sheet after the reading with questions about the content of the text (appendix E and F); (V) a vocabulary post-test (appendix G), which was the same as the pre-test plus an additional fill-in the blank exercise for target and distractor words. All of the testing materials used for the pre-/post-test and the individual tasks for both groups were in German. The researcher, who is an experienced teacher of the second semester German class, developed all of the materials.

The data for this study were collected during regular class time. Therefore, it was important to develop tasks that corresponded with the content of the participant’s course material in order to prevent conflicts between the material of the study and the second semester German course material. In addition, using chapter related material allowed for the control of what the participants had learned in class already and what they would learn in the following weeks. The materials for the tasks were developed based on the textbook *Vorsprung* by Lovik, Guy, & Chavez (2007) being used in this course. By the time the data was collected the participants were about to start with a new chapter in the course textbook *Vorsprung*. Therefore, the theme and vocabulary for this study was designed to match the chapter from the textbook *Vorsprung*. The chapter theme of *Vorsprung* is *Man kann alles in der Stadt finden* (one can find everything in the city), including aspects of giving and receiving directions with vocabulary words that cover: building names, public transportation, traffic laws, and a grammar aspect addressing prepositions. Since the chapter focused on the city of Stuttgart, the tasks were
thematically tailored for this city. The communicative task of the experimental group required the participants to design a new downtown area of Stuttgart. The reading task, conversely, of the control group, was about a girl who visited the downtown of Stuttgart. None of the task materials were accompanied by a dictionary or gloss. Instead the students had to infer the meaning of the words from context, somewhat resembling Horst et al. (1998) study.

3.2.1. Target and Distractor Words

The communicative and reading tasks included the same eight target vocabulary words and twelve distractor words as shown in Table I. The target vocabulary words included four nouns, one adjective, and three prepositions. Zebrastreifen (crosswalk) was one of the target vocabulary nouns that was categorized as a non-cognate compound word. The individual words, Zebra (zebra) and streifen (stripes) are cognates, but the meaning of the word Zebrastreifen implies more than just zebra stripes. The other two nouns, Springbrunnen (fountain) and Einbahnstraße (one-way street), are compound words.

The distracter words were twelve nouns that included four genuine cognates, e.g. Supermarkt (supermarket), and compound words e.g. Straßenbahn (train).


Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Words</th>
<th>Distracter Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zebrastreifen (crosswalk)</td>
<td>Bäcker (baker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einbahnstraße (one-way street)</td>
<td>Getränkeautomat (vending machine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbrunnen (fountain)</td>
<td>Zeitungsstand (newspaper stand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampel (traffic light)</td>
<td>Innenstadt (downtown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geradeaus (straight ahead)</td>
<td>Bücherei (library)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwischen (between)</td>
<td>Marktplatz (market square)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter (under)</td>
<td>Supermarkt (supermarket)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neben (next to)</td>
<td>Fleischerei (butcher shop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fußballplatz (soccer field)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitnessstudio (gym)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schwimmbad (swimming pool)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straßenbahn (train)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 8 | 12 |

3.2.2. Communicative Task

In the communicative task, the participants were asked to redesign the downtown area of Stuttgart using nine wishes from the residences of Stuttgart as guidelines. To complete the communicative task, participants received a sheet with instructions of the task and the nine wishes for changes to the city plan of Stuttgart as well as a labeled map of Stuttgart (appendix D and E). The instructions informed the students that they had 30 minutes to complete the task. The map included labels of buildings and street features. The nine wishes, each expressed in one sentence, were used to present the participants with a problem. The participants then had to solve the problem by discussing where and what places or objects needed to be moved or added on the map to solve the issue. The
nine wishes included an overall of five target words, meaning that not every wish contained a target word\textsuperscript{12}. The following is an example of a wish:

\textit{Klaus denkt, dass es nicht genug Ampeln und Zebrastreifen für die Fußgänger gibt.} (Klaus thinks that there are not enough traffic lights and crosswalks for the pedestrians)

In this scenario, the participants had to add traffic lights and crosswalks into the downtown area of Stuttgart and were asked to find places where they would put them. In this example both words \textit{Ampel} (traffic light) and \textit{Zebrastreifen} (crosswalk) are target words.

In addition to the above-mentioned materials, there were ten voice recorders used to record the interactions between the participants. Each pair of the communicative task groups received one voice recorder. All voice recorders were turned on and off at the same time to make sure that the entire interaction between the participants was recorded. The researcher transcribed the recordings.

\textbf{3.2.3. Reading Task}

In the reading task group (control group), the participants were asked to read a text that was comprised of 759 words. In addition, the participants were informed that they had 20 minutes to read the text for content comprehension. After reading the text the participants were asked to answer comprehension questions without having access to the text. If the participants did not know vocabulary items, they had to infer the meaning based on the content and clues given in the reading text (appendix F). However, the

\textsuperscript{12} The limitation section addresses why not every wish contained a target word.
participants were not prompted to infer meaning from the context. The reading text was a blog entry about Barbara, a student in Germany who visited downtown Stuttgart. The main content in her blog entry was about how she traveled to Stuttgart’s downtown area, where she ate, and what she saw and did in Stuttgart. The eight follow-up comprehension questions were in a multiple-choice format (appendix G) and focused on the main ideas of the text. The following is an example of one of the questions:

Wie ist Barbara zum Marktplatz gekommen?
(How did Barbara get to the market square?)
A. Sie ist gelaufen (She walked)
B. Sie ist mit der Straßenbahn gefahren (She took the train)
C. Sie ist mit dem Bus gefahren (She took the bus)
D. Sie ist mit einem Auto gefahren (She came by car)

To control the kind and amount of information that the participants were given about the target words, the follow up content question did not include any of the target words. They did however include four distractor words. As we can see in the example, a distractor word was Straßenbahn (train). The participants did not have access to the reading text when they answered the multiple-choice content questions.

3.2.4. Pre-Test

The pre-test (appendix B) measured the receptive word knowledge of the participants since they were asked to translate or describe the words from German into English. Besides the target and distractor words, the pre-test included thirteen additional words. These additional words appeared in either the communicative or reading task and were therefore not included into the analysis of word negotiation or word gain; however they were in the pre- and post-test. The vocabulary words were randomly mixed into the
pre-test, except for the prepositions, which were kept together at the end of the test in order to help the participants identify the different meaning for each of the items. For the pre and post-test, the participants were asked to either translate or describe the given German words into English, even if they had only a vague idea about the word.

To determine target word knowledge before the experimental treatment, the pre-test was given to all the participants (see Table II). There was not one target word that was known by all the participants in both groups. There were however seven participants in the communicative task group and five participants in the reading task group who knew some of the target words already. In addition, there was one target word: *Springbrunnen* (fountain) that was not known by any participant of the communicative task group; similarly, there were three target words *Springbrunnen* (fountain), *Zebrastreifen* (crosswalk), *geradeaus* (straight ahead) that were unknown to all the participants of the reading task group.

### Table II.
*Pre-test Results for the Target Words*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communicative Task Group</th>
<th>Reading Task Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Words known by all group members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Words known by some but not all group members</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Words not known by any group members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of target words tested</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III shows the same type of analysis for the distractor words. Even though these words were categorized as distractor words, the pre-test showed that only a small amount of these words were known by all the participants. Therefore, the distractor words were analyzed as well to find out if participants knowledge of these words increased from the pre- to the post-test. All distractor words were presented in the communicative task and the reading task.

All of the participants from the communicative task group could identify *Schwimmbad* (swimming pool), *Marktplatz* (market square), and *Fitnessstudio* (gym) in the pre-test. All participants of the reading task showed receptive knowledge of the word *Fitnessstudio* (gym).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communicative Task Group</th>
<th>Reading Task Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Words known by all group members</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Words known by some but not all group members</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Words not known by any group members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of words tested</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.5. Post-test

The first part of the post-test was the same as the pre-test (appendix H). The second part of the post-test included a fill-in-the-blank exercise (appendix H). The fill-in-the-blank section was made up of a text with 245 words and thirteen gaps. Seven of
the fill-in-the-blank words were target words\textsuperscript{13}. The researcher composed the text and the content did not directly relate to the reading of the control group or the communication task of the experimental group. This allowed for the target words to be presented within a partially new context. This type of test was included to examine if participants could use their receptive knowledge of the target words and place them correctly within a fill-in-the-blank text.

3.3. Scoring

The L2-to-L1 pre- and post-test was scored based on correct translation or description of the individual word. Each correct translation or description received a score of one and each incorrect or blank response received a score of zero. This type of scoring was done for target and distractor words on the tests.

The fill-in-blank section of the post-test was also scored with a one for correct use and zero for not using the target word correctly. Then, the data from all the participants was collected in an excel spreadsheet to count which words were filled in correctly most often. The results were compared to the pre-test. Since the fill-in section included only four of the twelve distractor words, the distractor words were not included in the scoring.

The comprehension task from the reading was not scored in this study.

\textsuperscript{13}The limitation section addresses why not all eight target word were included into the fill-in post-test.
3.4. Procedure

The study was carried out during regular class time in week eight of the semester. The participants were divided into either the control or the experimental group based on the courses that they were enrolled in. One intact course was the control group, while the other two courses were the experimental groups. Considering that the researcher taught one of the courses, her course was the control group to allow for as little interaction between the research and the participants as possible; that is, this specific course was chosen as the control group so that the participants’ performance would not be influenced.

At the start, all of the participants were told that the study was for a master’s thesis project, giving no specific information of what the study was about or what the students would be tested on. The participants were also not told what the theme of the tasks were or that there would be a pre- and a post-test.

First, each participant received the UIC IRB consent form. Each student was informed that the participation in this study was voluntary and that everybody would receive an extra point towards their grade by participating in the activities. Before giving out the background questionnaire, each participant received a number. They were asked to write the number on each of the documents that they were given so that nobody, except for the researcher, would be able to connect the pre- and post-test, as well as the documents for the individual tasks to a specific participant.

The second step was the background questionnaire, which collected information about the participants, including his or her age, gender, race, language background, and reasons for learning German. It took the participants about eight minutes to fill out the
IRB consent form and the background questionnaire. The third step was the pre-test, for which they were given about five minutes to complete.

In the next step, the procedure for the experimental and control groups differed. The experimental group completed a communicative task. Participants from the experimental group were paired up and asked to sit next to each other. The pairs were assigned based on the alphabetical order of their last name. For example, the first two students whose last names came first in the alphabet worked together. Next, each participant received the instruction sheet with the nine wishes and a map of Stuttgart. They were told that they had 30 minutes to complete this task and were allowed to draw on the map. In addition, each pair was given a voice recorder and asked to record their entire conversation. Each voice recorder was turned on by the researcher to ensure that they were properly functioning. After 20 minutes, the task sheets were collected and the post-test was given out. The participants had 10 minutes to complete the two-part post-test.

The group with the reading task was the control group. The control group received instructions and a reading text. In addition, participants were informed that they had 20 minutes to read the text. After 20 minutes the text was collected again and the participants received the eight multiple-choice comprehension questions. They had about ten minutes to complete the task and once the task was completed, the control group received the same post-test as the experimental group.

During the course of each step the participants were told how much more time they had left until the tests and tasks were collected.
3.5. Analysis

In order to assess whether the participants acquired vocabulary knowledge from the pre- to the post-test, as well as if there was a difference in the amount of word gain between the two groups (experimental versus control), a 2x2 repeated measure within subject ANOVA was conducted. The independent variables were the two different groups: the experimental group with the communicative task and the control group with a reading task. The dependent variables were the pre- and post-test measuring the vocabulary knowledge. The same type of analysis was used comparing the receptive vocabulary knowledge between the pre- and fill-in blank section of the post-test. The data was collected and scored in an excel spreadsheet and transferred into SPSS. The same procedure was done for the distractor words. All data was transferred and evaluated by the researcher.
4. RESULTS

4.1. Target Words

The descriptive statistics for the experimental (communicative task) and control (reading task) group for the target words from the pre- to the post-test are displayed in Table IV. The mean score for the experimental group (communicative task) in the pre-test was 1.57 (SD 1.46) compared to the mean score of the post-test 3.05 (SD 1.77) showing that the participant gained receptive knowledge of the overall eight target vocabulary words through the communicative task. The control group (reading task) also showed a gain in receptive vocabulary knowledge between the two tests with a mean of 2.20 (SD .918) in the pre-test and a mean of 2.60 (SD 1.89) in the post-test.

This information was then subjected to a 2x2 repeated measure within subject ANOVA in order to interpret the data based on this study’s hypothesis; namely, that communicative output tasks lead to more incidental work gain than input-based reading tasks. The results, however, showed no significant main effect for group \(F(1,27) = .022, ns = .884\). Learners in the experimental communication group did not gain more words than learners who had been exposed to the target words in the reading condition.

Regarding word learning, the ANOVA revealed significant main effect for both groups \(F(1,27) = 15.868, p = .000\) in receptive vocabulary knowledge between the pre- and post-test. In addition, there was a significant interaction between word learning (pre- and post-test) and the groups (both experimental and control), \(F(1,17) = 5.211, p = .031\). In order to interpret these results, Figure IV was created. Figure IV shows that while both groups (experimental and control) gained word knowledge from the pre- to post-test, participants who read the target words in a text (control group) started out with more
word knowledge as measured at the time of the pre-test than the experimental group who showed less target word knowledge. In addition, the experimental group gained more word knowledge during the communicative task than the control group who gained word knowledge during reading.

