



RISTAL 7/2024

Research in Subject-matter Teaching and Learning

“Transfer of Research and Research on Transfer in Subject-Matter Didactics”

Citation:

Hackbarth, A. & Müller, A. (2024). Grammar teaching in inclusive learning groups. A reconstructive analysis of subject-specific teaching. RISTAL, 7, 61-75.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/ristal-2024-0005>

ISSN 1863-0502



© 2024 Anja Hackbarth & Anja Müller. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Grammar teaching in inclusive learning groups.

A reconstructive analysis of subject-specific teaching

Anja Hackbarth & Anja Müller***

Abstract

This article argues that the relationship between subject-related and social participation is of paramount importance for inclusion-oriented subject teaching research. Firstly, subject teaching is understood as a social practice that is characterised by a specific complexity of the temporal, social and subject-related dimensions of teaching. Secondly, it is assumed that enabling and hindering subject-related and social participation in the practice of teaching is one of the most central analytical attitudes of inclusion-oriented subject teaching research. This is exemplified by empirical analyses of grammar lessons using the methodology of the documentary method.

Keywords

grammar teaching, social practice, documentary method, inclusion, social participation, subject-related knowledge

* Dr. Anja Hackbarth

is a Professor of Educational Science with a focus on diagnostics, support, and didactics in learning and developmental disabilities at the University of Bielefeld. Her research centres on learning and participation within subject-specific classrooms, inclusion and exclusion in educational contexts, disability from the perspective of individuals involved, as well as documentary research on classrooms and schools.

University Bielefeld, Fakultät für Erziehungswissenschaft,
Konsequenz 41a, 33615 Bielefeld

anja.hackbarth@uni-bielefeld.de

** Dr. Anja Müller

is Professor of Language Acquisition and Language Didactics at Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz. Her work and research focuses on first and second language acquisition, language support, language-sensitive teaching, comparative language work and the professionalization of prospective teachers.

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz,
Deutsches Institut, Jakob-Welder-Weg 18, 55128 Mainz

anjamueller@uni-mainz.de

1 Introduction

Breidenstein (2008, 2021), among others, has theorised that a perspective on teaching as a social practice can generate new insights into subject didactic questions. In this article, we follow this line of reasoning, with a particular focus on the practice of grammar teaching using a two-pronged approach. On the one hand we employ the methodology of the praxeological sociology of knowledge (cf. Bohnsack, 2018; Mannheim, 1982) and in so doing connect to established studies on subject teaching (cf. Martens & Asbrand, 2022; Gresch & Martens, 2019; Tesch, 2018). On the other hand, we refer to the discourse of classroom research in the context of inclusion and exclusion (cf. Sturm et al., 2023) in order to integrate questions of social and subject-related participation (cf. Ainscow, 2021).

For this purpose, we consider the combination of a pedagogical and a subject-specific perspective to be extremely beneficial: without subject-specific knowledge, it is almost impossible to adequately understand classroom interactions and, in particular, the practices of teaching and acquiring subject-related knowledge. From a school pedagogical perspective, however, it is equally relevant to understand teaching as a social practice of the teachers and pupils involved in the lesson (cf. Martens & Asbrand, 2022; Breidenstein, 2023). This means that, in addition to questions of subject-specificity, dimensions of social participation also become relevant. This applies in particular to inclusive teaching (cf. Schürer & van Ophuysen, 2021). Moreover, as our own research has shown, it is especially beneficial for the discourse on inclusive teaching to approach inclusion and exclusion on a performative level of teaching and thus also to gain praxeologically informed insights into barriers and possibilities of social and subject participation (cf. Hackbarth & Müller, 2021; Sturm et al., 2023).

Grammar teaching is not only important for us because it offers a particularly good opportunity to combine methodological and theoretical questions about the relationship between implicit and explicit knowledge. At the same time, grammar teaching in Germany is an area about which there are relatively few findings and reflections in relation to the practice of inclusive teaching (cf. Hackbarth & Müller, 2021). If we follow the educational policy requirements, then grammar lessons aim to transmit linguistically reflective knowledge through language comparison and analysis as well as the assignment and application of linguistic categories (cf. KMK, 2005). This competence of language awareness (cf. Wildemann & Bien-Miller, 2023) is central to participation in education (cf. also the discourse on academic language: e.g. Gogolin, 2009). However, grammar lessons tend to be somewhat unpopular among pupils as well as teachers. On the one hand, this seems to be due to the often very deductive way in which grammar is taught. On the other hand, studies have shown that trainees as well as teachers do not feel well prepared for school grammar instruction (Ilosvay, 2012; Topalović & Dünschede, 2014; Müller & Geyer, 2020). Despite the obvious need for more research in this area, there are few studies that have examined grammar lessons with respect to inclusive education.

In the paper, we will pursue the following research questions by means of reconstructively analysing an example of a grammar lesson in a formally inclusive primary school:

- 1) What practices of teaching grammatical knowledge can be reconstructed?
- 2) How do pupils deal with these practices of teaching?
- 3) What conclusions can be drawn from the empirically generated connection between mediation and acquisition for the didactics of inclusive subject teaching?

