

# Perfekt lernen (perfect learning) for storytelling in German

Rudolf Reinelt  
*Ehime University*

## Reference data:

Reinelt, R. (2006). Perfekt lernen (perfect learning) for storytelling in German. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2005 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper reports on a study which attempts to introduce the perfect tense (PT) early in a conversationally oriented one term German class. The first part introduces the background, problems faced and why the teaching approach was chosen. The individual parts of the (longitudinal) study itself are also presented, followed by a minimal discussion of the results obtained. Recommendations for future projects conclude the paper.

この論文では会話重視のドイツ語クラスにおけるPerfekt(現在完了形)導入の試みについて論じる。前半では、研究対象の背景、問題点及び最終的に採択された仮説につながるアプローチに関して、次に、長期にわたる調査の各部分を紹介し結果の解釈を説明する。最後に今後のプロジェクトへの展望を述べる。

In order to tell a story in German, one has to be able to use the perfect tense (PT in this paper) (also called present perfect in English, and a host of other terms), such as in (1)

(1)

Da habe ich ihm aber einen reingezogen

That's when I gave it to him (got the better of him, beat him)

The phrase in (1) used to be the story starter when telling about a competitive event, in which the utterer had the better of another figure in the story to follow. *habe* (have) and *reingezogen* (beat) are in the present perfect.

The problem of learning this tense can be approached from various starting points. Grammarians would discuss characteristics and difficulties of the *haben/sein* (have/be) + ...+ PPP (present perfect participle)

construction, while conversation analysts would point out its importance for establishing and keeping up rapport with one's partners, and language teachers discuss, at which stage in the process of learning German it should be introduced.

This paper reports on a study introducing the perfect tense (PT) in a one-term German conversation class. The first parts introduce the background, problems faced and why the approach that was eventually taken was chosen. Then the individual parts of the (longitudinal) study itself are presented, followed by a minimal discussion of the results. Recommendations for future projects conclude the paper.

### Background: Teaching the German perfect tense in Japan

This section briefly introduces only the minimal background that is necessary for this discussion and to follow the study.

From a grammatical point of view, the PT is a construction consisting of two parts with word status,

- an auxiliary a form of either the verb *haben* (to have, in most cases) or the verb *sein* (to be, with verbs of movement, and a few others) inflected for (tense,) person and number (but not gender), and
- a past perfect participle (PPP)-form of the main verb. This participle is constructed from an infinitive (*machen* to do) by leaving out the infinitival *-en* (*mach-*), by prefixing *ge-* (*gemach-*) and adding a *-t* (*gemacht*), and prefixing any discontinuous parts (*vor-ge-mach-t* < *vormachen* to show). Irregularities can occur in the stem (as in English) or on any other level of construction. No syntactic slot is reserved for PT

so that its parts can surface anywhere in a sentence as long as they follow the usual rules for verbs (main or one auxiliary verb in second place in main sentences and other parts close to its end, the auxiliary even after the PPP in subordinate sentences).

In summary, from a Japanese point of view, students have to know about discontinuous constructions (aux + verb, familiar from English), inflexion according to person and number (both rudimentary in English verbs), as well as inflexion for past (in English simply with only *-ed*), stem-prefixing (new) and discontinuous verbs (*to take (one's hat) off* vs. *to do in*), and their prefixing (new). Also the (compared to English) relatively free movement of the two elements within the sentence is unfamiliar. The "frame structure" (very rare in English) built by Aux and PPP contains any number of elements, usually the subject, the object and other complements, all of which should, in theory, also be known before tackling the PT. In short, quite an ordeal.

From a conversational point of view, the story is much simpler: From all the many past-indicating tenses, aspects, etc. of the Indo-European languages, German is essentially left with only one, the PT. The auxiliaries can form the past perfect (*hatte gemacht (Imp+PPP)*) and the subjunctive (potential and unreal meanings (*haette gemacht (subj+PPP)*)), but in that they follow usual inflexion rules. In speaking, only the imperfect of auxiliary verbs and a few others is used, but of course, things are different in writing. Using the PT makes a story more lively, actual and present, and easier to understand; the participants feel closer in sharing the story and the speaker's involvement is felt. Thus

fairy tales are usually not in the PT, while (the speaker's) accident stories almost always are. Lack of use of PT puts a distance between the participants and adds the ever-so-slight foreign touch.