Table IV.
Pre- and Post-test of Target Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This analysis includes eight target vocabulary items. The experiment group performed the communicative task. The control group performed the reading task.
Figure 1. The interaction between groups based on target receptive word knowledge from pre- to post-test.
4.2. Fill-in task

The fill-in-the-blank exercise from the post-test was analyzed to see if there was a relationship between target word gain and successful use of the word in context when participants could choose the words from a word bank. The descriptive statistics are displayed in Table V. This analysis includes six target words. The mean score of the experimental group (communicative task) was 1.32 (SD 1.29) in the pre-test with a mean of 2.05 (SD 1.47) in the fill-in-the-blank post-test, indicating that the participants were able to acquire receptive knowledge of items and apply this knowledge in the fill-in task. The mean for the control group (reading task) was 1.60 (SD .97) in the pre-test and 1.00 (SD .94) in the fill-in post-task, showing that the average dropped from the pre-test to the fill-in task. The results of the 2x2 repeated measures within subject ANOVA (experimental versus control group) showed no significant main effect for group ($F(1,27) = .865, ns = .361$) indicating that the comparison of the groups did not show that one group performed better in receptive knowledge gain and transfer tests than the other group. Regarding word learning, the ANOVA revealed no significant main effect for both groups ($F(1,27) = .066, ns = .799$) in receptive vocabulary knowledge between the pre- and fill-in post-test. However, there was a significant form of interaction between word learning (pre- and post-test) and both groups (experimental and control), ($F(1.27) = 5.854, p = .018$). Figure 2 shows the results of that interaction. The participants from the experimental group were able to correctly fill in target words in the post-test, showing a mean gain of .73 from the pre- to the fill-in post-test. Whereas the mean gain from the participants of the control group showed a decrease by -.6. This drop indicates that the
participants from the reading group were on average less likely to transfer their receptive knowledge of the target items to the fill-in reading task.

Table V. Pre- and Fill-in Post-test of Target Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This analysis includes six target vocabulary items. The experiment group performed the communicative task. The control group performed the reading task.
Figure 2. Interaction between groups based on distractor receptive word knowledge from pre- to post-test.
An item analysis of the individual target words from the pre-test to the fill-in post-test can be seen in Table VI. The biggest gain in acquisition and transfer occurred for the experimental group (communicative task) for the word *Zebrastreifen* (crosswalk). The pre-test showed that one participant had receptive knowledge of this word and the fill-in post task showed that eight participants were able to fill in the word into the reading task correctly. In contrast, from the control group (reading task), only three participants showed receptive knowledge of the same word in the pre-test, but no participants were able to fill in this item correctly in the post task. What can be inferred from these results is that the experimental group with the communicative task was able to transfer their receptive knowledge of the target items with greater success than the control group with the reading task. This transfer, namely receptive knowledge of the items to applying them into a fill-in task, might be due to the difference in the treatment task. In the communicative output task, the participants had to produce the target language and use the target words in context, thus putting them in a situation in which they had to apply their knowledge beyond mere receptive recognition of the target items. Meanwhile, the control group participated in an input based reading task, in which they read a text and answered content questions, not giving them the opportunity to use and produce the words within an output task.
Table VI. 
*Fill-in blank task*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fill-in Post-Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebrastreifen (crosswalk)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampel (traffic light)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einbahnstraße (one-way street)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geradeaus (straight ahead)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwischen (between)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter (under)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Experiment group (n=19) performed the communicative task. Control group (n=10) performed the reading task.

4.3. **Post-Hoc Analysis: Distractor Words**

After the data was collected, it became evident that participants’ receptive knowledge of the distractor words increased from the pre- to the post-test. Therefore, the twelve distractors were examined as a post-hoc analysis (Table VII). The mean score for the experimental group (communicative task) in the pre-test was 4.79 (SD = 3.41) and in the post-test 5.89 (SD = 4.34), showing that participants gained on average one word from the pre- to post-test. The control group (reading task) showed a mean of 7.30 (SD = 2.41) in the pre-test and a mean score of 9.60 (SD = 2.32) in the post-test, showing that they gained on average one and a half words from the pre- to post-test. To confirm or disconfirm this study’s research question, a 2x2 repeated measure within subject ANOVA was run. The results showed a significant main effect for both groups (experimental and control) \( F(1,27) = 5.588, p = .026 \). Participants who encountered the distractor words in the reading passage showed more word knowledge than learners who
encountered the distractor words in the communication task. In addition, there was a main effect for word gain \((F(1,27) = 27.030, p = .000)\). Students in both conditions (experimental and control) significantly gained word knowledge by engaging in their respective tasks.

Table VII.
Pre- and Post-test Distractor Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This analysis includes twelve distractor items. The experiment group performed the communicative task. The control group performed the reading task.
5. POST-HOC ANALYSIS OF THE INTERACTIONS

To further explore how the participants interacted with as well as negotiated the meaning of unfamiliar words, the recorded interaction from each pair of the experimental group was transcribed. Once the conversations were transcribed, the researcher analyzed them for negotiation of meaning based on Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (1980). Negotiation of meaning here is defined as asking their partner directly what the unknown words mean, using the unknown word in a statement and asking their partner if they agreed or disagreed; this is also called a comprehension check, in which prior knowledge is used to explain an unknown word (Long, 1980). The following are examples of each concept taken from the transcripts of the current study:

*Asking their partner directly what the unknown word means:*

Excerpt 1:
90 *55: Klaus thinks that the Ampel, I don’t know what that is! Do you?
91 *54: What?
92 *55: Ampel?

*Using the unknown word in a statement and asking their partner if they agreed or disagreed (comprehension check):*

Excerpt 2:
134 *45: mh [...] Die Innenstadt soll mindestens viel Einbahnstraße bekommen.
135 *43: Einbahnstraßen ist not like one-way street is it?

Excerpt 3:
124 *65: Neben means like next to, right?

*Using their prior knowledge to explain an unknown word:*

Excerpt 4:
218 *42: What’s Einbahnstraße? Straße ist street [+<]
219 *41: Street. So Einbahn, so one way street?
220 *42: Yeah.
Excerpt 5:
159 *45: Do you know what durstisch ist?
160 *43: Durstig, I don’t know maybe busy.
163 *43: Oh, thirsty.
164 *45: Oh thirsty oh ok.
165 *43: Like Ich habe durst, yeah +<
152 *45: Hm. [...] Um [...] Die Besucher von dem Fittnessstudio und
153 football [/] Fußballplatz sind immer durst [/] durstisch [...] do
154 *43: Durstig I don’t know maybe busy.
155 *45: Are always busy [...] or it says like the visitors [...] from the
156 Fitnessstudio, Fuß [/] Fußballplatz are always +…
157 *43: Oh thirsty.
158 *45: Oh thirsty oh ok.
159 *43: Like Ich habe durst, yeah +<
160 *45: Ah.

Overall, eleven instances of negotiations for meaning with the unknown target
items were noticed within these interactions (see Table VIII). Of these eleven instances
of negotiation of word meaning, five were categorized as asking directly what the word
meant and six were categorized as a comprehension check. Of the negotiations for
meaning, ten were resolved correctly and one incorrectly. Other instances of addressing
target items included: skipping the words when neither one knew the meaning, not
addressing a question that included a target word within the conversation, or explaining
or translating to one’s partner unknown words.
Table VIII.
Summary of the Negotiation for Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Question</th>
<th>Comprehension check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zebrastreifen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(crosswalk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einbahnstraße</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(one-way street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(traffic light)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neben</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(next to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section will provide examples from the transcripts about the negotiation of meaning.

5.1. Transcript Excerpts

The first excerpts are about participants asking direct question regarding the meaning of the unknown item Einbahnstraße (one-way street). In the first interaction, the participants found out the meaning of the word very quickly by separating the word and knowing what Straße (street) is in English, allowing them to make an educated guess about the meaning of the entire word.

Interaction 1
218 *42: What’s Einbahnstraße? Straße is street [+<]
219 *41: Street. So Einbahn, so one-way street?
220 *42: Yeah.

Looking at the pre- and post-test of these two participants, neither one provided the English translation of the word Einbahnstraße (one-way street) in the pre-test.
Through this very short exchange of meaning, however, both were able to correctly translate the word in the post-test.

For the next excerpt, participant number 52 knew the meaning of the word \textit{Einbahnstraße} (one-way street), shown through correctly translating it in the pre-test.

However, participant #50 did not know the English translation of the word in the pre-test.

\textit{Interaction 2}

212 *52: Einbahnstraßen. So one +…
213  *50: What is the Einbahn +<
214 *52: I think it’s a one-way street. I don’t know that’s what I’ve guessed.
215        […]. So I’m just gonna put one here, in the corner. […] Einbahnstraße.

Participant number 52 mentions that he/she guessed the meaning of the word \textit{Einbahnstraße} (one-way street), but feels confident enough with his/her guess to continue, not asking participant number 50 for feedback. Participant number 50 learned the meaning of the word \textit{Einbahnstraße} (one-way street) through this interaction with the partner and was able to correctly translate it in the post-test.

In excerpt number 3, the participants negotiated the meaning of the word based on the context from the overall theme of creating a new downtown of Stuttgart.

\textit{Interaction 3}

145 *49: Die Innenstadt soll mindestens mehr Einbahnstraßen bekommen. The innercity should more +/-
147 *48: Ah the inner [ ] inner ah downtown thinks it should have a ah
148     unionbahn is that like an Einbahn its like a rail.
149 *49: Einbahnstraße [ ] it should have a monorod [ ].
150 *48: I feel like this is like a monoroad cause like ah+…
151 *49: Ja, it could become helpful [ ]
152  *48: I guess it could be.

We can see that participant number 49 had an idea about the word, but showed uncertainty through the tone of his voice. His voice sounded like he was asking a
question, which is why a question mark is included in parenthesis. Participant number 48 agrees in sentence 150 and gives participant number 49 positive feedback on his/her assumption. Together they agree that a mono-road would be useful in a city and with that end the negotiation of the German word *Einbahnstraße* (one-way street).

Based on this interaction one could assume that both participants were able to translate the word *Einbahnstraße* (one-way street) correctly in the post-test. However, participant number 49 translated this word as a monorail instead of a single way road. This might show that the short interaction was not enough for participant number 49 to understand that the German word *Einbahnstraße* (one-way street) was used to refer to a streets and not for a rail road system. Participant number 48 translated the item correctly in the post-test.

The next excerpt shows an interaction in which the target vocabulary word was not negotiated successfully.

*Interaction 4*

53 *61:* Ok. Zebrastreifen für die Fußgänger gibt. Yeah isn’t that it isn’t like [/]
54   isn’t like Ampel a like a crossing thing?
55 *60:* Yeah.
56 *61:* Clear crossing thing you know.
57 *60:* Dam like it could be a bridge or +… cause like that’s like a flower thing.
58 *61:* Mh. I think um I think the Zebrastreifen is probably like a subway thing. You know like how you get on the blue line.
59 *60:* Yeah cause look it’s the bus.
60 *61:* Yeah.
61 *60:* Yeah.
62 *60:* Yeah.
63 *61:* So your saying that the Ampel and Zebra are not for the people that walk.
64 *60:* Yeah. Ampel isn’t a bus but it’s this one +…
65 *61:* Is it like a +// Mh. Ample, what the hell is an Ampel?
66 *60:* So it’s saying that [/] that the Ampel is not enough and that the +/.
67 *61:* Zebrastreifen is not for the walk +/.
68 *60:* Walking
69 *61:  + walking people.
70 *60:  But isn’t it?
71 *61:  I think so yeah. Cause I like think this is everschery [?] for this part like the subway thing where you get of and on.
78 *60:  Yeah.
79 *61:  Or like a bus thing or something. […] Ahm I guess we can just say [..]

Move on to the next wish.

In this interaction it seems like the participants were making each other unsure about the meaning of the words. They continued to guess and connect it to pedestrians, a train, and even give an example from their surroundings; for example, sentence 59 states, “how you get on the blue line”. Even though the interaction did not correctly identify or lead to a clear translation of *Ampel* (traffic light) and *Zebrastreifen* (crosswalk), participant number 61 did translate the word *Zebrastreifen* (crosswalk) in the post-test correctly, even though he did not provide the translation in the pre-test. Participant number 60 did not fill in either *Ampel* (traffic light) or *Zebrastreifen* (crosswalk) in the pre- or the post-test.

The last excerpts show how participants asked their partner if they agreed or disagreed with the translation of the target word into English.

*Interaction 5*

124 *65:  Nebens means like next to right?
125 *64:  Yeah.

*Interaction 6*

90 *55:  Klaus thinks that the Ampeln, I don’t know what that is! Do you?
91 *54:  What?
92 *55:  Ampeln?
93 *54:  No I don’t know.
94 *55:  Oh street, maybe it’s a street light, oh no light?
95 *54:  Maybe it’s a bike ph +…
96 *55:  Bike?
97 *54:  Um

changes the topic
159 *54: Yeah. Um. Die Ampeln mh Ampeln.
160 *55: Is that enough maybe?
161 *54: What?
162 *55: Is genug enough? [.] Klaus thinks that there is not enough lights
163 and something for the, I think that’s enough.

Participant number 65 seems unsure about his/her translation of the word *neben* (next to) and therefore asked his partner number 64 for his or her opinion. The partner quickly confirms the meaning with a simple “Yeah” and the interaction moves on.

In interaction six participant number 55 asked participant number 54 if he/she knew what *Ampel* (traffic light) was. The participant who asked the question then guessed the meaning in English correctly, but showed uncertainty about his/her guess. Next, their interaction changed to a different topic and later participant number 55 translated *Ampel* (traffic light) correctly within the context as “lights”. In the pre-test both participants left the English translation of the word *Ampel* (traffic light) empty. However, in the post-test, participant number 55 translated *Ampel* (traffic light) correctly, while participant number 54 left the spot blank.

The transcripts provided some insight of how the participant might have negotiated the unknown vocabulary items and how communication can make the learner confident in his/her idea or on the other hand make them question their guesses. These examples suggest that the participants were able to notice their knowledge gap and respond to it as explained in the output hypothesis (Swain, 1993). The participants’ response to the gap was to either ask for a clarification request: e.g. “What does this mean?”, a comprehension check in which they translate the word into English and then ask their partner if he or she agreed, or to use the word in context.
6. DISCUSSION

This study sought to develop further insight into incidental vocabulary learning by engaging students in either a communicative output task or a reading input task. By engaging in a communication or reading task, participant’s receptive word knowledge of the target items increased significantly for both groups from pre- to post-test. This receptive knowledge gain emerged while participants focused their attention on the content of the tasks at hand.

6.1. Communicative Task

Using the theoretical frameworks of the output hypotheses from Swain (1993) and interaction hypothesis from Long (1980) helped to analyze the interactions from the participants of the communicative task. Based on the post-hoc analyses of the interactions, the participants were able to notice knowledge gaps and respond to these gaps accordingly. To be more specific, the three components of Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (2008), namely comprehension checks, clarification requests, and repetition were observed in the participant’s interaction and led to receptive knowledge word gain for the participants. The two types of negotiation for meaning were either a direct question of what the word meant or a comprehension check. Both types were used in the interaction almost equally.