The article is structured as follows: In order to introduce the perspective of qualitative-reconstructive classroom research pursued here, methodological and object-theoretical considerations on teaching as a social practice are presented (section 2). Since reference to the discourse on grammar instruction is important for the classification of the results, a brief description of the current discussion on grammar instruction is given in section 3. This is followed by an empirical analysis of the social practice of teaching grammatical knowledge (section 4). Finally, the results are related to subject didactic considerations on the linguistic transmission of specialised language knowledge, thus sharpening the relevance of this research perspective for subject didactic research (section 5).

2 Methodological implications: Teaching and learning as a social practice

If teaching is understood as a social practice, it is important to adequately consider aspects of the complexity of this social practice in research (cf. Asbrand & Martens, 2018; Breidenstein, 2023). Many different people are usually involved in the teaching process. They interact with each other, independently or in relation to each other. Several interactions take place at the same time, e.g. parallel group work on the same topic. At the same time, however, there are also completely different interactions that do not necessarily relate to each other. When analysing simultaneous interactions, it is also important to note that these often take place in connection with certain artefacts in subject lessons. For this reason, a video-based approach is particularly suitable for capturing this complexity of interactions visually and auditorily (cf. Sturm et al., 2023; Asbrand & Martens, 2018; Martens & Asbrand, 2022; Wagner-Willi, 2012). The documentary method was chosen to analyse the video-based data. With its reconstructive approach, this is particularly suitable for empirically mapping the complexity and action level of the social practice of teaching (cf. Martens & Asbrand, 2022; Bonnet, 2020).

The focus of reconstructive research is on the process of generating meaning in the practice of teaching (cf. Breidenstein, 2021), which implies distancing oneself from normative, didactic and theoretical presuppositions. The aim of the analysis is to approach the perspective of the actors and the logic of teaching practice in its everyday realisation in a methodically controlled manner. This methodologically guided turn to the logic of practice and to the perspective of the actors is connected with an abductive interest in knowledge (cf. Bohnsack, 2012, 2018). With its focus on implicit knowledge, this methodological approach is suitable for both the analysis of subject-specific teaching and learning (cf. Hackbarth & Mehlem, 2019; Martens & Asbrand, 2022; Hackbarth et al., 2022a) and the reflection of inclusion and exclusion in classroom practice (cf. Hackbarth, 2017; Sturm et al., 2023).

3 Excursus: grammar teaching

The history of grammar instruction is characterized by a controversy about the relationship between the form and function of language (cf. Ossner, 2015, p.25). Different approaches have developed that focused either on forms or on meaning of grammar (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Williams, 2005). One solution to this controversy can be found in the concept of language awareness, which presents a rationale for grammar didactics and methodology of grammar teaching that has been well established in the discourse (cf. Ossner 2015, p. 25). Language awareness can be understood with Andresen and Funke (2003, p. 439) as the ability to

distance oneself from the content aspects of language and turn to the formal properties of language (cf. also Gornik, 2015; Wildemann et al., 2020; Wildemann & Bien-Miller, 2023). Central to grammar instruction is not only the development and expansion of metalinguistic implicit skills of language awareness, but also explicit declarative rule knowledge (cf. Binanzer & Langlotz, 2018). For years, however, school-based grammar instruction has been criticized for being primarily characterized by forms of explicit rule teaching, and that independent, conscious reflection on language takes place far too rarely (cf. Bredel, 2013). In addition, it is criticized that this kind of knowledge transfer presupposes that the pupils have already mastered the grammatical knowledge to be taught at the level of implicit knowledge (cf. Bredel, 2013). If pupils do not yet have the required implicit knowledge, this leads to a restriction of participation in subject learning and educational processes (cf. Geyer & Müller, 2024; Hackbarth & Müller, 2021; see also Topalović & Michalak, 2012). At the same time, teaching that clearly builds on explicit grammatical rule knowledge requires that pupils know the relevant technical terms needed to analyse and describe linguistic structures (e.g., verbs, pronouns, past tense) and relate them to implicit knowledge. Due to the fact that in inclusive learning groups there are children who have neither the implicitly presupposed knowledge nor the explicit knowledge of grammatical structures classroom research must take an interest in the relation between implicit and explicit knowledge and the related barriers to subject and social participation in the practices of teaching.

4 Empirical data

4.1 Context

The empirical examples and analyses presented below are part of the interdisciplinary study "Expertise in Interactions. Teaching and learning in the Context of Inclusion and Exclusion" (cf. Hackbarth et al., 2022b). This study aims to lay bare the connections between teaching and learning of (written) language knowledge and skills as well as the possibilities and barriers of social participation in classroom practice. By means of video-based analyses of lessons, an empirically grounded type and theory building of an inclusive language didactics is aimed at.

As part of the study, coherent teaching units on grammatical topics were videotaped at three different schools over a period of around five days per teaching unit. For this purpose, three fixed cameras and one handheld camera were used. A coherent teaching unit (consisting of several lessons) was observed in order to get an adequate view of the introduction, construction and completion of the teaching and acquisition of grammatical knowledge. Additional recording devices were used to capture the pupils' group conversations. In addition, all materials relevant to the interactions were photographed. For the documentary method, the case comparison forms the basis of the analysis. Subject lessons in which grammar was taught were selected for the case comparison. It was also important for the case selection that pupils with special educational needs (SEND) were also taught in the learning groups. Finally, grammar lessons were videotaped at a formally inclusive elementary school and at two special needs schools (with a focus on hearing, physical-motor development and learning support).