From a language learning point of view the situation is ambiguous: On the one hand, PT should be introduced as early as possible because of its conversational importance; on the other, it should come only after the introduction of a considerable number of other grammatical items as we will see below.

The textbook situation mirrors this ambiguity. For all practical purposes, textbooks for learners living in the target language country (Germany) introduce the PT as early as lesson six (Themen (Aufderstrasse, 1997) vol. 1, out of three long volumes), while German courses in the US usually take the PT out of the beginners part and, using the ACTFL guidelines (World Languages), for example introduce it on level two in the interpersonal conversation part (Bangor Area School District (Frau Jory, n.d.) in level II, powerglide (German 1, n.d. ) in German 1 Semester 2 Section 2, mckinney (Course Syllabus German, n.d.) at the very end of the first 9 weeks). Grammar-oriented textbooks, as they are widely used in Japan, have the PT towards the beginning of the second part of the (usually 15-lesson-term) course, only followed by subjunctive and similarly difficult constructions, e.g. in Ichikawa et al. (2001). Lek. 9: 39-43; Kasuga, M. (2006). Lek. 10: 69-74; Maeda, R. & Takagi, Y. (2006). Lek. 8: 34-37; Nitta, H. & Graeb-Koenneker, S. (2001). Lek 12: 56-60. An overview of regional textbooks can be found in Slivensky (1996).

The latter mirrors the acquisition tendency found by Holzer-Terada (2003), the (to date) largest longitudinal study on the (written) use of the PT by Japanese learners (784 texts by 289 learners after 90, 120, 180 and 240 hours of instruction): Present inflexion marking > modal verb + infinitive > preterite=imperfect > perfect tense (> sentential infinitives (to + inf. etc.) > future > passive. However, she did not find a fixed, super-individual order of acquisition. The latter rather followed the example of self-organizing systems (Holzer-Terada, 2003).

In practice, there are usually two kinds of German courses in Japan. Both are based on the assumption that it does make sense in which order something is introduced:

The first are grammar-oriented courses, which usually treat every part of the grammar of German in a strictly systematic order. Within one year or even one term, they mostly follow one of the above-mentioned textbooks by beginning with the first person singular and ending with the subjunctive, irrespective of whether the contents have any practical use. Such courses are the default way of teaching language courses and still meet the expectations of most Japanese students, probably because they have learnt English in much the same way (Boeckmann et al., 2000). In such grammar-oriented courses, the PT is treated usually in the beginning of the second half of the term or year. Since the knowledge to be imparted on the learners is almost purely theoretical and usually confined to the textbook, it is highly doubtful, whether any learning does take place at all.

The second type of courses commonly taught in Japan is conversation-oriented courses, which try to introduce the ability of speaking in the foreign language classroom. To

this purpose, at least a limited vocabulary and its application have to be acquired. Such courses deviate from the norm and many students' expectations and thus easily land teachers in trouble because they require the students' initiative, as the author has experienced regularly. At the same time, such courses also cover most of the complex contents of grammar-oriented courses as well. Therefore, PT is treated (late) in the second term in one-year conversation courses, but very often not at all in one-term conversation courses.

Late treatment is in accordance with at least one theoretical approach, Pienemann's "language processing hierarchy", the precursor to Pienemann (1998). "It serves as a general grid for the prediction of acquisitional chronologies for a wide range of structures in morphology and syntax" (Nielsen, 1995). "According to Pienemann, there exists an implicational relation between the different levels of the hierarchy in the sense that the processes which are acquired at one level are considered a necessary prerequisite for the processing of structures at the following level. Or as Pienemann puts it: 'The devices acquired at one stage are a necessary building block for the following stage'. Thus, no level can be jumped in the acquisition process, since learners are unable to process structures more than one step beyond their current level." (Nielsen 1995). For an overview of this discussion, see Griesshaber (2004).