Furthermore, the findings of the experimental group with the communicative task align with Newton’s case (1995) and quantitative study (2013), in which the learners gained vocabulary knowledge through communicative output tasks. In Newton’s research the participants were exposed to the target vocabulary words through
information-gap and opinion-gap tasks. This allowed the students to engage with the words at least two times, thereby increasing the frequency of encounters to more than a one-time exposure. The same can be said when comparing the results to Shintani’s (2011) study, in which the participants encountered the target words in three to five different tasks. In this current study, the participants encountered the target words in one opinion-gap task, which still resulted in a statistically significant receptive knowledge gain ($M = 2.5$) for the experimental group (see Table 4). The findings suggest that second language learners can acquire receptive knowledge of a word through a single task within a communicative context. Second language learners partake in these communicative tasks within the language classroom, talking to their peers. Furthermore, the results of the communicative task align with Shintani’s (2011) outcome, namely that the productive task leads to an increase in target vocabulary knowledge.

Moreover, Newton’s participants were English second language learners whereas the participants for the current investigations were German foreign language learners. For this reason, the current study expands upon the previous research findings by showing that foreign language learners show statistically significant receptive word knowledge gains. Additionally, the current investigations include almost four times as many participants as Newton’s (2013) study.

### 6.2. Reading Task

In light of previous research studies on incidental vocabulary learning through reading tasks, the outcome of the current study is consistent with previous findings (Eckerth & Tvakoli, 2012; Ferrell et. al., 2006; Kweon & Kim, 2008; Pigada & Schmitt,
2006; Pulido, 2007), namely that there were small gains in vocabulary knowledge from the pre- to post-test. As previously mentioned, Horst, Cobb, and Meara’s (1998) participants showed a small amount of vocabulary gain (\( M = 1.48 \)) in the word association post-test after a text was read out loud to them. The participants in the current study also showed a small mean gain of .4 from the pre- to the post-test in receptive vocabulary knowledge by reading the text themselves. Findings from the current investigation confirm that learners gain receptive knowledge while reading a text and encountering the vocabulary in context.

One important difference between the communicative task group and the reading task groups is the extra step for the reading comprehension questions. The reading task group had one more step between the reading task and the post-test, namely the comprehension questions that the communicative task group did not have. This extra step might have influenced the outcome of the post-test, since more time had past between the pre- and post-test for the reading group. Considering this, the comprehension questions might have incidentally functioned as a distractor task for the reading group.

6.3. Target items

An item analysis, shown in Table IV, visualizes the percentage of receptive knowledge gain from pre- to post-test for the individual target words. The gain for the target items in the experimental (communicative task) group corresponds with the negotiations of meaning as seen in the transcripts. Through the transcripts, it was seen that participants addressed the meaning of the following target words most often in their
interaction, leading to a receptive knowledge gain of 68% for Zebrastreifen (crosswalk), 37% for Ampel (traffic light), and 32% for Einbahnstraße (one-way street). Whereas, zwischen (between), unter (under), neben (next to), and geradeaus (straight ahead) were either not addressed or only briefly mentioned in the interactions, leading to a mean gain of zero to 11% in receptive knowledge. The reason why some words were brought up in the interaction and others not might be due to the task itself. The participants who completed the communicative task were focused on redesigning the downtown of Stuttgart and discussed vocabulary items that were necessary for them to understand and complete the activity. Consequently, some words were more important than others and therefore more often addressed in the interactions. This finding corresponds with Newton’s (2013) in which he explains that where a word appears within the input determines how much learners will attend to it. Overall, the findings confirmed that learning new words happens when the learners are focused on the communication during a task. Results suggest that vocabulary items do not need to be taught in an isolated manner, but rather they can be learned within a communicative task.

When it comes to the control group (reading task), the percentage of receptive word knowledge gain is lower than for the communicative task group. The items Springbrunnen (fountain), Einbahnstraße (one-way street), and geradeaus (straight ahead) were the only words that participants showed a receptive knowledge increase from pre- to post-test. Furthermore, there is no indication of how the participants inferred the meaning of words that were unknown to them. The gain from the pre- to the post-test suggests that these second language learners acquired the meaning of unknown items from the context of the text. These findings align with previous research findings in
which the use of an input task for vocabulary learning resulted in knowledge gain from pre- to post-test (Host et al., 1998; Shintani, 2011). Future studies might apply a think-aloud procedure in order to have a better understanding of the thought process from participants who read a text. Through this procedure the participants would vocalize their thoughts while reading. Thus, it might be possible in the future to examine whether and how they inferred the meaning from the context.

Table IV.
Target Words Pre- to Post-test receptive knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Words</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Gain %</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebrastreifen (crosswalk)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampel (traffic light)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einbahnstraße (one-way street)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geradeaus (straight ahead)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwischen (between)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter (under)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springbrunnen (fountain)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nebenn (next to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The experiment group (n=19) performed the communicative task. The control group (n=10) performed the reading task.

6.4. Fill-in Post-Test

The findings for the fill-in task showed no significant difference for word learning for both groups. The findings did show a significant interaction between the two groups.
This interaction displayed that the communicative group performed better on receptive knowledge transfer with a mean gain of .73, compared to the reading group who showed less word knowledge after the task (-.60). The reading group demonstrated receptive knowledge of the target items on the pre-test (M = 1.60), but had a lower word knowledge average in the post-test (M = 1.00). These findings suggest that learners who gain receptive knowledge of vocabulary items during a communicative task are able to transfer and apply this knowledge to a fill-in task with greater success than learners who read a text for comprehension. In addition, the findings suggest that if learners receive only input through reading, the transfer of using their receptive knowledge of vocabulary items in an output task are not as successful.

6.5. Post-Hoc Analysis: Distractor Items

When the materials for this study were developed, it was assumed that the participants already had at least a receptive knowledge of the distractor items. This assumption was based on word similarities between English and German as well as the participants’ knowledge from previously learned materials in the German language program. However, this assumption proved to be wrong since there was a significant gain from the pre- to the post-test regarding the distractors.

The post-hoc analysis for the distractor words exposed a significant mean gain for both groups from the pre- to the post-test. The findings showed that the participants from the communicative task gained an average of 1.10 compared to the participants from the reading task with an average gain of 2.30 in receptive knowledge from the pre- to the post-test. A reason for this increase might be due to topic recognition. In the pre-test the
participants did not know the overall topic that the individual items belonged to. Once participants identified the topic, distractor words could have been better understood based on their relationship with the topic and other items.

Furthermore, the findings showed a significant difference between the two groups. When students encountered the words during reading tasks, their receptive knowledge improved on average more than twice as much as the communicative task for the distractor items. This difference might be due to the exposure of distractor items in the reading text. The reading text provided controlled input to the participants, giving them more exposure towards distractor items. The group with the communicative task had less input, since the task provided only nine sentences and a map. The input in the communicative task was restricted to the nine wishes and the communication between the learners. Participants encountered the distractor items through those nine wishes or the labeling on the map.

These findings for the distractor words were not the same as the findings of the target words. Participants from the reading task group were more likely to show receptive knowledge of the distractor words than participants from the communicative group; however, there was no significant difference found between the groups in regards to the target items. These findings suggest that reading might not direct learner’s attention to certain words like a communicative task does. Therefore, a reading task might lead to more uncontrolled incidental word learning than a communicative task. In contrast, a communicative task can direct learner’s attention to a more select group of words, as for example nouns, and thereby, make incidental learning more predictable in
regards to target words. The learner’s need for understanding and using a word to complete a task seems to determine the processing that leads to retention.

The following is the item analysis for the distractors (Table X). What stood out is the difference of receptive gain for the word *Innenstadt* (downtown). An overall of eight participants from the communicative task showed a gain in this word from pre- to post-test in contrast to two participants form the reading group. This difference might be due to the task. In the communicative task the participants reorganized the downtown of Stuttgart and therefore the understanding of the meaning of the word *Innenstadt* (downtown) might have been more apparent. While the reading task mentioned that the character visited the city of Stuttgart, the participants’ attention was most likely focused on what the main character did, instead of her being in the downtown area. Therefore, it seems possible that the word carried a different relevance in the tasks.

*Table X.*

**Distractor Words Post-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Gain %</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fleischerei</em> (butcher shop)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bücherei</em> (library)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Innenstadt</em> (downtown)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Straßenbahn</em> (train)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bäckerei</em> (baker)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zeitungsstand</em> (news paper stand)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Swimmbad</em> (swimming pool)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fußballplatz</em> (soccer field)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Getränkeautomat</em> (vending machine)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Supermarket</em> (supermarket)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Marktplatz</em> (market square)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fitnessstudio</em> (gym)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The experiment group (n=19) performed the communicative task. The control group (n=10) performed the reading task.
7. CONCLUSION

Language is used to communicate and the more the learners experience a communication of some kind, via a reading text or a communicative task, the more they will find the need to learn and express themselves and their opinions. To express themselves and their opinions they will need to notice their knowledge gaps in terms of vocabulary, formulate and try out hypotheses, and learn from the feedback that they receive (Swain, 1993). The teachers can control what vocabulary items are learned by designing communicative tasks about a specific topic and providing the meaning of target vocabulary within the context of the tasks. Through these tasks the learners receive guided input and are able to infer the meaning from the context. Considering that participants of this study gained receptive vocabulary knowledge in both the reading and communicative tasks, both types of task can help learners gain receptive knowledge of vocabulary items. For an in-class activity, a communicative task might be implemented instead of a reading task, since a communicative task can help learners to practice aspects of pronunciation, give and receive feedback, communicate their thoughts about the topic, and collaborate effectively in the target language with their partners to end the task at hand. A reading task might be a better fit than a homework assignment outside of class since the learners read the text by themselves and do not need their peers or the instructor as they would for a communicative task.

7.1. Implications for teaching

The results of this study show that the participants gained vocabulary knowledge through both a reading and communicative task. Even though this word gain was not
significantly higher from one group to the other, a communicative task is a useful teaching method in the foreign language classroom. The post-hoc analysis of the transcripts showed that participants were able to help each other with negotiating the meaning of unfamiliar words successfully in ten out of eleven instances. These findings suggest that foreign language instructors can expect word learning to take place through communicative interaction. Furthermore, the findings support the outcome in Varionis & Gass’s (1985) study in which the negotiation of meaning takes places through non-native speaker interactions. In order to include a communicative task for vocabulary learning in the foreign language classroom, the task would need to be set up properly. The instructor would need to involve information about the unknown vocabulary items within the instruction of the task to provide input about them and the opportunity for the learners to infer the meaning from context. If this requirement is met, a communicative task gives the learners the opportunity to acquire the target vocabulary through negotiation of meaning and involvement with the vocabulary item during classroom interactions. Furthermore, through a communicative task the students have the possibility to use and engage with the language as well as practice their pronunciation, speed of speech, tone, and pitch. Moreover, a communicative task might lead to more motivation to learn the language and foster the learner’s confidence in speaking the language. If we spend a lot of time on communicative tasks in the classroom we can expect that learners develop a positive interdependence (Swain, 1985). A positive interdependence entails that learners feel confident to collaborate with communication partners and finish a given task (Swain, 1985). Furthermore, it assures that all learners profit from the collaborative activity by supporting and helping each other.
7.2. Limitations

Results of this investigation cannot be generalized because of multiple limitations. The standard deviation scores were high for the communicative task and reading task group because of the small sample size ($n = 29$). A larger group of participants divided evenly between both groups might lower the standard deviation scores. In addition, standard deviation scores are high due to the variation between learners of target and distractor word knowledge.

Another limitation was the choice of words for the tasks. Since the tasks were built upon the participant’s regular classroom material, the participants might have encountered the target and distractor items before. Developing tasks with vocabulary that the participants could not have encountered before can give a better control of not influencing the research. In this study the participants might have done their online homework earlier than they had to and stumbled upon some of the words used in the pre- and post-test. Furthermore, the communicative task did not provide enough input of the meaning of individual words and all eight target words. Three target words - *Springbrunnen* (fountain), *geradeaus* (straight ahead), and *zwischen* (between) - were not mentioned in the nine wishes that set up the communicative task itself and with that did not provide the participants with any type of input about these words. The task material has to include more input for the target words to give students the opportunity to infer the meaning from the context. Moreover, the fill-in post-test only included seven target words instead of eight. This was another mistake in the set up of the study. The fill-in post-test should have included all eight target words within the word bank that the participants could choose from for the fill-in the blank text.
The type of words that the participants were tested on should also have been categorized. For example, further studies might look at incidental learning of nouns versus verbs or prepositions to see possible differences in receptive knowledge gain based on the word types.

The testing materials and tasks themselves were also a limitation. The testing and task materials were not developed as a coherent package. There were flaws between the words in the pre- and post-test, as well as the words that were presented in the individual tasks. These flaws included the issue that some words appeared in the pre- and post-test but not in the tasks themselves. Furthermore, not all words were presented in both tasks, meaning that the reading task featured some of the words from the pre-and post-test, whereas the communicative task included some other words. For these reasons, the target vocabulary items ended up being only eight words. Future research should include more target words to provide a larger variety and might also make a distinction between types of words to analyze if there is a difference in acquisition. In addition, these limitations also influenced the distractor items, resulting in twelve words as well as thirteen additional items on the pre- and post-test that were not included in any analysis. If this research study were to be implemented again the researcher would develop completely new testing and task materials that represented the target words equally in both task and provide more input for the target words.

The time that participants spent on the task was also a limitation. Even though the participants from the communicative task were given 30 minutes to work through the task, no pair needed more than 20 minutes. This meant that there were only 20 minutes

---

14 The pre- and post-test included an overall of 33 words.
between the pre- and the post-test for the communicative group participants. The participants from the reading group were given a limit of 20 minutes to read the text, but no participants needed more than 15 minutes. The reading group was then given the questions regarding the context of the story. As mentioned in the discussion section above, the reading group had one more step between the task and the post-test, which the communicative group did not. This difference might have influenced the outcome of the study and future research should make sure that each group has the same amount of steps and time for all tasks between a pre- and post-test.