The learning group presented is a formally inclusive primary school class with 19 pupils. The pupils are around 9 years old, four pupils have SEND. For 13 pupils German is their first language; the other pupils grew up in a multilingual environment and acquired German in the

context of dual first language acquisition or as an early second language. In addition to the class teacher Ms Roth (all names are anonymous), the class team includes a special needs teacher, a school social worker and a school assistant. For the series of lessons on the topic of tenses presented below, there are recordings of 5 days (with one double lesson each) spread over a period of 14 days. All thematically relevant lessons (including the group work phases) were recorded on video and transcribed. The worksheets and work results used were also photographed.

For the planning and implementation of the lesson series, the class teacher adapted the material "Tenses - simply fabulous" (Fink, 2018), which aims at introducing, recognising and using the tenses past tense, present, future and perfect of the German language (ibid.). The lesson is based on a story about two children who travel to different "time islands" on the ship "Tempus". At the beginning of the lesson, there is a letter to the class inviting the class to participate in the adventures (to discover the different islands, which in turn represent the different tenses). The lessons are characterised by a homologous structure: The learning group receives the letter in which the protagonists each report on a new adventure. The letter is discussed with the group. This is followed by group work in which a worksheet is worked on together. Finally, the respective tenses are practised in a plenary situation, usually with the help of a pronoun-cube and verb cards (see Fig. 1).



Fig. 1: Photogram of the plenary situation with pronoun cube and word cards

4.2 Empirical analyses

4.2.1 An adventure story as a frame for working on the task

The lesson series starts with the following scene. The narrative frame is built up in a plenary discussion about the medium of the letter and the props. Similar to what is shown in Figure 1, the introduction to the topic takes place in a sitting-circle order typical for primary schools in

Germany. All children in this learning group sit in a circle, there are no separating learning settings. This gives all students the opportunity to participate in the following interactions.¹

L: °So wer war denn ganz leise (.) heute und hat schön gearbeitet, ihr habt alle so schön gearbeitet °gell° (2) Lisa dann schau doch mal rein ((hält einen schwarzen Beutel in ihren Händen, hält ihn kurz auf))
 Lisa: ((Geht nach vorne, holt etwas aus dem Beutel))
 L: (2) was ist denn das?
 Lisa: Ein Brief?
 L: Mhm. dann leg ihn mal hin,
 Lisa: ((Legt den Brief auf den Boden und setzt sich wieder hin))
 Me: ((melden sich))
 L: Wer möchte denn mal vorlesen was auf dem Brief draufsteht?
 (1. Tag, 1. Stunde: 8:02 – 8:21)

Teacher: °So who was very quiet (.) today and worked beautifully, you all worked so beautifully °okay° (2) Lisa then takes a look ((holds a black bag in her hands, holds it open for a moment))
 Lisa: ((Goes forward, takes something out of the bag))
 Teacher: (2) what is this?
 Lisa: A letter?
 Teacher: Mhm. Then put it down,
 Lisa: ((Puts the letter on the floor and sits down again))
 Teacher: Who would like to read out what is written on the letter?
 (1st day, 1st hour: 8:02 – 8:21)

In this scene, ‘being quiet’ and ‘working beautiful’ are marked as positively framed behaviours or norms. By answering the leading question, all pupils are addressed by the teacher as exemplary. This indicates the teacher's orientation towards involving all pupils and creating a calm and appreciative atmosphere. Furthermore, the teacher builds up a tense atmosphere in close connection with everyday materials (such as the letter) and opens the new topic in this way. It becomes clear in the way that the subject of the lesson is not explicitly called up as a subject matter. Rather, the way the objects are presented (they are hidden in a bag and gradually brought out) and the materials are arranged all around refer to a materialisation and at the same time an implicit mode of focusing on subject matter. Through the elaborately designed staging of the lesson subject, school pedagogical concepts of child-friendly primary school education become visible. These can be distinguished from science-oriented subject teaching, which is more typical of secondary school teaching, by comparing cases (cf. Kater-Wettstädt, 2018).

L: Und an wen ist der Brief?
 Carla: An die Klasse drei a [Adresse der Schule]
 Gerrit: [Postleitzahl der Schule]
 L: Genau; dann Samuel?
 Samuel: Was will der von uns?
 Me: ((lachen))
 L: (Ja) was weiß ich. schau mal rein
 (1. Tag, 1. Stunde: 9:34 – 9:51)

Teacher: And to whom is the letter?
 Carla: To class three a [school address].
 Gerrit: [postcode of the school].
 Teacher: Exactly; then Samuel?
 Samuel: What does he want from us?
 Me: ((laughing))
 Teacher: (Yes) what do I know. have a look
 (1st day, 1st lesson: 9:34 – 9:51)

¹ This is worth mentioning at this point, as comparisons of cases from other primary schools indicate that pupils with SEND are taught separately from the group. This in turn obviously restricts the opportunities for social participation.