In order to also give students in a one-term course a chance to express themselves about past events, the PT was treated as early in the course as possible after the most important verb and sentential features (verb second, subject after and before verb, sentence frame with verb and preposition (discontinuous verbs)) of German were

introduced and practiced. The following study reports on an attempt at introducing the perfect in the ninth week of a one-term conversation course and retaining it to its end.

## The study

### Conditions and hypotheses

In the ninth week of instruction of a one-term German conversation course for first-year electric engineering students, our students would be in an intermediate position: On the one hand, if following the default order mentioned above, they would still need several weeks of grammar and vocabulary learning before being able to learn the PT. On the other hand, they already have learned and practiced the most important features of the present tense in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The sentences (2a) (Present tense) and (2b) (PT) are structurally similar in that they share the sentence frame:

(2a)

Was haben Sie heute abend vor?

(What have you this evening to do) (vor/haben discontinuous verb

(haben= main verb; vor- disc. part): planning to do)

What are you going to do this evening?

(2b)

Was haben Sie gestern gemacht?

(What did you yesterday do) (haben is aux; machen > gemacht main verb PPP)

What did you do yesterday?

In 2a, the sentence frame consists of main verb+...+discontinuous part and several elements in between, such as the subject and a time phrase, and of course many more parts could intervene. In 2b, the sentence frame consists of the aux (*haben*) and the main verb PPP (*gemacht*) with several elements in between, much as in 2a. Exploiting this admittedly somewhat over-extended similarity, we designed the following study:

On the condition that the present tense (with some similarities with English such as inflexion for person) was familiar, including flexion, discontinuous elements, etc., the PT was introduced and treated repeatedly until the end of the course. Both present and perfect tense would be part of the final oral examination. In this longitudinal study, the use of the PT in sentences and its overall correctness would be counted.

This leads to in the following hypotheses:

- If there was a high point score in the test immediately after the introduction, one-time learning of the PT would have taken place;
- If there was correct use of the PT in the final oral examination, long-time PT learning would have taken place.

The "language processing hierarchy" would be justified by difficulties with perfect learning and especially with retention in the oral examination, but good perfect learning and especially retention and use in the final oral examination would refute it, at least as it pertained to the class subjected to the treatment.

Note that despite the large number of data (see below), we cannot make any more claims beyond proving or refuting the hypotheses on a general level. Because normal teaching with variation in order to maintain attention and other requirements had prominence ("priority of teaching" (Reinelt, Balmus, and Oebel 2005)), the tests for the study had to take place during this time.

There was for example a need to make progress every time, practically excluding a pre-test, test, and post-test design. Data had to be gathered from various sources with only limited comparability, such as submitted homework, parts of various short tests and the final examinations' oral (subsequently transcribed) and written parts. All tests, however, had to cover several contents areas at the same time.

Of course, we tried to keep contexts of use as constant as possible. A final impediment to strict data interpretation involves students' attendance, with on average 25 out of 29 students at each class present, but no two times with the same population, and only 5 attending all lessons. There was also no control group, because different treatment in class would have been discriminatory, and asking another teacher would have intruded into his/her academic freedom. And in the open-ended tasks, not all students produced the same amount of sentences....

### Method

The start of the class was in October 2004. The 29 electrical engineering students all had nearly the same language learning background, none had learned another second

foreign language before, and all had had at least some experience with L2 classes (mostly English) taught by a native speaker, before entering Ehime University, where all had English native speaker classes. The German class was an elective and convened 2 times per week (Monday and Tuesday) for 90 minutes with the author. Frequently, homework was given to be submitted on the Friday in between.