Some of the students showed discomfort about the voice recorders, which could be a limitation as well. The research assured the participants that the researcher would only listen to the recordings and that they would not influence the participants’ grades. However, participants might have felt intimidated by the voice recorders nevertheless.

The interactions, recorded with the voice recorders, were transcribed by the researcher. Further studies should include a second transcribe to account for inter-rater reliability.

Another limitation was that the pre-test was given in the same session as the experimental task. The participants might have focused on the individual words from the pre-test during their tasks because they had just encountered them. Even though the test included distractor items, giving the pre-test on a different day might have led to different results. If the pre-test was given on a different day there would have been more time between the pre- and post-test and participants would not focus on the individual words or even get the impression that the tasks were about vocabulary learning.
This research does not give any insight into the participants’ thought processes. Perhaps a questionnaire after the post-test could give a better understanding of how a participant would have negotiated the meaning of specific vocabulary items had their partner not explicitly told them the English translation or if they had not understood the items from the context within the reading task. The questionnaire could ask the participants about strategies that they used during the task, what they found complicated or what helped them complete the task.

It also needs to be mentioned that the interaction of two of the pairs from the communicative task group were not recorded. This was due to the fact that the voice recorder was either not properly turned on or did record the interaction but then did not get saved properly once the participants turned the voice recorder off. Consequently, the post-hoc analysis of the interaction included seven instead of nine voice recordings of the interactions.

Finally, the transcripts should have been analyzed more thoroughly to gain a better understanding of word negotiation and general interaction between the participants. For the current investigation, the transcripts were quantified and analyzed in terms of amount and type of target word interaction; however, they were not analyzed from a more qualitative perspective. The quantitative analysis did not account for other aspects that might have played a role in the interactions, including for example how intensively participants dealt with unknown words or understood the wishes from the task, the differences in the negotiation of words between poorer versus more successful learners, as well as other aspects that might have come to the surface in the interactions.
7.3. Future Research

A delayed post-test would be a good tool to measure the participant’s long-term receptive vocabulary knowledge. Implementing multiple post-tests allows the researcher to measure vocabulary retention over a long period of time than just immediately after the test. In the current study, a delayed post-test could not be implemented since the participants engaged and practiced the vocabulary words in the classroom and during homework assignments that followed the testing session. Therefore, using vocabulary items that do not correspond to the classroom material would be a better choice for a research study.

Another aspect of further investigation might be a possible cut-off percentage for participants that scored over 60% on the pre-test. There was one participant from the experimental group who showed 75% knowledge of the target words in the pre-test. For the distractor words there were three participants in the control group and four participants in the experimental group that scored 60% or above. Taking these participants out of the study might change the statistical outcome.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A

Background Questionnaire

Subject Number: _____

I. General Information

Are you:  Female  Male

What is your age?  __________________________

Country of origin:  __________________________

Race:  _______ White  _______ Hispanic  _______ African American  
       _______ American Indian or Alaskan  _______ Asian or Pacific Islander

Highest Level of education Completed:  __________________________

Program of study/major:  __________________________

If you were not born in the U.S., during what ages did you live in your country of origin?  
_________________________________________________________________

If you were not born in the U.S., how long have you lived in the U.S. for?  
_________________________________________________________________

II. Your Linguistic History

What is your native Language:  __________________________

If not English at what age did you first begin to learn English:  __________________________

At what age did you first begin to learn German?  
_________________________________________________________________

How many languages do you speak fluently?  
(Fluently- are able to read, speak, and write, expressing your ideas/opinions/needs)

1  2  3  4  5

How many languages have you learned in the past?

1  2  3  4  5

If you speak more languages than English and German, what other languages do you 
know?
_________________________________________________________________

How did you learn this/these language/languages?  
_________________________________________________________________
III. High School

Did you have German as a foreign language in high school?  Yes  No

If yes, how many years of German did you have in high school?

1 year  2 years  3 years  4 years

Did you learn German outside of High School or College?  Yes  No

If yes, where? ____________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for learning German</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it will enhance my résumé.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I hope to further my education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is a university requirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a personal development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it will enhance my status among my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Motivation to learn German

1) What are your reasons for learning German?
Please rate the following reasons according to their importance.
Translate or describe the following nouns and prepositions into English. If you only have a vague idea about the word, please write your idea down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Die Bücherei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Bäcker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Schwimmbad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Zebrastreifen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Straßenbahn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Marktplatz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Bäume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Einbahnstrasse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Konditorei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Supermarkt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Ampel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Fleischerei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Fußgängerweg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Getränkeautomat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Apotheke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Springbrunnen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geradeaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Hafen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Oper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Zeitungsstand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Innenstadt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Fußballplatz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Fitnessstudio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwischen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Stuttgart braucht eine neue Innenstadt

Situation:
Stuttgart hat sehr viel Geld und es wurde daher entschieden, dass die Innenstadt von Stuttgart ganz neue gemacht werden soll.

Aufgabe:

Zeit:
Ihr habt 30 min. für diese Aufgabe.

Wünsche der Einwohner:
1. Lisa denkt, dass es nicht genug Mülleimer auf den Fußgängerwegen gibt.
2. Tim denkt, dass das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist von dem Fitnessstudio und dem Fußballplatz.
3. Klaus denkt, dass es nicht genug Ampeln und Zebastreifen für die Fußgänger gibt.
5. Die Straßenbahn soll erweitert (extended) werden und mehr Haltestellen haben.
7. Der Müll von der Fleischerei stinkt und das ärgert die Besucher (visitors) auf dem Marktplatz.
9. Die Stadt hat genug Geld um die Bäckerei und Konditorei neben oder unter den Supermarkt zu bauen.
Appendix E

Babara besucht Stuttgart

Situation:
Barbara hat Stuttgart besucht und hat ihre Erfahrungen (experiences) in ihren Reise Blog geschrieben.

Aufgabe:
Lesen Sie Barbaras Reise Blog.
Nachdem sie den Blog gelesen haben, wird der Text eingesamelt (collected) und sie bekommen zehn Fragen über den Inhalt von Barbaras Blog.

Zeit:
Sie haben 20 Minuten Zeit um diese Aufgabe zu lesen und 10 Minuten fuer die Fragen.
Appendix F

Barbara besucht Stuttgart


sondern aus Plastik. Es gab auch noch viele andere Sorten von Fleisch bei der Fleischerei und der Geruch (smell) hatte mich hungrig gemacht.


Bis bald, Barbara
Appendix G

Frage zum Text

Please answer the best of your ability.

1. Barbara hatte keinen Müllkorb für das Paper vom Fischbrötchen gefunden. Wo hat sie das Paper hingetan?

A. Auf den Fußgängerweg  B. In das Wasser beim Hafen
C. In den Rucksack       D. In ihre Hosentasche

2. Was gab es in der Apotheke?

A. Viele Medikamente  B. Einen Arzt
C. Viel kranke Leute  D. Alte Möbel

3. Wie ist Barbara zum Marktplatz gekommen?

A. Sie ist gelaufen  B. Sie ist mit der Straßenbahn gefahren
C. Sie ist mit dem Bus gefahren D. Sie ist mit einem Auto gefahren

4. Was hat Barbara auf dem Marktplatz gemacht?

A. Eine Bratwurst gegessen  B. geschlafen
C. Leute beobachtet       D. Eine Freundin getroffen

5. Warum ist Barbara zu der Bank gegangen?

A. Weil sie sich ausruhen wollte  B. Weil sie Geld brauchte
C. Weil sie Fleisch brauchte     D. Weil sie sich verlaufen hat

6. Wie alt ist die Bücherei?

A. 25 Jahre alt  B. 250 Jahre alt
C. 5 Jahre alt   D. 100 Jahre alt

7. Wie ist Barbara wieder nach hause gekommen?

A. Sie ist gelaufen  B. Mit der Straßenbahn
C. Mit dem Bus      D. Mit einem Taxi

8. Am Ende des Blogeintrags schreibt Barbara das sie noch etwas machen muss. Was muss sie machen?

A. Einen Kuchen essen  B. Ihren Freund beim Fußballplatz treffen
C. Einen Brief an ihre Eltern schicken D. Fußball spielen
Translate or describe the following nouns and prepositions into English. If you only have a vague idea about the word, please write your idea down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Die Bücherei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Bäcker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Schwimmbad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Zebrastreifen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Straßenbahn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Marktplatz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Bäume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Einbahnstrasse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Konditorei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Supermarkt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Ampel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Fleischerei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Fußgängerweg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Getränkeautomat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Apotheke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Springbrunnen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geradeaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Hafen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Oper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Zeitungsstand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Innenstadt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Fußballplatz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Fitnessstudio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neben</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zwischen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
@ Beginning

@ Language: deu, eng, ns

@ Participants: 41, 42, BG Researcher

@ Transcriber: Bianca Gavin

@ Time Duration: 1:53-19:38

@ Date: 15-Oct.-2012

*BG: What’s your question?
*41: Well, were having trouble figure out what the situation is. We can figure out the first part, but the second part we don’t know.

*BG: Hm. What do you know so far?
*41: Um Stuttgard hat sehr viel Geld und es würde, I don’t know this word, da [/]
daher.

*BG: Daher, Um, because of.
*41: Oh, because of.

*BG: Yeah, don’t get caught on every word, you don’t have to know every word to know what’s going on. So ähm, Stuttgart, die Stadt Stuttgart, sie hat ganz viel Geld, ganz viel Geld und sie wollen eine neue Innenstadt bauen, ja, eine neue Innenstadt.

*41: Ok.

*BG: Und ähm ihr, ihr müust darüber reden was sie machen müssen, die Wünsche der Einwohner ja. Hier steht zum Beispiel; Die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden. Ja, die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden. Oder, Lisa denkt dass es nicht genug Mülleimer auf dem Fußgängerweg gibt, ja, so your task is to just go through those wishes and to see what has to be changed. And how can you change that? And where?

*41: Ok.

*BG: Is that clear?
*41: So we go through those questions and figure out what needs to be changed<+

*BG: Hm.
*41: Ok. And we don’t write anything on here we just <+.

*BG: Yes, you absolutely can write on it.
*41: Ok. [...] So, Lisa denkt das es nicht genug [/] genug Mülleimer auf dem Fuß-
gänger-wegen +…

*42: Fußgängerwegen +…

*41: Mülleimer. [...] Oh the Fußball [/] Fußballplatz <+.

*42: Platz […] ähm +…

*41: Das ist nicht genug [/] genug do you know what genug?

*42: So, I’m not sure cause it’s. […] What’s Boden mean?

*41: Hm?

*42: What’s this word?

*41: No, I don’t know what that is. […] Mülleimer?

*42: What’s number two? Shall we figure it out?
Sure. So, Tim denkt das dass das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist von dem Fitnessstudio und dem Fußballplatz. I think that means, he thinks the, is this do you know what +… That the Schwimmbad zu weit. Is that swimmingpool? Ähm I, yeah I think so. Well either way I think the sentences say that Tim thinks that it’s Swimmingpool. [>1] next to the Fittnessstudio and the Fußballplatz, but it is not. It’s on the other side. Yeah. So we have to correct it right? Yeah. So. I don’t know, were are we supposed to were sup +… Still struggling? So are we supposed to um like when we fix the sentence, do you want us to say the full sentence in German, or are you just recording like our general +… I’m recording your general conversation. Ok. Oh, or general thought process? Yeah. Exact that’s exactly what it is. Well you have to read +… This these are the wishes of the citizen’s right. So you have to fulfill the wishes of the citizens. Ok. That’s the task. So if he thinks that this is here we have to, how do we fulfill it? What’s the question? We have to fulfill the citizen uh +… So Tim denk das das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist. Ja, es ist zu weit weg, ok? It’s over there it’s not next to that. Ok. So what’s the problem? Ähm, are we supposed to correct it? Into here. Like say it? Hmm. Ok. So if +< Like, what what is the problem? What do you have to do in order to solve the problem? Ok. So we have to tell Tim where how to g where it actually is. I think Tim knows where it is, because he says; Tim denkt dass das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist, ja. Er weiß dass und er denkt das ist viel zu weit weg, das ist hier ganz oben, dass ist ihm zu weit weg. Er will das hier unten haben. Ja, er will das hier unten hinkommt. Und weil ihr ihr macht ja die neue Innenstadt, ja. Ihr, ihr seit verantwortlich. Its your its your responsibility to make all this new. Ok.
So you can tell Tim [...] well will do it, will not do it. Why are we gonna do it, what do we have to do if we [...] if we do what Tim wants.

Ok. Alright. Danke.

Bitte.

Thanks.

So it’s not, it doesn’t mean next to it, I guess it means +<

That’s.

Acr [...] like across town or far from it, I don’t +…

Ok. Let’s (?) when she said these are the wishes of, [...] so like, what is he wishing?

He thinks that the Schwimmbad is [...] is von dem [...] und what is von? [...] äh, I know this one.

Isn’t that am [...] for or from.

Yeah.

I think it’s for.

Can we look up our stuff?

I don’t think so.

Ok, you know [...] do you know what you have you have to do? Do you know what [...] what is required of you?

Um I think so. We just can’t understand these sentences. I guess there are a lot of words we don’t know.

Ok. That’s fine.

So +…

Just try to figure them out. If you don’t then just move on. Maybe there is something that you do understand.

Ok.

Ok.

Cause we thought this is [...] he thought that the swimming pool was next to the fitness center and this, well I guess is not the case. Um

Hm. [...] Ein [...] ein Schwimmbad, ja [...] Which is here.


So, it’s far away?

Hm. Ja. It’s to [...] It’s too far away.

Ok.

So, that’s the problem.

Ok.

So what do you need to do in order to solve that problem?

oh, ok. [...] We could move this. Sollen wir? Or we could um just tell him to walk [...]?

So.

But I mean it makes sense to have them all close to each other, cause they are all like Fitness related.
Right. I agree.

Let’s go on to some of the next sentences and see if we can figure any of this out.

Ok. So. Do you want to do number drei?

Sure.

Or say it [?] [..] genug [..] Do you know genug? [.]. Cause it is in the first one too and I just don’t know that word.

This one. Um.