By addressing the letter to the learning group, the pupils are involved as important actors. Samuel asks: "What does he want from us?" and thus half-jokingly responds to the teacher's staging. The teacher responds to this question with a joyful laugh that illustrates the focus on creating a friendly and exciting atmosphere. She answers this question vaguely and delegates the answer to the pupils, which means that pupils should read the letter aloud. Furthermore, the request "have a look" documents that here the subject matter is first to be discovered and that the teaching of subject matter content will thus take place in an implicit mode, via engagement with the objects. The children are asked to discover the subject matter on their own. This suggests a closeness to the concept of discovery learning. The fact that she has not used any technical terms up to this point points to an implicit mode of teaching subject-related knowledge. At the same time, it becomes visible that this teaching method runs smoothly for both the pupils and the teacher, which shows how habituated pupils and teacher are to this mode of instruction.

The letter then read out by Samuel provides the narrative framework for the task that then follows, which is to be done in group work. The task, which is designed in the style of an adventure narrative, is primarily framed as an exciting and joyful journey of discovery. In this type of staging, a programmatic orientation towards the children's lifeworld becomes clear, which at the same time aims at engaging the pupils emotionally. However, the story itself is not the subject of the lesson. It merely forms the framework for the pupils' activities. They have to acquire the subject-related knowledge themselves with the help of the tasks, the materials and the peer group in a self-directed learning mode. It is noteworthy, however, that this type of task does not address any of the pupils as particularly capable or less capable (cf. among others Sturm, 2018; Merl, 2021). The opportunity to complete the task is initially open to all pupils. This points to the potential for social participation that is routinely established here in the social practice of teaching.

Although it is clear that the children seem to be familiar with this way of preparing content and are able to engage with this form of teaching, there is some irritation with regard to the understanding of the tasks.

4.2.2 Irritation in task comprehension

L: ihr dürft herausfinden zu welchen Inseln reist der zu welchen Inseln gehen Tim und Emma; und wo reisen wir hin. [...]

Domingo: Wie soll man das denn wie soll man das denn herausfinden?

L: Tja ihr seid am Forschen. Sprachforscher. schaut die Listen nach. guckt ihr habt doch auch (.) so kleine Schiffchen (.) die geben euch einen Tipp; ich schau sie mit euch noch nicht an. denn ihr sollt das ja in euren Gruppen herausfinden (.)

(1. Tag, 1.Stunde: 17:09 – 19:55)

Teacher: You may find out to which islands Tim and Emma are going; and where we are going. [...]

Domingo: How are you supposed to find out how are you supposed to find out?

Teacher: Well, you are researching. Language researchers. look up the lists. you also have (..) little ships (..) that give you a hint; I won't look at them with you yet. because you are supposed to find out in your groups (..)

(Day 1, Hour 1: 17:09 – 19:55)

The way in which the tasks are set shows that the teacher is orientated towards a co-constructive and cooperative mode of acquiring specialist knowledge. To this end, she organises the lessons in such a way that the pupils come together in groups and receive learning aids (such as lists and tip cards), which they then use to complete the tasks independently. This demonstrates the teacher's focus on learning by self-discovery. There are

no individualised tasks here that would address certain pupils as being particularly fast or particularly in need of help. The teacher explicitly addresses all the pupils as “language researchers”. Analogous to other analyses, all children are addressed as potentially equally capable researchers. This is remarkable for the reflection on opportunities for social participation, as no distinctions are made with regard to the different work tasks and abilities of the children (cf. for examples of constructions of difference in inclusive learning groups: Sturm 2018).

However, Domino's question then points out that the way the task is set creates a comprehension problem. This shows a lack of correspondence between the task expectation, the mode of knowledge acquisition and the implicit knowledge of the pupil. This also becomes very clear in the group work, where the pupils are primarily concerned with working together to understand the task itself.

Gina: Wie soll man das denn rausfinden, wenn man das gar nicht kennt?
L: Du kannst das rausfinden. ihr kennt sogar schon eine.
Andrea: Frau Roth, warst du in Griechenland?
Gerrit: Nein, ich kenn keine.
L: Doch [...]
Gerrit: Ich kenn keine. [...]
L: Schaut euch mal die, die ganzen Karten an.
Andrea: Schi:ffe.
Gerrit: Ach so. man soll sich die Schiffe angucken. wer. (.) **ach so** aus den Buchstaben. kommt ein (.) raus? ein Wort? aber das ist ja dann schwer;
L: ((steht auf, fragende Geste mit den Händen, geht vom Tisch))
(1. Tag, 2. Stunde, Gruppenarbeit: 27:29 – 27:55)

Gina: How are you supposed to find that out if you don't know it?
Teacher: You can find out. you even know one already.
Andrea: Mrs. Roth, have you been to Greece?
Gerrit: No, I don't know any.
Teacher: But [...]
Gerrit: I don't know any. [...]
Teacher: Look at the, at all the maps.
Andrea: Ships.
Gerrit: I see. You're supposed to look at the ships. who. (..) ah so from the letters. comes out a (.)? a word? but that's difficult;
Teacher: ((stands up, questioning gesture with the hands, walks away from the table))
(1st day, 2nd lesson, group work: 27:29 – 27:55)

In this group work, the children try to understand the task framed as an adventure journey. Gina asks how you can find out something you don't know. On the one hand, this poses a difficulty for the further processing of the task and, on the other hand, it points to the potential of teaching to enable new experiences. They try to solve the problem and oscillate between interpretations that refer to real experiences (e.g. an actual island trip) and to experiences in class (putting letters together to form solution words). However, they do not help with regard to the development of the subject content. The pupils ask the teacher for help and make it clear once again that they do not understand the task in this way. The teacher continues to hold back, referring again and again to the material as a source of knowledge and thus repeatedly making it clear that the children have to acquire the knowledge themselves. Analogously to the first scene, the orientation towards learning through discovery is also evident here. For the teacher, this teaching mode goes hand in hand with her attempt to convey grammatical knowledge within the framework of an adventure story. She holds back with subject-related explanations and hopes that the pupils will be able to acquire the technical knowledge themselves by working on the task together.