Yeah [..]

In don’t know.

Ähm […] Are you going on to the next one?

Yeah.

Die Bücherei soll vergrößert [<1]

I know soll it’s should. So I’m wondering and then there is vergrößert. That means that it’s like, the book, I think that’s bookstore. Should be bigger.

Der addend [/] is bigger? [..] So [,] die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden. [.]. Oh the […] Is the Ampeln the streetlights?

Yeah, it looks like it cause they’re kind of like labeled, aditmat [?]

And the Zebrastreifen [/] streifen is the crosswalk.

Alright, so.

So Klaus think that [,] it’s not +./

Something, and it’s not. It’s not something.

+ Light and crosswalk for the +./

What’s Buslinie?

+ Bus. It’s boys [?] maybe? [.]. Fuß ähm, Foot.

Is foot. So a person who is walking, like a pedestrian.

Yeah. I think so.

So maybe he thinks that the cros [..] crosswalks and streetlights are not good for pedestrians. Like there is not enough.

Yeah.

They are bad for whatever reason.

I think that’s a good analysis +…

All right.

Of the text. [,] Um, the Bücherei so [/] so should […]

Should be something.

Should. Yeah.

And the house colosing out [?]. so I was thinking it should be bigger.

Bigger. So the +…

Did he not bookstore [?]. Yeah cause it’s +<

Is that a bookstore? I think so. So the bookstore should be bigger. Werden [..]

that’s all I got.

Yeah, well. I think that’s it. That one.

Number five is.

Straßenbahn.

Um, Straßenbahn is street, so acurelent [?]
Äh, well. Straße is street, I think. Straßenbahn, so the street traffic? I don’t know.

That could be.

Ah +<

stentive [?]

Ahm

It’s canner [?]

Werden [<1]

Its still the problem.

[>1] mehr halts +… is that a

I don’t know what Haltestelle is.

Haltestellen […] Haltestellen, I don’t know what that is. [...] Ähm, stop [/] stoplight have.[.] Die, maybe it’s saying they should have more st [/ ] stoplights? I don’t know, I’m, that’s probably wrong.

I don’t know cause we got to decide what’s, Ampel is stoplights.

Well, I was thinking Haltestel [ ] stele, like Halt, like To halt.

Stop.

Maybe.

It could be wrong.

It could also be right. […] It means a stop sign.

Ähm, so the street traffic should [<1]

Maybe it is stop sign.

[>1] should.

Should like be extended and have more stop signs?

Yeah.

So, und werdens und werden und sollen aber [?] and have more something. I don’t know what that is.

Um, maybe more stop sign stehens. It seems like it would be stop sign.

Yeah, I mean the thing it is a reasonable guess.

Ok, shall we go on?

Yeah.

Ah, die [/] die Innenstadt soll mindestens vier Einbahnstraßen bekommen.

Ok. Die Innenstadt is this like the inner-city, should +…

Meidestens.

What’s Einbahnstraße? Straße is street [+<]

Street. So Einbahn, so one way street?

Yeah.

Bekommen. So die [.] what did you say inner-city?

I think that’s what Innenstadt means.

Innestadt.

Cause Innenstadt is, stadt is city.

Oh ok. So the inner-city should [..] good one-way street [. ] bekommen.

How does bekommen fit in there?
Should become a one-way street. Um. [...] What does it say is there is it labeled ähm Einbahnstraßen. [...] There is the Straßenbahn. [...] Maybe it’s a Highway <

We have the Straßenbahn but […] Well I don’t know with the Einbahn seriously it might be one way street like you said. But I don’t know. […]

Um [...] Shall we do seven?

Yeah. Although it looks wired right nekt [...] Um, der Müll von der.

Fleisch Fleischeirei.

Oh man.

Stinkt [...] Well what’s the often Marketplace, helbühn [...] in the marketplace [=laughs] so, visitors in the market place, so Fleischerei stinkt […]

I’ll give you one more minute.

Die Büch is.

Äh, well here is this, die Fleischerei.

Where is it?

Right here.

Oh […]

Hm, I’m not sure about that one.

Ok let’s go on. Die [..] die Besucher von dem Fitnessstudio und Fußballplatz sind immer durstig

What is durstig?

We have to just think about the overall idea. So the [..] dem Fitnessstudio […] and Fußball […] sind immer […] Ok, were not gonna figure [..] were not gonna figure that one out in a minute.

Die Stadt hat genug Geld. So money bek […] […]

Ok. Make sure you push the stop button. It’s on the side.
*43: I think it like ahm saying how the Stuttgart has a lot of money [noisy] howanry
[?] is really rude fantasy [?] and stuff [.] ahm and I think it’s something like you
have to draw a whole plan for them to like get all the places they wanna go to. [.] So
Lisa denkt das es nicht genug Mülleimer auf den Fußgängerwegen gibt. [.] So
*45: No. […] No I’m not really percisley sure what we are doing.
*43: I think it’s like, the situation is saying how it’s to [/] to datronized [?] downtown.
*45: Yeah yeah.
*43: Your activity is die innercity of Stuttgart new zu gestalten. It looks like Dabbie [?]
must wünsche der Einwohner weckten. Do you know what that means?
*45: No, I know what Einwohner is just like the citizen there.
*43: Yeah.
*45: Wünsche, I’m not [///] I don’t [///] I’m not sure Wünsche.
*43: Yeah.
Beachten. [.] Neu city mache +… […]
*43: Neues Schwimmbad +… […] Studio [...] der Footballplatz. I think we need to
like address what they are thinking +<
*45: Mh
*43: And like answer if they are like yea or no like in number two is Tim thinks the
swim [/] ah swimming pool is I want to say like inbetween or next to I forgot what
weit weg is. But its ah something in relative to fitnessstudio the.
*45: Fußballplatz.
The footballstadium the field […] and the schwimmbad +<
*45: Oh ja.
*43: So.
*43: Ähm […] Do you know what an Fußgangerwegen? I know it’s like.
*43: It’s like a foodpath.
*45: Oh ja ok that’s what I thought.
*43: Yeah.
*43: Yeah I didn [/] I didn’t see that on the map though.
*43: I think it might just be like understood as sidewalk.
*45: Yeah.
*43: I figured out that Zebrastripe and is like the crosswalk.
*45: Yeah, I was [///] cause I saw that on the sheet and I’m like ah Zebrastripes I guess
[<1]
*43: That’s clever though.
*45: I figured crosswalk.
*43: That’s clever [...] Those’s clever Germans.
*45: Ok.
All right ähm. What’s a Mülleimer though.

Where is that at?

Mülleim +… it’s in the first question and it’s located there.

Mülleimer.

Do you think it’s one of those ähm [...] like when you’re in a downtown area they

have like a pavilion sort of thing people put notices and stuff on there?

Maybe I don’t know.

Yeah […]

Lisa denkt, dass es nicht genug Mülleimer +…

Maybe ähm Mülleimer is like a Telephone booth

No I don’t think so. I think, no cause I think I […] I remember we learned that word

but I don’t thing +…

Did we? [...] Does some of this, there’s a second Mülleimer?

Oh ja.

So [...] Maybe it’s not like one of the paring (?) fitting this.

Yeah I’m not sure. Do you know what Ampel is?

I think thats suppost to be like a streetlight.

Ok

Just judging by the thing, in number three it’s ah Klaus denkt das es nicht genug

Ampeln und Zebrastreigen für die Fußgänger gibt

Ok yeah

Which I think is like he things there is not enough lights or crosswalks for people.

Ah.

Ähm.

Yeah for pedestrians. []

The Bookeri soll vergrözt werden. I don’t know what those words mean. Bücheri

[...]

Im still not sure how am they would want us to like respond to these.

Wünsche für. I guess it’s just give your opinion in their opinion cause it’s all like.

Indirect opinions for suggestions or something yeah.

Yeah, like Lisa thinks, Tim thinks.

Yeah. So they should be bigger or.

Four of the nine look more like statements but […]

Yeah […]

I think part of this is to see how we treated.

[=laughs] that was what I was thinking.

like knowing how we can answer thinks, how we go about doing that.

Yeah. Is Bücherei is that Bakery.

I thought that was die Bäckerei would be baker.

Bäcker.

Bücherei ähm [...] I [...] I said it was a bookstore but I completely guessed on that

one.

Do you have a question?

We were just wondering that +<

We were just talking about that.

Yeah forward (?) it looks like it should be bigger [...] it should become bigger. […]
*45: I also think that number two weit weg that might be far away.
*43: Yeah, yeah, yeah that sounds [.] that sounds about right. [..]
*45: mh [..]
*43: So Lisa denkt das es nicht genug Mülleimer auf den Fußgängen ah Fußgangerwegen gibt ähm [.] Das a stimmt, äh, there is only zwei, two äh of the Müll [.] Mülleimers.
*45: Äh, Tim denkt das das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist von dem Fittnessstudio und dem Fuss [.] Fußballplatz. Ähm [.]
*45: Ich denke, dass das Schwimmbad ähm [.] ist neben dem Fittnessstudio und Fußballplatz.
*43: Ähm Klause denkt +<
*45: Sollen.
*43: Klaus denkt, dass es nicht genug Ampeln und Zebrastreifen für die Fußgänger gibt. Ah ich glaube für [.] Ich glaube mit ihm äh there are äh I forgot how to say that phrase but ah zwei Ampel.
*45: Es gibt zwei Ampeln.
*43: Oh, es gibt zwei Ampeln und ein Zebrastreifen ähm in Innenstadt äh Stuttgart [.] von Stuttgart.
*45: Brings us to die Bücherei. Die Bücherei soll ver [.] vergrößert [.] vergrößert werden. Should become bigger.
*43: Isn’t soll like by itself?
*45: No it’s like should.
*43: Oh should.
*45: Ja.
*43: Ja so when that’s right that’s right.
*45: Bücherei.
*43: should.
*45: Ähm […] Ich habe keinen denken an die Bücherei.
*43: [=laughs] [] Ah die Straßenbahn soll äh etwa [.] erweitert warden und mehr Halts [.] Haltestellen haben. Oh ähm. Nein ich glaube die Straßenbahn ist gut sieht äh. Ick ich ah+<
*45: [=laughs]
*43: No it like crosses all of downtown. As far Haltestellen haben ah ich weiß nicht ich don’t know where it stops. But [.] it seems like its long enough it cuts through it’s half [?] +<
*45: mh [.] Die Innestadt soll mindestens soll mindestens vier Einbahnstraßen bekommen. Einbahnstraßen ist not like one-way street is it?
*43: I think its ahm. Einbahnstraßen. It’s more like a one train car thing like a trolly or something +<
*45: Oh yeah yeah.
*43: Cause it’s a [.] it’s a one car street it might be one way street so just like single lanes.
*45: Or like a street car something +…
*43: Right.
*45: Yeah [.] Do you know what mindestens +…
I’m guessing ähm should prepare for like work towards, have the mind set maybe. Cause like the inner city should blank more single lane streets [<>1] Trolleys whatever become +… Ähm [.] ja [.] Ahm [.] Th thtthtth [.] Amh [.] Aber die Innenstadt hat eine Bus. Ähm, seven is der Müll von der Fleischerei stinkt und das ärgert die Besucher auf dem Marketplace ähm [.] Ja das stimmt I mean Fleischmarket viel stinkt aber [.] where will it go other than the Marketplace, like wo +< Wo soll der Fleischerei gehen? Ahm [.] Maybe switch with Baker cause that’s like on the next street sort of out of the way of the Marketplace. Hm. Real nice [?] those smellS of the town. Hm. [.] Ähm [.] Die Besucher von dem Fittnessstudio und Football [/] Fußballplatz sind immer durst [/] durstisch [.] do you know what durstisch? Durstig I don’t know maybe busy. Are always busy [.] or it says like the visitors [.] from the Fittnessstudio, Fuß [/] Fußballplatz are always +… Oh thirsty. Oh thirsty oh ok. Like Ich habe durst, yeah +< Ah. Which make sense cause it’s [<>1] Ähm [>1] the gym and ah like a football field. Hm [.] Ähm [.] Ja das stimmt ähm [.] Ich [.] Ich denkt, dass ahm das Supermarket ist neben die Fußballplatz und Fittnessstudio sollen. Der Museum soll haben viele dränke und ah viele Geld high prices. Jaja. Äh die Stadt hat genug Geld um die Bäckeri und Konditorei neben oder unter dem Supermarket zu bauen [.] I don’t know what those words mean. Bäckeri und die teori [?] […] I don’t know what ah Bäckeri or Konditorei are. Next to or under the supermarket. Do you know what bauen is? I heard it before but I don’t know what it means. [.] Die Stadt hat enough gold um die Bäckeri +… […] it’s here […] Yeah I’m not sure what that’s really saying. The city has enough money at the Bäckerei und Konditorei +… […] Is there even a [/] ey a Bäckeri on the map? [.] hm well I [.] I can see the Backer and the Bächeri but that’s about it. Maybe Bäcker is the same thing as. Oh Bächeri. Bäckerei. That would make sense +< It could be the baker or bakery [.] Kondi [/] Konditorei.
Die Stadt hat enough gold of the bakeris and Konditori [..] Do you have any idea what a Konditori is?

No [.] I’m not sure what it has to do with them being next to or under the supermarket. I guess if I knew what bauen [/] zu bauen.

I feel like it might be talking about combining them.

Yeah and +<

like the Backers of [///] if the Backeri is a baker and the konditor +<

Is something related to food or something.

Right.

Yeah.

Or even like an appliance store or something like that.

Hm.

We’re German two students were not city planers.

I know, that’s what I was thinking […]

Hm […]

I’ll give you one more minute.
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*BG: I can help you to if you + ...

*49: I’m just trying to figure out what are we su [/] what are we suppost to + ...

*BG: Yeah absolutely.

BG: Ok ähm es ist über Stuttgart ja, die Stadt Stuttgart. Stuttgart hat sehr viel Geld und
es wurde eine neue [///] entschieden das es eine neue Innenstadt, ja ein neue
Innenstadt wird gebaut und ähm die Aufgabe, that’s what you have to do. Is ähm
you have to build eine neue Innenstadt ja und dabei müst ihr die Wünsche ja, die
Wünsche der Einwohner die müßt ihr beachten. Und dann steht hier zum
Beispiel: Lisa denkt das es nicht genug Mülleimer auf dem Fußgängerwegen gibt
ja. So than you have to solve that problem with talking to each other. Oder eine
andere; die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden. Ja

*49: Ok. So like putting in more Fußgängerwegen.

*BG: Ja.

*48: Ok.

*49: Lisa denkt da es nicht genug Mülleimer auf dem Fußgängerwegen gibt. Let’s
see here […]

*48: Yeah she want’s more like [.] Fußgängerwege. Ok [.] Yeah that would be great
but I don’t think we can answer +.. 

*49: Like wir mussen more Fußegängerwegen in der Stadt.

*48: Genau [?] were a [/] are you asking like where she wants them or? […]

*49: So Zebrastreifen +/.

*48: die crosswalk.

*49: + like Fußegängerwege.

*48: Ok.

*49: So maybe where would you put that?

*48: Ok.

*49: Fußgängerwege [/] Füße [/]Fußgängerwegen.

*48: Fußgängerwege.

*49: Bei dem Marketplatz?

*48: Bei dem Marketplatz.

*49: Hm und+.

*48: Wo ist der Marketplatz? Âh ok Marketplatz.

*49: + Mh Marketplatz und ahm das [/] die [/] das Bank.

*48: Ja das Banke ja das Bank ahm.

*49: Und bei die Fußballplatz.

*48: Fußballplatz und Museum?

*49: Ja.

*48: Ja ok. That works.
Und dann bei.
Ja dem Museum ja that works.
Ähm so Zwei.
Zweit.
Tim denkt dass das Schwimmbad zu weit äh ist von dem Fitnessstudio und dem Fußballplatz. So thinking at the +<
+Fussballplatz.
+probably should be closer to the Fitnessstudio and the Fußballplatz.
Yeah.
So.
Er denkt das.
Ahn der Museum uh Schwimmbad.
Yeah der Museum ahm [...] where is the Schwimmbad? Oh Schwimmbad is over here. Ok.
Schwimmbad hm this.
This [///] we could probably ahm switch them out ahm
Der Museum.
Die Museum.
gehen.
geht ah.
to.
ah.
Amfer [?]
obers [?] Schwimmbad.
Oper, Oper..
Oper.
Oper.
Move it over to Schwimmbad in der Nähe Fußballplatz. Ahm.
Drei Klaus denkt das es nicht genug Ample und Zebatren für die Fußgänger gibt nur [/] nur Zebrastreifen für die Fußgänger.
Yeah.
Wir hm [...] playing +<
been.
+ were.
been is this.
+ Are we supposed to be speaking in German?
I don’t know because this is like making it really difficult, I don’t know [...] Yeah why not. I don’t know.
Well were putting it in line Fußgängerwegen +<
Fuß.
+in popular areas.
Ok.
So we need more Zebatren für die Fußgänger.
And it said its not enough Amfe [/] Ampeln which is light look [name] the way its reading here.
What’s that?
Ampel.
Yeah its Ampel and its like plural I think so what could that be?
So its zwei [...] so lets assume [...] that it is not enough.
We are still looking at num [/] number three right>
Yeah.
Ok.
So maybe ahm in this new area Fitnesstudio and der Fußballplatz und die Schwimmbad +<
Yeah.
Were ahm +<
More about + Ampeln +,
Zebrastreifen + für die Fußgänger
Yeah and then ah freilan [...] Bücherei und der Marktplatz we can put some more ah Zebrastreifen und Ampeln.
Ja.
That works.
Vier die Bücherei soll vergrößert +<
Vergrößert.
+ werden.
Does that mean ah [...] Vergrößert ver+… [...] so should [...] should be bigger
Where is the bakery? [...] Maybe we can put the [...] maybe the Bookstore +/ Maybe the Bücher where?
There.
Soll vergrößert werden so it needs to be bigger
It needs to be bigger so.
Soll ahm maybe where das Schwimmbad ist? Move Schwimmbad over to the +/ Schwimmbad over where the +…
+ by the sports area.
Yeah and then +<
Und dann die Buscher [...] Bücherei to that area where we have the Museum
And die Oper.
Opra und die Museum in that area.
Yeah we could do that and than it could be bigger alright.
Fünf die Straßenbahn soll erweitert werden und mehr Haltestellen haben. So the streets [...] the streetcars should transf +…
Should be extended?
extended und more halt.
I’m [...] I’m assuming that Stops +<
Stops.
< Yeah. Should have more stops.
Yeah yeah ahm.
Ahm let’s see.
Die Straßenbahn soll erweiterd erweitered ahm mehr Stra

Ja mehr Strassen ah +…

Ahm nicht nur eine Strasse mit mehr Haltestellen.

Word.

Die Innenstadt soll mendest mindestens vier Einbahnstrassen bekommen.

The Innercity should more +/

Ah the inners inners ah downtown things it should have a ah unionbahn is that like an Einbahn its like a rail.

Einzahnstraße its it should have a manoroad [?].

I feel like this is like a manoroad cause like ah+

Ja it could become helpful [?]

I guess it could be.

Or oder er erweitert die Straßenbahn und then na ah nein Einbahnstraßen.

Nein Einbahnstraßen what?

Ahm just +/

Happen ex +…

+ erweiterd erweitered.

erweitered die Straßenbahn +<

die Straßenbahn und ahm

und nix Einbahnstrasse +/

und Bus.

+ Und Bus but nix ah keine Einbahnstrassen.

Aber ahm […] sehr viel Geld so.

Sehr viel Geld for, oh ja, we could wir haben viele Geld really.

By the ein Bus Strassenbahn Strassenbahn oder ein ahm Einbahn +<

Einzahnstrassen. […]

Der Müll von der Fleischerei stinkt und das ärgert der Besucher auf der Marketplatz. So.

Oh so like.

Fleischerei.

Fleischer is like the butcher right?

Yes move that over here so +…

Move that over so we could put that by the supermarket maybe.

Warum die Fleischerei stinkt.

Ja die Fleischerei +…

So ahm we were Hafen ist move Hafen […]

Move Hafen.

Straß und Fleischerei in this big area.

In this big area.

Groß […] Groß area.

Und Hafen […] sounds good Besuch +…

Die Besucher von dem Fitnesstudio und Fußball Fußballplatz sind immer durstig.

Was ist durstig?
Visitors of the Fitnesstudio and soccer filed are always durstig.
durstig. A ein +…
Ahm we could move the where is it? Getränkeautomat +/
Supermarkt.
+ Getränkeautomat.
Oh where?
Getränkeautomat.
Oh Getränkeautomat ja. If bring schwimmbad +<
Ah.
+ Ahm here Museum.
Where the Museum is ahm +…
Den Getränkeautomat +<
Ah.
In this Area.
In der [/] In der Nähe?
Ja.
Ah in der Nähe ja and then+…
Museum.
Same Straße than this Museum or the same Straße as +/
The same Straße.
+ As Swimmbad or something.
Ja gut Idee. [...] Die Stadt hat genug Geld um die Bäckeri und Konditorei neben
oder unter dem Supermarket zu bauen. [...] 
Die Stadt hat genung Geld um die Bäckerei +…
Bakerei.
Bäckerei [/] Bakerei is a Bakery I think.
Ok.
And then Konditorei ich weiß nicht. [...] 
Ah was ist Konditorei?
Konditorei. Ich kann euch das nicht sagen.
Oh.
I can’t tell you that.
Ok.
So. [...] Maybe combining them?
I think they wanne like [...] ahm [...]
putting them together so +<
Yeah.
+ die Backer und die Konditorei und die Supermarket is ahm +…
They are very separated right now.
Ja. Bäcker ist der Bäcker
Oh.
So, bei so, ahm die Bäcker ähm bei die Supermarket.
Ja and then die Konditorei.
Ahm Bahn die woher [?] 
Und die other side of die Straß.
The other side of the Straße ja.

[laugh]

So in the same area.

Ja.

So.

Das ist +…

So now we have +/

Ok.

+ die Fittnesstudio, Museum und Schwimmbad mit Getränkautomat.

Fitnessstudio und Museum ist+/

Excuse me. The Fittnesstudio, Fußballplatz und Schwimmbad +<

Getränke.

Mit Getränkeautomat. Here.

Ja.

Und die Museum.

Ist ah.

Nu [/] Nur.

Nur dem ah bei der Oper.

Bei der Oper und ah die Bücherei.

Bücherei in der Nähe die Oper.

Right Oper und Museum. Die Konditorei und Bäcker bei die Supermarket.

Ja.

Die Fleischerei.

Fleischerei.

Norden.

Norden ah bei der Hafen.

Und die ja norden [?] like its Platz. Wir haben mehr [/] mehr Ampeln und

Zebrastreifen für die Fußegänger.

Ja [...] Ahm [...] und die Strassenbahn bus und die Einbahnstrassen mehr [/] mehr a

Haltestellts. Mehr Haltestellen.

Ja. [...] Ich glaube wir sind fertig.

Fertig?

I guess.

Wir sind fertig.

I’ll give you one more minute.

OK. I don’t know if we should.
*52: Was ist denkt.
*50: Ahm, es ist weg.
*52: Ah ok.
*50: ...denk ist das es nicht genug Mülleimer.
*52: Mülleimer [.]
*50: ähm.
*52: hmmm.
*50: the Basement [...] das es ist. [...] Auf den Fußgängerwegen gibt [>1]. Oh.
*52: So [...]do we [?]. [...]  
*50: Lisa denkt das ist nicht genung [?]. Man nehme +...  
*52: Ja, ähm aber sie sind in ne andere Plätze, ähm hier auch +...  
*50: oh +...  
*52: so +... [...]  
*50: Auf den [...] So we have to write down what it is?  
*52: We have to like build [...] we have to build like a what ever this is. [...] Cause they  
*50: have a lot of money and they wanna build a thing +/.  
*50: hmm.  
*52: +, but I don’t know what this is. Do you know what Innenstadt means?  
*50: Nope. Maybe like an information stand.  
*52: Maybe. So it sound like a want to make a new whatever this is. So.  
*50: Stuttgart.  
*52: Save a bunch of money so they wanna invest it and build whatever this is, I need  
*50: to ask her. And then +/.  
*50: Cause I must wer die [?]  
*52: +, so we have to go by the wishes of the people that live there +/.  
*50: hmm.  
*52: and.  
*50: oh this is what they want <+  
*52: Yeah, so this is what they want and <+  
*50: so they want <+  
*52: and [...] We have to change the layout.  
*50: Maybe we could ah, maybe the innenstadt is like [...] ahm [...] ahm break a rout or  
like even.  
*52: Yeah, I think its like, we have to build like a [...] like a new street or something.  
Innenstadt. I don’t know, I’ll ask her when she [...] when she comes over here.  
*50: and.  
*52: I have a question. Ah, say the question. I don’t know what this is  
*50: Innenstadt, and we have <+
I can’t tell you that.

Ok.

Just keep on going and try figuring it out.

Alright.

Um.

Do you understand the task that you have to do?

Say we have to build something this thing +<

Hmm.

And then connect I don’t know like go by the wishes of people.

Yup.

to like figure out where to put it.

Thats right.

Ok.

You got it.

So, genung Mülleimer auf dem Fußgängerwegen gibt. So there is not enough whatever that is, ähm the walkway. So +<

So, she wants +…

like more.

more [...] more of these.

so, and then this guy thinks das [...] das Schwimmbad.

 [...] dass das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist von dem Fitnesstudio und Fußballplatz.

That would make sense.

Yeah, so he wants the Swimming pool to be closer to the gym [...] and.

Fittnessstudio is all the way over here.

and then the swimming pool is over here.

hm, all the way across town.

yeah.

and then the +…

bask.

baseballplatz. So we have to take the Schwimmbad and put it over here, or.

Ok.

I wish we knew more, we knew what to build [...] I think [...] I think we have to chan [...] I feel like we have to change like the city plan. So I think your right. Cause I think you said before, your like I think we have to .

Ok, so these are labeled and these are empty. This one, this one, this one, this one, this one.

Yeah.

Unless these are just Platz.

Yeah, but I think we put [...] put it wherever we want.

Ok, so maybe the schwim.

Will put the admir [...] here or something. [...] Schwimmbad.

The train goes right next to it. She wants more of the wolemer [...] So we can through.
Yeah, so were’s the Fußgängerplatz is though. Oh, wait, that’s Fußballplatz. I mean, I’m pretty sure they are like everywhere. Fußgänger where is the Fußgänger Wegen. Ähm.

I think it’s just everywhere, cause there are streets and stuff. She wants just a couple of more. [>]Yeah, I’m imagining that there is like near each other. Stodbewgen? Because she has one here. Here, here.

+, maybe there should we should put two more, so the first one they put by the Bäcker. I put it her, but that’s ok. Either way, as long as we are relatively close. Ah, you put it on this one.

mmmhhh, its maybe a balls a busroute. Where? Maybe by like a bus route, oh wait, there is one right by the bus. Yeah.

Wherever else you think that it should it go, maybe we should just keep them all. Oh, who’s that on cloks. So, Zebrastef Zebrastrefen, that is where people cross. So I think.

She wants one right next to it? Near it, ja possibly. I think.

Oh my gosh that’s it as, it was a zebra-stripe. Yeah, but I think that’s like where, cause I don’t know that’s what it means here [=laughs]

Ok, so I’m crossing this one off. That was getting das ist nicht genug. and Zebrastreifen vor der Fuß. ganger gibt. So, we can make more. Ähm, wie ist Ampel Ampeln.

Ähm, es ist I think ähm street lights. Oh, ok.

So we could put on like here. Since then like more. There is only two streets. Yeah.

You thinks there should be one right next to it? Like, so that people can cross the street-thing? Ähm, that would make sense, maybe one like here and then one here. Ja?

But then theirs is like the the Straßenbahn, you know? Hmm.