4.2.3 The delegation of the transmission of subject knowledge to the material

In the teaching materials - in contrast to the teacher's restraint in terms of subject language - subject-related markings of the tenses are fixed in written language. Thus, terms such as "verbs" or "past" are used on the tip cards. However, these terms are not taken up, explained or differentiated in the lesson discussion and must therefore be self-explanatory in the written form used. As the excerpts from the analyses of the group work show, however, they are not self-explanatory for the pupils; they already fail to understand the task and thus, above all, to decode the narrative framing of the adventure story (cf. Hackbarth & Müller, 2021).

The form of delegation of subject-related knowledge to the teaching material thus not only creates a barrier to the learning process, but at the same time raises questions about the 'mediability' of the material. The task is to assign the sentences from the story read aloud and depicted on the image of a sail of the ship *Tempus* to the tense islands. The sentences are formed in different tenses. There is no recognisable system in the selection of sentence constructions that would, for example, differentiate the task. On the one hand, the task is differentiated using the tip cards. For example, a tip card promises that the words listed below can help. The Latin terms for the tenses present, past, present perfect and future are listed. Below this is the explanation that there are 4 tenses. This again documents the teacher's focus on technical aspects of the language but it is only visible in the written form. When speaking, she consistently restrains herself from using technical language, as already explained. Thus, the transmission of technical knowledge is explicitly delegated to the material. The pupils are called upon to develop implicit and explicit grammatical knowledge on their own. This presupposes that the material is sufficiently suitable to represent the subject content in such a way that it can be acquired by the pupils with their respective different learning requirements. The pupils must have language-reflective abilities to focus on the segmentation of the sentences with an analytical approach. They need to be able to recognise the verbs as markers of the tenses, in order to then assign them to the islands with the Latin names of the tenses. This requires both implicit and explicit knowledge of the tenses. Only those pupils who already have the knowledge marked as relevant and are not dependent on a systematised teaching of sentence analysis and tense assignment can therefore participate in this form of teaching technical language knowledge. This is problematic for subject teaching in the context of inclusive learning conditions. However, in line with the above analysis of the options of social participation, the routine of group work established here offers a further possibility of differentiation, which is particularly interesting in the context of inclusive learning groups.

In the alternation of plenary phases and group work established here and the required mode of appropriation of discovery learning, the peers become the relevant others who can have the subject knowledge relevant to the task processing. In addition to the tip cards, the format of cooperation among the pupils offers an option for social as well as subject-specific participation (cf. Hackbarth & Mehlem, 2019).

4.2.4 Summary

In the following, the results of the analyses presented will be summarised and reflected upon with regard to the questions formulated at the beginning.

The question of what practices of teaching grammatical knowledge can be reconstructed can be answered with reference to the analyses presented here with a practice of technical

language restraint on the part of the teacher. The communication of subject knowledge is consistently delegated to the material and thus to the register of writing. This delegation points to the teacher's orientation towards the concept of discovering learning. The teacher acts linguistically primarily as a moderator who marks incorrect answers as requiring correction, refers non-verbally to memory and tip cards and thus again to the medium of writing. It also becomes clear that she refrains from differentiating and addressing pupils who are in need of support. It turns out that the teacher addresses her pupils directly, especially when she wants to regulate the social order of the lessons.

Another feature of the teaching of subject-related knowledge is that the lessons are primarily integrated into the action framework of an adventure story. The tasks are formulated linguistically in the style of an adventure story, creating a plot in the mode of a fiction. Thus, the acquisition of grammatical knowledge is framed as an adventure trip, a journey to different islands. The plot itself, however, consists of pupils cutting out sentence cards disguised as ships and assigning them to tenses, which in turn are referred to as islands. Since at the same time neither the topic of tenses nor the technical terms necessary for the tasks are explicitly addressed and framed in subject-related language, the pupils are called upon to acquire the explicit knowledge on their own from their engagement with the material. In this case, however, this presupposes that they have implicit knowledge of the concept of the tenses relevant in German. They should also be able to recognise markers for the tenses from the sentences. These are, for example, adverbial determination of time such as “yesterday” or “tomorrow” or the prefixes and suffixes of verbs.

The second question asked how the pupils deal with this teaching practice. It becomes clear in the analyses that the pupils are able to connect to the lifeworld orientation of the teaching offer to some extent. However, the requirement to decode the subject matter from the adventure story creates difficulties. This can possibly also be explained by the fact that the linguistic material itself does not show any systematic approval and thus provides little guidance as to how they can independently develop the knowledge from the confrontation with the material. It becomes clear in the analysis that the pupils demand explanations from the teacher, but the teacher rejects them in line with the programme of discovery learning. As shown in other publications, the pupils only succeed in developing the task cooperatively through the format of group work or peer interactions (cf. Hackbarth & Müller, 2021). This also makes it clear that primarily pupils who already have the knowledge to be imparted can participate in this form of discovery learning. Pupils who do not have the knowledge marked as relevant are called upon to acquire this knowledge indirectly, through the example of their fellow pupils. In this way, the transmission is not only delegated to the material, as described above, but also to the classmates.