Oh, wait. Is this like a train thing? I don’t know.
Cause the Bahn is +
the bahn is.
the road all, well it’s like a highway thingy. [...] Oh, wait no, your right. Cause ja,
the U-Bahn is the underground train. I don’t know. [...] I get those [/] I get Zug and
Bahn like [...] dissent [?] I don’t know. There is two different words for like similar
things.
So he wants one.
And then Ampeln, but like that infront of the […] So you put the [/] So you put
that +…
So you put one here, the Zebra-stripe one.
Ja […] And then I thing like [...] he probably wanna put the Ampel here. Just so it
feels like ähm [...] makes sense to me.
And then where did you put the other one?
I would put one like right by the other thing we made.
Ok.
And I guess we could add more of [...] so die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden.
verges ah, wait what?
Vergrößert. So it’s, I think it needs to be, I think they are saying it should be
bigger. [...] I think. The Bücherei +<
Ja.
Which I thing is the Library. Does that sound right?
Ja, that sounds good to me.
Ja, so just make that bigger. [...] That would be funny if that’s like totally wrong.
Everything needs to be smaller and less of and +…
I like that’s not it, that’s not what it means [=laugh]
Ok. And then, die Straßenbahn soll erweitert werden und mehr Haltestellen
haben. Ok. So I know that Haltestellen means like Stops.
But [/] Bushaltestelle means Busstop. So, I have never [...] Haltestelle oder
Straßenbahn, oh the Streetcar that’s what that is. Streetcar, Straßenbahn. So, mehr
Haltestellen. So we need to have more stops. [...] Which I don’t know +/-.
For the Bus?
Yeah, No. For the Straßenbahn.
Oh, oh I see. So it just goes straight through.
Yeah. So like +…
Maybe by the bank or the [...] Maybe they can have one right were we put the
Zebrastreif [/] streifen? [...] So it’s like they can get off and go to the Supermarket.
Yeah or you know what I thing a good one would be here cause there are so many
businesses right here.
Ok.
So [...] Autosteuern […] I only know that cause they have this really [...] retarded
ahm, German cd thing for my car [=laughts] +/-.
[=laughts]
Its like Bushaltestelle.
As long as you remember it.
*52: Yeah. Ok. [.] So, ah and then they say more, so I’m assuming more than one, cause there is zero right now, so we can put one like +<
*50: So we can put one here.
*52: We can put one here cause there is like markets over here too, they can go to like either thing.
*50: hm. This stop sign is terrible.
*52: Die Innenstadt soll mides [/] meidestens vier Einbahns [/] Einbahnstraßen bekommen. So the cityplan should more [/] Should probably for +…
*50: But we don’t even know what the, die Innenstadt +…
*52: I thing it means innerplan +<
*50: Innercity?
*52: I thi… think that’s what it means. I think were just changing […]. Yeah.
*50: The Innercity
*52: The city of. I just think were changing the city plan.
*50: Yeah.
*52: So the city plan should +…
*50: have four in it +…
*52: Einbahnstraßen. So where, is there any? [/] are there any? [.]. Einbahnstraßen. I don’t know.
*50: Is that +…
*52: I don’t see any.
*50: Four Bus stops?
*52: No. It’s +…
*50: Vier. +<
*52: Einbahnstraßen. So one +…
*50: What is the Einbahn +<
*52: I think it’s a one-way street. I don’t know that’s what I’ve guessed. […]. So I’m just gonna put one here, in the corner. […] Einbahnstraße.
*50: Well it said [/] said something about four Ein +…
*52: Yes, so we should put four of them. […] So I put [/] I put one like in the big [.]. one.
*50: Ah ok. […]
*52: So, I gonna put another one, I don’t know, [.]. here.
*50: There should be four, there sh [/] we should create four.
*52: There aren’t any right now. So we have to create four. […] Unless they are like implied by something, but I don’t see it. […] So were there any of you [/] you could just put one anywhere. […]
*50: One, two. […]
*52: So that [=laugh] So der Müll [?] von der Fleischerei stinkt und das ärgert [.] die Büch [/] Besuchers auf dem Marktplatz. So […] where is die Fleischerei? Ähm.
*50: Right here.
*52: So we should move it away from the market place. We could put it over here, cause it’s like away from everything. […] So, Fleischerei. […] Die Besucher von dem Fitnessstudio mh fisch braucht hat sind immer +…
*50: Durstig.
*52: Durstich. Ja, so, they need ah ah [/] ahm Getränkeautomat. […] So they, but when they’re on this, ähm die on [?] […] Die Stadt hat genug Geld um die Bäckerei und
Konditori [/] und Konditorei neben oder unter den plankt zu bauen [.]
they’ve enough money, so the Baker and the whatever. Do you know that this is
Konditorei?
*50: No.
*52: I don’t know either.
*50: Condition-something?
*52: Yeah, I [/] I thing it would be. Tells you how [?]. We just talked about like [,] in
culture [/] we just talked about like get [,] or konditionen [,] ãhm get like, so that
like a thing, where people like immigrate. I don’t know. That’s just my guess.
*50: Oh, I have no idea.
*52: So [,] but, oh ok so anyway so the stick [,] the city has enough money s [,] so the
baker and the other thing have [,] ãhm, next to or under the Supermarket.
*50: So the Supermarket [,] is right there.
*52: Oh I think, ok. So we could move the baker over or near the supermarket, so it
seems like that’s where people go for their +…
*50: Yeah [?] +…
*52: It’s like Boh and ah stuff anyway [?]
*50: Where is it?
*52: The baker guy is right here.
*50: So then we can [,] put them here?
*52: Yeah like next to, yeah you can out it across there. I’ll put mine next to the
Supermarket. [,] My Bäcker. […] Where is that âh things [?] [,] Where is that K-
word thing? [,] Where is the [,] the K-thing? Oh here it is. We could put that here
I guess.
*50: Put the Kondit +/.
*52: Konditorei. [,] I think.
*BG: I’ll give you one more minute. One more minute.
*52: Hey, were done.
*52: Do we need to press stop when were finished?
@End
*54: Ok then this should be fun. I’m not sure. Are we supposed to map it?

*55: Are we supposed to make directions? No.

*54: Mh.[.] I think we are supposed to say how we get there. I don’t know.

*55: What are we doing? Ok. So this is like a map thing.

*54: Yeah.

*55: So is like a busroute maybe and this is this street [/] streetcar thing.

*54: Mh yeah I thing so, but +… [...] So I thing he was saying that he was there and that he want to get to the Fitnesstudio and then Fußballlatz.

*55: Wait who is where?

*54: I don’t know Tim oh for number two sorry.

*55: Oh.

*54: I was looking at it.

*55: For and the Fitnestudio and the Football or soccer something?

*54: Yeah its probably soccer.

*55: Soccer something.

*54: Mh soccers stadium.

*55: Ok.

*54: So then take the Bus.

*55: Something needs a new innecity something. This, wait I’m trying to translate +/-

*54: Yeah.

*55: / you know. Stuttgart braucht needs [/] need something new something city

*54: I’m not sure. [...] This is terrible.

*55: ohm Ok this is good. This is good. Something must her something. Something the map.

*54: What?


*54: I don’t know, I don’t know what genug is. Mh.

*55: Mülleimer.

*54: Shall we ask her what to do?

*55: She’ll be like: What do you know? Nothing.

*54: Right around nothing.

*55: How about we know that it’s a map that has German words on it.

*54: That’s terrible.

*55: Ahm we’re a little confused.

*BG: Ok. What are you confused about?

*55: Are we like [inaudible] where they are going or?

*BG: You are +/ May I have this? It says ahm eure Aufgabe ist es die Innenstadt von Stuttgart neu zu gestalten, ja? Ihr macht die neu. Die Innenstadt wird ganz neu gemacht, das ist die alte, das ist die Alte Innenstadt und ihr macht eine neue
Innenstadt, ja? Ich mache eine neue Innenstadt und wenn
ihr diese neue Innenstadt macht, dann müsst ihr die
Wünsche der Einwohner berücksichtigen, ja? Es steht zum Beispiel; Lisa denkt,
dass es nicht genug Mülleimer auf den Fußgängerrücken gibt. Lisa möchte, dass
es mehr Mülleimer gibt, ok? Oder es steht zum Beispiel; die Bücherei soll
vergrößert werden, ja? Sie ist zu klein. Sie soll vergrößert werden und dann müsst
ihr das verändern, hier auf der Mappe, ja? No? [=laught] Ask me questions so that
ich was du verstehst und was du nicht verstehst.

Ok, are we supposed to be moving things?
If that’s [] if that is what is required in order to fulfill these wishes, yes.
So we are supposed to be moving things near where someone wants?
Well, you have to read the wishes of the [] of the city [] citizens.

Yes.
Ok. So you have to fulfill those wishes. So you might have to move something,
you might have to add something, you might have to take away something.

Ok.
Ok.

But you want us to draw it here or +…
You can draw on the map ahm you don’t have to but if that makes it easier. Other
the other class has []use to draw on the map and that worked so it’s absolutely
up to you guys.

Ok.
Ok. [...] Right +<

So Mülleimer that’s right here.
Yeah.

Fußgänger hm where is that? [] Fußgänger I didn’t even see that. Does she not
want it there? Oh wait there is two, this one and this one. [...] What’s
Fußgängerwege? Oh pedestrian path? These are Fußgänger something.
Ahm I would thing so.
It’s the path.
Yeah, yeah.
The pedestrian path, sidewalk <+
Hm Yeah.
Ok. So it’s [] is it bad? [...] Ok so I think Tim thinks the swimming pool
should be by the fitness studio and that. So they shall be like near each other.
Yeah.
Right?
Yeah.

So maybe we can move swimming bad right?
Mh.
Klaus things that the Ampeln, I don’t know what that is! Do you?
What?
Ampeln?
No I don’t know.
Oh street, maybe it’s a street light, oh no light?
Maybe it’s a bike ph +…
93  *55: Bike?
94  *54: Ahm
95  *55: This one is like upside down.
96  *54: Maybe that is a light.
97  *55: Stop sign or?
98  *54: Mh [...]
99  *55: Ok and.
100 *54: Yeah.
101 *55: Ok here [...] Ahm the Bookstore something should be [...] bigger or something?
102 *54: Hm [...] vergrößert I would think that it would be bigger but [...] ahm.
103 *55: Ok.
104 *54: What’s werden?
105 *55: Oh this person thinks that the butcher is stinky [laugh] and the visitors
106  [=inaudible] by the Marktplatz. Where is that? [...] So, this shouldn’t be her or this
107  should be far away or something?
108 *54: Yeah I guess it should be farth [/] further away. And then
109 *55: So we could put the Bücherei somewhere else?
110 *54: Mh. The Bücherei +...
111 *55: And then [/] It’s also von dem Fittnessstudio [...] see so the visitor thing, right?
112 *54: Mh.
113 *55: By the Fittes studio always [...] oh it’s always dusty. Could it be that? The
114  Fußballplatz is always dusty? So maybe it didn’t go there?
115 *54: I guess it could be. Maybe we should move it to like [...] mh.
116 *55: Maybe switch it?
117 *54: Yeah.
118 *55: Like put it on one of these or?
119 *54: Ohm.
120 *55: Wait no, where are we? Where is the Besucher?
121 *54: It’s the a football [...] There is the Fitness studio there is the football
122 *55: Yeah but where is the visitors thing?
123 *54: Oh.
124 *55: Do they even have one or are we supposed to add one somewhere?
125 *54: I’m not sure. Let’s see.
126 *55: How about we add one [...] here?
127 *54: Yeah.
128 *55: Or here or here?
129 *54: Mh.
130 *55: But this is still kind of close to this. Right here?
131 *54: Maybe dam [?]
132 *55: Cause now we don’t have the hole there anymore.
133 *54: Yeah.
134 *55: So all we have is whatever this is.
135 *54: Ahm. For the visitors center?
136 *55: [inaudible]
137 *54: Its for the visitors center right?
138 *55: What?
What are we gonna move.

Yeah.

Or put.

Yeah.

Ok ah. [...] Maybe like in the middle close to everything you know?

Yeah.

So maybe like +/

But it can’t be close to this cause they are saying it’s to stinky so it can’t be like here.

Yeah. Or we can just put it right [/] right there [/] right there.

Mh, yeah cause then it’s by the Museum.

Mh.

And it’s by a public transportation.

Yeah.

So we can do visitors. Ok. [...] Ahm

Mh.

So maybe we can say that one is done. That one is done and this one is done


Is that enough maybe?

What?

Is genug enough? [...] Klaus thinks that there is not enough lights and something for the, I think that’s enough.

Crosswalk?

Yeah for like the crosswalk.

It’s probably enough.

Yeah. And then this one the study [/] or the city has enough money for the something or the supermarket to whatever.

Crosswalks.

Crosswalks.

Crosswalks.

Yeah.

Ok well we can do ahm [...] we can make more of these and more +/

Crosswalks.

Crosswalks.

Yeah.

Ok. So let’s draw some crosswalks. [...] ahm the fitness [/] for the +…

Lots of +/

Visitors center to the Museum?

Yeah.

That would be a good one right?

Yeah. [...]
Yeah we should probably fix that.

So we can get to this part and then maybe a crosswalk from here to here and here to here?

Mh Yeah. [...] Ok. So we have this connected were not connected to this side.

Oh.

So the visitors center can be across.

Mh.

Maybe right here. Cause there is no point in crossing to that other thing cause there is nothing there yet.

Yeah. 

Ahm. Maybe here and here?

Yeah I would thing so. [...] Where else?

Mh.

Mh. 

Ahm. Maybe here and here?

Ok. So we have this connected were not connected to this side.

Mh.

Mh.

Mh. 

Yeah. 

Ahm. Probably here right? On like this big intersection.

Yeah probably.

I’m assuming this is like a light of some sort.

[=laugh] Kind of like that is not a light [=laugh][..] Amp [...] Where is the other one?

I don’t.

Ampel. One there, one there.

And.

And one like right here?

Yeah that’s where I was thinking. [...]

Ok, Ok so we made some crosswalks. [...] Zebrastreifen. [...] On the questionnaire I wrote Zebra stripes.

[=laugh] really?

Cause Zebrastreifen I was like zebra stripes.

[=laugh] I just left it blank. I was thinking the same thing though. Like zebra stripe that can’t be right. Like screw that.

[=laugh] Yeah it looks like it.

[=laugh]

Ok. [...] Die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden. Straßenbahn. I don’t know what die Straßenbahn +…there is not enough of these so maybe we just add some of those?