With regard to the third question which asked what conclusions can be drawn from the empirically generated connection between mediation and acquisition for the didactics of inclusive subject teaching, we can conclude: The pupils in this lesson are asked to acquire the subject knowledge indirectly from their engagement with the material. However, in order to understand and apply the rules of tense marking, they need to be able to speak consciously, this means that they have to speak in a linguistically reflective way. This also means that they must be able to distance themselves from the content of the language and to analyse linguistic structures. The lack of direct teaching of linguistic knowledge thus potentially disadvantages pupils who do not have the presupposed subject knowledge. This is potentially exacerbated by the dominance of the written language reconstructed here. Especially since the language

material does not show any systematisation that would simplify rule recognition. But even if pupils have the knowledge, e.g. to correctly determine tenses, they are only able to cope with the task by performing the action (here the assignment task). The didactic function of teaching and explaining terms and contexts within the group work can thus not be expected from primary school pupils. These findings should be taken into account, especially in view of the knowledge of pupils' different experiences with regard to the school knowledge to be imparted and the dominant language used in school. It can be assumed that even an organisation of teaching that places children front and centre and is oriented towards social participation, which is characterised at the level of the social order by an atmosphere of friendliness and receptiveness, will in turn disadvantage the pupils in particular who are most dependent on the linguistic mediation offer with regard to subject participation.

5 Conclusion

The reconstructive perspective on subject teaching pursued here presents an approach that provides insights into both the logic of teaching as social practice and the constitution of subject knowledge in the classroom. In this way, the complexity, sequentiality and synchronicity of teaching as a social practice are methodologically taken into account (cf. Martens & Asbrand, 2022). On the other hand, this reconstructive research approach can empirically show how and where barriers and options of participation are generated in the practice of subject teaching. These findings are particularly significant for the discourse on inclusion-oriented subject didactics.

Exemplarily, it was shown via the presented lesson analyses that the social practice of teaching is characterised by an atmosphere of friendliness and an orientation towards social participation. The focus on social participation becomes clear in the practice of teaching and is demonstrated performatively by the fact that all children are addressed. All tasks and the additional material are made available to all children without addressing specific children as special. Although we know from the description that four children are entitled to SEND, it is not obvious in the group which children these are. This demonstrates that all children have an equal opportunity to participate in social interactions. It is also clear from the fact that many tasks have to be completed cooperatively. Peer interactions and social participation in the peer group are given a great deal of space. At the same time, there are regular phases in which all pupils are addressed as a group via sitting circles. This form of teaching represents a contrast to other sequences in our study, in which not all children can participate equally at the level of social interaction (cf. Ludwig, 2024). However, it is also clear in other studies that children with SEND in particular are addressed as less able and positioned as such in the classroom (cf. Merl, 2021; Sturm, 2018). These children then have fewer opportunities for participation at the level of social interactions.

At the same time, this approach to teaching, characterised by indirect knowledge transfer, serves as a counterpoint to the often criticised method of explicit grammar instruction (cf. chapter 1). The school pedagogical concept of discovery learning seems to fit very well with the orientation towards a differentiation-sensitive lesson design, a non-discriminatory differentiation of pupils. At the same time, disadvantages for subject-specific participation become visible in the mode of subject-language restraint and the delegation of mediation to the material. Technical language markings, explanations and modelling are indispensable for a technically appropriate acquisition of knowledge, even in the context of discovery learning.

This is especially true for content that is constitutively dependent on language as a medium of language reflection (cf. Ahrenholz et al., 2018) and in particular for pupils who are dependent on direct instruction (cf. on this also the discussion on direct and strategic instruction, including Mehring, 2010; Lopez et al., 2017).

For an inclusion-oriented professionalisation, these analyses make it even more clear that it is necessary to sensitise teachers to subject-specific language competences in relation to the material to be taught and the ability to modulate this knowledge in the complex classroom interactions. A teaching programme of discovery learning incl. the associated teaching materials is – apart from the subject-specific linguistic framing and systematisation of the material – particularly dependent on a selection of language materials and forms of action that match the teaching programme and enable all pupils to acquire the necessary subject knowledge. This is conceivable, for example, through systematised linguistic offers and strategies that call for conjectures, checks and subsequent rule formulations.

Furthermore, the explanations on grammar teaching (cf. chapter 1) show that an essential approach of grammar teaching or language reflection is the linking with everyday language experiences. Whether the selected teaching material with the adventure trip to the "time islands" represents an adequate everyday language experience is questionable not only from a didactic but also from an empirical point of view (cf. chapter 3). Furthermore, it is hardly conceivable without a systematic and technical language-oriented framing and modelling of the interactions in class to tie in with the pupils' language experiences. This is especially true for the topic of language reflection.

The analyses presented here thus sharpen the critique of the written nature of the teaching of linguistic knowledge and at the same time strengthen the importance of language for the teaching of subject knowledge (cf. Ahrenholz et al., 2018). This, in turn, presupposes subject-specific explanatory and mediating competences among teachers, which cannot be compensated for by concepts of discovery and cooperative learning and must be the subject of teacher education.

References

- Ahrenholz, B., Knoblich, L., & Reichel, J. (2018). Sprache im Fachunterricht. Analysen mündlicher und schriftlicher Wissensvermittlung im Schulunterricht. In I. Winkler, A. Gröschner, & M. May (Ed.), *Lehrerbildung in einer Welt der Vielfalt. Befunde und Perspektiven eines Entwicklungsprojekts* (pp. 167–181). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Ainscow, M. (2021): Inclusion and equity in education. In: A. Köpfer, J. Powell, R. Zahnd (Eds.): *Handbook Inclusion International: Global, National and Local Perspectives on Inclusive Education* (pp. 75-87). Opladen: Budrich.
- Asbrand, B., & Martens, M. (2018). *Dokumentarische Unterrichtsforschung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Andresen, H., & Funke, R. (2003). Entwicklung sprachlichen Wissens und sprachlicher Bewusstheit. In U. Bredel, H. Günther, P. Klotz, J. Ossner, & G. Siebert-Ott (Ed.), *Didaktik der deutschen Sprache* (pp. 438–451). Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Binanzer, A., & Langlotz, M. (2018). Grammatik. In J. Boelmann (Ed.), *Empirische Forschung in der Deutschdidaktik. 3. Forschungsfelder der Deutschdidaktik* (pp. 303–320). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag.

- Bohnsack, R. (2012). Documentary method. In U. Flick (Ed.), *SAGE handbook of analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 217–234). Sage.
- Bohnsack, R. (2018). Praxeological sociology of knowledge and documentary method: Karl Mannheim's framing of empirical research. In D. Kettler & V. Meja (Ed.), *The anthem companion to Karl Mannheim* (pp. 199–220). Anthem.
- Bonnet, A. (2020). Die notwendige Zumutung der Komplexität und welche Früchte sie trägt. Prinzipien, Gegenstände und ausgewählte Befunde Rekonstruktiver Fremdsprachenforschung. *Zeitschrift für Rekonstruktive Fremdsprachenforschung*, 1(1), pp. 4–18.
- Bredel, U. (2013). *Sprachbetrachtung und Grammatikunterricht* (2. Aufl.). Paderborn u.a.: Schöningh.
- Breidenstein, G. (2008). Allgemeine Didaktik und praxeologische Unterrichtsforschung. In M. A. Meyer, M. Prenzel, & pp. Hellekamps (Ed.), *Perspektiven der Didaktik* (pp. 201–215). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Breidenstein, G. (2021). Interferierende Praktiken. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 24(4), 933–953. doi:10.1007/s11618-021-01037-0.
- Breidenstein, G. (2023). Issues in "Individualized" Teaching Practice in Germany: An Ethno-Methodological Approach. In F. Ligozat, K. Klette, & J. Almqvist (Eds.), *Didactics in a Changing World: European Perspectives on Teaching, Learning and the Curriculum* (pp. 123–136). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philip & H. Reinders (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 3–25). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Fink, P. (2018). *Zeitformen – einfach märchenhaft* (5. Aufl.). Augsburg: Auer.
- Geyer, S., & Müller, A. (2024). Grammatical Categories in Linguistics and Education. In H. Härtl & K. Zaychenko (Ed.), *Trends in Applied Linguistic* (pp. 121–141). Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Gogolin, I. (2009): „Bildungssprache“– The importance of teaching language in every school subject. In T. Tajmel & K. Starl (Ed.): *Science Education Unlimited. Approaches to Equal Opportunities in Learning Science* (pp. 91–102). Waxmann: Münster u. a.
- Gornik, H. (2015): Sprachreflexion, Sprachbewusstheit, Sprachwissen, Sprachgefühl und die Kompetenz der Sprachthematisierung - ein Einblick in ein Begriffsfeld. In H. Gornik (Ed.) *Sprachreflexion und Grammatikunterricht* (pp. 3–40). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag.
- Gresch, H., & Martens, M. (2019). Teleology as a tacit dimension of teaching and learning evolution: A sociological approach to classroom interaction in science education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 56(3), 243–269.
- Hackbarth, A. (2017). *Inklusionen und Exklusionen in aufgabenbezogenen Schülerinteraktionen. Empirische Rekonstruktionen in jahrgangsübergreifenden Lerngruppen an einer Förderschule und an einer inklusiven Grundschule*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Hackbarth, A., Asbrand, B., & Martens, M. (2022a). Learning as a Relationship Between Understanding and Interpretation. The Acquisition of Knowledge in Actionist Practices. In M. Martens, B. Asbrand, T. Buchborn, & J. Menthe (Ed.), *Dokumentarische Unterrichtsforschung in den Fachdidaktiken: Theoretische Grundlagen und Forschungspraxis* (pp. 39–53). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Hackbarth, A., Ludwig, J., & Müller, A. (2022b). Wissen und Können im Grammatikunterricht. Eine praxeologische Perspektivierung von Passungsverhältnissen in Interaktionen. In M. Martens, B. Asbrand, T. Buchborn, & J. Menthe (Eds.), *Dokumentarische Unterrichtsforschung in den Fachdidaktiken. Theoretische Grundlagen und Forschungspraxis*. (pp. 231–248). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Hackbarth, A., & Mehlem, U. (2019). Aufgabenstruktur, Wissen und Interaktion. Schreiben mit der Anlauttabelle in heterogenen Lerngruppen. *Zeitschrift für Grundschulforschung*, 12, 33–47. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s42278-019-00042-x.