Yeah.

The memory when we don’t know where they are [?] I don’t know.

Where can we get one, right here?

Ahm ja. And then.

Mülleimer. [...] I see one there and we have one here. We should probably add this, connecting them.
102

231 1.55: So we have a Müllleimer there there, shall we put it here?
232 1.54: Yeah. Sure.
233 1.55: I have no idea what this is.
234 1.54: [=laugh]
235 1.55: There like you don’t need six police stations.
236 1.54: Yeah [=laugh]
237 1.55: Ahm. Maybe it’s like a +/- . I don’t know what that is.
238 1.54: What?
239 1.55: This. I can’t figure out what this is. +<
240 1.54: Oh the Müllleimer. I have no clue.
241 1.55: Maybe directions? [?] [..] or the city something something for [.] this the
242 Komonist [?]
243 1.54: I don’t know ah. I can’t think of it.
244 1.55: To come from? Come.
245 1.54: I think so.
246 1.55: The city has Einbahnstraßen has four ahm +/-
247 1.54: BG: I’ll give you one more minute. One more minute.
248 1.55: + has four street stops maybe street car stops.
249 1.54: Mh. Ahm.
250 1.55: Or it needs ok so maybe it needs.
251 1.54: Is it bus stops?
252 1.55: Yeah four Bus +…
253 1.54: Bus stop.
254 1.55: Or just Busses but maybe another or ähm +/-
255 1.54: Yeah.
256 1.55: + another streetcar thing?
257 1.54: Yeah maybe.
258 1.55: So like, oh wait look.
259 1.54: Or another bus route.
260 1.55: Has one two se how it has those two little guys.
261 1.54: Yeah.
262 1.55: Maybe we have to add like another one somewhere in this route.
263 1.54: I bet yeah that’s probably what this is.
264 1.55: So maybe, I don’t even know.
265 1.54: Ahm maybe one going through over here?
266 1.55: Like the outer +/-
267 1.54: Yeah.
268 1.55: Road maybe?
269 1.54: Yeah.
270 1.55: All right though starting here and [.] going around the other.
271 1.54: Yeah.
272 1.55: And back up this way?
273 1.54: Mhm.
274 1.55: Ok so.
275 1.54: BG: Ok . Ahm make sure you push the stop button, its on the side.
276 1.55: @End.
*60: Stuttgart hat sehr viel Geld und es wurde daher entschieden das die Innenstadt von Stuttgart ganz neu +…
[inaudible]
*60: Das es nicht genug Mülleimer auf dem Fußgängerwegen gibt.
*61: So Lisa thought that is not enough .]
*61: Mülleimer. []
*60: I don’t know.
*61: There is not enough grass on the football field.
*60: Maybe. []
*60: Is that what Fußgänger is.
*61: Yeah maybe. So like we just write it down.
*60: Maybe ahm. I think we are like supposed to find the directions.
*61: Oh.
*60: Like, it’s pretty much like we do it ourselves [?] with directions.
*61: Ok. So, it’s by the Marketplate [/] Marketplatz then?
*60: Yeah. Wait so its by Müll [/] Mülleimer.
*61: Its right by the Marketplatz.
*60: Its right her ah it’s right here by the Fuß +… [.] I think its here cause then there is one over here on the footballplatz.
*61: Mh.
*60: Ok.
*61: alright so Tim denkt, dass das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist von dem Fitnessstudio und dem Fussballplatz. [.] Alright so we need to find the Schwimmbad.
*60: Schwimmbad.
*60: Von dem [///] so right by the fittnessstudio [.] platz, so Museum?
*61: Nein. Wait. No he thing that +…
*60: Yeah.
*61: The swimm thing is next to the Fittnessstudio and the Fußballplatzit no it’s the Museum. The idea. Nein.
*60: Es ist nicht +/.
*61: Museum.
*60: + die Museum. Nein, es ist die Museum. So then the first one will be nein das ist genau I guess.
*60: Oh yeah because there’s.
*61: Because there is one there.
*60: Yeah. [..]
Ok so Klaus denkt das ist nicht genug Ampeln und Zebrastrifen für die Fußgänger gibt. Where is the Ampel then.

Ampel.

Ample. So there is like two Ampels.

Yeah right that’s the confusing part.

Und Zebrastrifen. Where is that?

It is here.

Ok. Zebrastrifen für die Fußgänger gibt. Yeah isn’t that it isn’t like [/] isn’t like Ampel a like a crossing thing?

Yeah.

Clear crossing thing you know.

Dam like it could be a bridge or +... cause like that’s like a flower thing.

Mh. I think ahm I think the Zebrastrifen is probably like a subway thing. You know like how you get on the blue line.

Yeah cause look it’s the bus.

Yeah.

So your saying that the Ampel and Zebra are not for the people that walk.

Yeah. Ampel isn’t a bus but it’s this one +...

Is it like a +/- Mh. Ample, what the hell is an Ampel?

So it’s saying that [/] that the Ampel is not enough and that the +/.

Zebrastrifen is not for the walk +/-.

Walking + walking people.

But isn’t it?

I think so yeah. Cause I like think this is everschery [?] for this part like the subway thing where you get of and on.

Yeah.

Or like a bus thing or something. [...] Ahm I guess we can just say [..]

Nein, Ja.

Ja, nein die.

Oh we don’t have to write, they don’t have to write.

Oh, so its just be like nein die Ampel und Zebrastrifen ist für die Fußgänger gibt.

[...]

We don’t have to write it down.

Ok well I just said the answer anyway.

Die Bücherei +/-.

Soll vergroßt werden. Is it saying it’s like the biggest?

Yeah it’s the biggerst, I guess.

Ahm.

Well its not cause Apotheke is Apotheke is it.

Yeah so the doctors office.

Yeah, nein.

Yeah, nein die Pafurtheke +/-

Die Apotheke.

Soll vergrößt werden.
Yeah. Die Straßenbahn soll erweitert werden und mehr Haltestellen haben. Soll erweitert werden.

Erweiterte. [...] There are Haltestellen out here. [...] There are no see that (?) Die Straßenbahn soll etwert [...] so its like the extended version of the [...] do you know what number five is asking for?

Number five, ähm is the Straßenbahn extended to the house of. I don’t know what the Haltestellen is. [...]

There are Haltestellen out here. [...]. There are no see that (?) Die Straßenbahn soll etwert so its like the extended version of the [... do you know what number five is asking for?

I don’t think it is.

Ok so, nein die Straßenbahn soll etwart werden und mehr Haltestellen nicht haben.[...]

Die Innenstadt soll mindestens viel Einbahnstraßen bekommen. Where is the Innenstraße? Whats that?

Yeah you know where the Innenstadt ist? Soll mindestens vier Einbahnstraßen bekommen.

Ok the Innencity.

Innercity. No it’s the S-Bahn right?

Nein, es ist die Straßenbahn bekommen in die Innenstadt. [...] Der Müll von der Fleischerei stinkt und das ärgert die Besucher auf dem Marktplatz. Der Müll für die [...] Isn’t like the Fleischerei like the +…

The like the fish market.

Or later (?) is like the meat guy I thing.

Yeah. I though it just sounded like fish market.

Ok. Stinkt.

Ok ahm. Wie weit seit ihr. Wie weit seit ihr? How are you guys doing?

Ahm. We are on number seven.

Ok I’ll give you some more time.

So let’s just go to number eight.

Die Bücher von dem Fitnesstudio sind immer durstig.

So fitness studio.

Fitness studio is right here in this +…

Yeah.

Ja.

Cause like I think they mean like is it ongoing next to each other but like on the same street.

Mh.

That could be. Yeah, it is cause its within walking distance.

Ahm die Stadt hat genug Geld um die Bäckerei und Konditori neben oder unter dem Supermarkt zu bauen.
Die Bakery.

Where.

Bakery.

Right here.

Oh bakerei. Where is Konditorei?

Right here.

Oh. I think yeah cause I guess they mean is it enough in that section.

Or is it like are they.

Like connected the rest of the city getting access.

I was also saying like will these two get more money or will the supermarket get more money.

Oh.

Cause I think it will be the supermarket, right because it has like everything.

Instead of having to go to these two things.

Yeah but like if you put these two oh yeah.

So. So, den supermarket zu bauen that would be the answer.

Yeah. It would be.

Alright.

Alright.
Situation. Stuttgart hat sehr viel Geld und es wurde daher entscheiden das die Innenstadt von Stuttgart ganz neu gemacht werden soll.
Aufgabe [eng] or Aufgabe ist die Innenstadt von Stuttgart neu zu äh gestalten dabei must ihr die Wünsche der Einwohner beachten. Benutze die Mappe von Stuttgart um die Innenstadt zu planen. So we
Für diese Aufgabe.
+// So we are planning a trip.
Oh.
You know.
Ok [.]
Yeah.
So what do we do?
Lisa denkt das er nicht genaug Mülleimer auf den Fußwegen gibt. So Lisa things that [.] It’s not.
It’s not pract +/.
Practical. Äh. The Müll [/] What’s the Mülleimer? Is that a place?
Ah.
[incomprehensible utterances]
Do you see it anywhere? Yes. It’s right here.
Where is it?
Der Fußgängerwegen. Ok yeah so [.] What’s a Fußgängerwegen?
That’s what I’m trying to figure out.
 [=laugh] Is that a wagen for people who travel on food, cause äh. Well a side walk goes there. So is it asking if it’s on the sidewalk? Cause its actually the sidewalk.
Yeah it’s ähm, its yeah. I mean it’s accessible from the sidewalk.
Acessible from the sidewalk. Ok. Ok. Tim denkt das +//. Oh is this one true or falsh? I don’t know. Tim denk dass das Schwimmbad zu weit weg ist von dem Fitness[/] Fitnestudio und dem Fußplatz. So […] So he’s [/] he thinks the swimmingpool is really far from the fitnestudio and the platz.
Oh let’s see where it is. See it’s over here. Yeah, that’s a bit of a +/.
That’s pretty far.
+, a bit of a hike.
Let’s see what the, wait what was the other thing it was fitnesstuido and what else? The Fußballplatz.
Fußball yeah which is Fußballplatz.
Oh yeah so yeah.
It a bit of a [/] a trip.
Yeah pretty far. Ok. Klaus denkt das es nicht genug Ampeln und Zebrastreifen für Fußgänger gibt.
This I don’t know [?]
There is not enough crosswalks and street lights.
So its four äh +…
There is one, two zwafel [?] and than one Zebrastreifen so yeah. That’s all I know.
Yeah, yeah I agree with you, yeah. Auf like [?]
Die Bücherei soll vergrößert werden. Where is the Bücherei?
Okay [?
It’s pretty big.
Yeah that takes up like a block. It’s huge.
[=laugh] [,] Die Straßenbahn soll äh erweitern werden and mehr Haltestellen haben. So, the streets should be extended and +<
Have more like +<
Have more stops signs.
Stop signs yeah [.] äh.
Where are the stop signs?
There aren’t any.
There aren’t any stop signs.
mh.
[=laugh]
There should be one like here.
I agree.
And I would mh.
Die Innenstadt stoll [/] soll sorry mindestens vier Einbahnstraßen bekommen. So should [///] the Inselstadt should have more one way streets. Those [?] should be called one way streets.
Yeah.
That would be very difficult to get around I think.
Yeah that would be a struggle.
I don’t like one-way streets.
Yeah it’s stupid, it’s a bad idea.
[=laugh]
For a city planning.
[=laugh]
Der Müll von der Fleischerei stinkt und das ärger die Besucher auf dem Marktplatz. So.
What is oh, ok so where is the.
Fleischerei is right here.
Yeah that’s true cause it’s like right next to this it’s probably gonna start smelling I bet.
Yeah.
I agree.
Yeah so are we supposed to be marking don’t that we agreed?
Are we?
I don’t know.
I’m not quiet sure.
Yeah I don’t know possibly.
I think for the discussion thing.
Oh. Ok.
Die Besucher von dem Fuß [/] Fitnesstudio und Fußballplatz sind immer
durstig. What does durstig mean?
Simpler maybe.
Similar?
Ah maybe.
Like very common like the same people +<
Yeah wik [?] yeah wik [?] which I can see that I mean +…
Cause they are really close to each other.
If you like [incomprehensible] with this stuff. If you probably like soccer as
well so.
Well that’s really good and then if you look at Museum then I mean your just sat.
Yeah.
Cause it’s like the town for you. I would move here.
Yeah basically. Ah, die Stadt hat genug Geld um die Bäckerei und whatever.
Kon +//. I don’t know what that means.
Konditorei yeah I didn’t get that one.
I’ve heared conductor. I’m not sure what it means though.
Äh, oder unter den Supermarkt zu bauen.
Neben oder unter. Ok, so where is the Bäckerei where is the Konditorei?
Bäckerei is right here.
Konditorei [.] here it is. What’s say neben or what?
Neben oder unter den Supermarket +<
Unter. Oder unter.
Die Bäckeri.
Oder unter.
Unter like.
Nebens means like next to right?
Yeah.
So it’s like.
derunder I guess. Yeah. Äh yeah.
All right. That took not fif [/] thirty minuites. That took like six minutes.
Yeah. We should make sure we did this stuff right.
Yeah [.] Ähm were we supposed to write anything down?
You can if you want.
Otherwise this is a discussion.
Its just a discussion [incomprehensible] if you want to draw on the map to make it
more clear to solve the problems absolutely.
Ok.
Ok. [.] Im not really quiet sure what she is asking with these two.
Yeah. Let’s Lisa thinks that.
It’s not.
It’s not very good, it’s not enough.
Good think we didn’t like report no, not possible its.
What?
Oh I think that means possible.
Yeah.
It’s not possible to get to here.
From all right. But no it’s [/] it’s not true cause I mean.
Well it is possible.
Yeah I think. See if it’s like, oh yeah Fußgängerwegen it’s [/] sidewalk right?
It is side walk.
Yeah well they can it’s right there [.] wrong.
Tim thinks that the schwimmbad zu weit weg is von dem.
It’s to far. See it’s pretty far.
The yeah +/-. It’s a bit of a hike. It’s to dam far.
[laugh]
A long trip.
The road is to dam high.
It’s to dam high.
[laugh]
@End
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