- Hackbarth, A., & Müller, A. (2021). Fachdidaktik des inklusiven Deutschunterrichts: Eine praxeologische und fachwissenschaftliche Perspektivierung von Vermittlungs- und Aneignungsprozessen. *Zeitschrift für Inklusion*(2). Retrieved from <https://www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion-online/article/view/633>.
- Ilosvay, K.K. (2012): A Qualitative Study of Language Beliefs and Linguistic Knowledge in Preservice Teachers using the Intercultural Communicative Competence Framework. Dissertation Portland State University. Paper 233. Available online: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/233.
- Kater-Wettstädt, L. (2018). How secondary-school pupils deal with issues of sustainable development in class. *Environmental Education Research*, 24:11, 1565–1580, DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2017.1373068
- KMK (2005). Bildungsstandards im Fach Deutsch für den Primarbereich. Beschluss vom 15.10.2004. München: Wolters Kluwer. 20041015-Bildungsstandards-Deutsch-Primar.pdf (kmk.org).
- López, P., Torrance, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Fidalgo, R. (2017). Effects of Direct Instruction and Strategy Modeling on Upper-Primary Pupils' Writing Development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. Doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01054.
- Ludwig, J. (2024). Additive Inklusion? Inklusiver Fachunterricht als autonomes Interaktionssystem im Regelunterricht. In G. Wilm, R. Koßmann, S. Böse, M. Fabel-Lamla & C. Meyer-Jain (Ed.), *Videographische Forschung zu inklusivem Unterricht. Erziehungswissenschaftliche und fachdidaktische Perspektiven* (pp. 153–169). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Mannheim, K. (1982). *Structures of thinking*. Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Martens, M., & Asbrand, B. (2022). Documentary Classroom Research. Theory and Methodology. In M. Martens, B. Asbrand, T. Buchborn, & J. Menthe (Ed.), *Dokumentarische Unterrichtsforschung in den Fachdidaktiken: Theoretische Grundlagen und Forschungspraxis* (pp. 19–38). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Mehring, T. (2010). Direct Instruction and the Education of Children with Special Need. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Education (Third Edition)* (pp. 584–587). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Merl, T. (2021): In/Sufficiently Able. How Teachers Differentiate Between Pupils in Inclusive Classrooms. In: *Ethnography & Education*, 16(2), pp. 198–209.
- Müller, A. & Geyer, S. (2020). Gut vorbereitet auf den Grammatikunterricht in der Schule? Eine empirische Untersuchung zum schulgrammatischen Wissen angehender Deutschlehrkräfte. In: N. Masanek & J. Kilian (Hrsg.). *Professionalisierung im Lehramtsstudium. Überzeugungen, Wissen, Aushandlungsprozesse* (pp. 121–151). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Ossner, J. (2015). Geschichte der Grammatikdidaktik – von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. In H. Gornik (Ed.) *Sprachreflexion und Grammatikunterricht* (pp. 3-40). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag.
- Sturm, T. (2018): Constructing and addressing differences in inclusive schooling – comparing cases from Germany, Norway and the United States. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(6), pp. 656–669. DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1444105.
- Sturm, T., Wagener, B. & Wagner-Willi, M. (2023). Inclusion and exclusion in classroom practices – empirical analyses of conjunctive spaces of experience in secondary schools. In: G. Rißler; A. Köpfer; T. Buchner (Ed.), *Space Studies in Inclusive Education – Interdisciplinary Relations*, pp. 142–160. London: Routledge.
- Tesch, B. (2018). *The reconstruction of sense in the foreign language classroom. An introduction to reconstructive foreign language research*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Topalović, E. & Dünschede, S. (2014): Weil Grammatik im Lehrplan steht. Bundesweite Umfrage zur Grammatik in der Schule. In: *Der Deutschunterricht*, 66 (3), pp. 76–81.
- Topalović, E. & Michalak, M. (2012). Sprachreflexion und Grammatik zwischen DaM und DaZ. In M. Michalak & M. Kuchenreuther (Ed.), *Grundlagen der Sprachdidaktik Deutsch als Zweitsprache* (pp. 226–250). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag.

Wagner-Willi, M. (2012). On the multidimensional analysis of video data: Documentary interpretation of interaction in schools. In H. Knoblauch, B. Schnettler, J. Raab & H. Soeffner (Ed.), *Videoanalysis – Methodology and methods. Qualitative audiovisual data analysis in sociology* (pp. 143–153). Berlin: Peter Lang.

Wildemann, A., Bien-Miller, L., & Akbulut, M. (2020). Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachbewusstheit – empirische Befunde und Unterrichtskonzepte. In I. Gogolin, A. Hansen, S. McMonagle, & D. Rauch (Ed.), *Handbuch Mehrsprachigkeit und Bildung* (pp. 119–123). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Wildemann, A. & Bien-Miller, L. (2023): *Sprachbewusstheit: Perspektiven aus Forschung und Didaktik*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.