Instruction and tests were as follows, leading to data sets T1 to T10:

T1: In order to test for present tense (in German also usable for future events or plans), students were asked to write a schedule for the following year by writing (at least) one sentence for each month, resulting in items such as (3):

(3) 1

Im November genieße ich Festival

(In November, I will enjoy the festival) (with a missing definite article)

T2: In the first lesson after the Christmas break, the material we had covered, including the present tense was reviewed with both written and spoken activities. Then, the Japanese New Year was brought into focus, and because it is somehow unimaginable to a German and requires further explanation, the following question was asked and written on the blackboard:

(4)

Was haben Sie an Neujahr gemacht?

(What did you do on New Year)?

Sentences the students volunteered were written on the blackboard under the question and with the same structure, so that the auxiliary would always be under *haben* and the PPP under *gemacht*, such as

(5)

An Neujahr habe ich Mochi (Reis) gegessen.

(On New Years Day, I had mochi-rice cake)

(6)

An Neujahr bin ich zum Schrein gegangen.

On New Years Day, I visited the shrine

Both *bin* in (5) and *habe* in (4) were written straight below *haben* in (3), and *gegessen* in (4) and *gegangen* in (5) were straight below *gemacht* in (3). 10 sentences were collected and then orally repeated together. The students asked each other question 4 and were asked to give at least 3 answers. The author was available in class for vocabulary and help. After this, the sentences were copied from the blackboard.

For homework (=T2), students were asked to write 10 sentences describing their actions on the holidays. The results were sentences such as:

(7) 2:62

Um 7 uhr habe ich Milch gekauft

(At 7 o'clock, I bought milk).

This homework resulted in a total of (10x26 Stud.) 258 (2 students made only 9) sentences, gathered at the beginning of the following class one week later.

T3 (T=72) At the beginning of the next lesson (Mo Jan 17) the following dictation in German was given (among other items):

(8)

Was haben Sie vorgestern gemacht?

(What did you do the day before yesterday?)

and the students were asked to write two sentences as answers, e.g.

(9) 3:643

Um 22 Uhr habe ich Mathe gelernt.

At 22:00, I studied math.

(10) 3:644

Um 24 Uhr habe ich schlafen

(At 24:00, I went to bed) (Note the error in the PPP: geschlafen)

T4 (T=81, three students were late)(Jan 17, 2004) At the end of the same class, the following dictation was given, again as part of a short test containing unrelated items:

(11)

Was haben Sie am Wochenende gemacht?

(What did you do on the weekend?)

and the students were asked to provide two answers, for example

(12) 4:103

Am Samstag bin ich Auto gefahren

(On Saturday I drove my car)

(13) 4:104

Am Sonntag habe ich O-nigiri gegessen

(On Sunday, I ate rice balls)

Note: Both T3 and T4 refer to the same entity, the previous weekend, but T3, at the beginning of the class, was intended to check for retention of the grammar forms taught one week before, and also the homework. As the PT was not used in the class, T4 was intended to check for retention despite the presence of content unrelated to this study.

In order to avoid overkill and let PT settle in students' minds, it was not mentioned in the second lesson in the week, nor in the homework.

T5 (T= 75) (Jan 24) The first lesson in the following week checked for retention: The question was a dictation in German and the question had to be written and one answer (T=2) to be given.

(14) 5:162

Was haben Sie gestern gemacht (CHECK)?

(What did you do yesterday?)

(15) 5: 163

Um 10 Uhr habe ich Sport gesehen

(At ten o'clock, I watched sport.)

T6 (T=75) (Jan 31) At the end of the following week, we checked for retention again.

This time the question was given in Japanese only in order to check for the ability to express meaning in the 2FL:

(16)

Kinou ha nani wo shimashita ka

(What did you do yesterday?)

Three answers were required, leading for example to

(17) 6:103

Um neun Uhr habe ich Mathematik gelernt.

(At nine, I was learning Math)

(18) 6:104

Um 8 Uhr habe ich Onigiri gegessen

(At 8 o'clock, I ate rice balls)

The following week, the oral (Feb 7th) examination and the written (Feb 8th) examination were held.

In the oral examination, students had to speak in German for two minutes with a partner allotted immediately only before the talk. Details of the oral examination followed Reinelt (2000). Although there was no instruction on which linguistic means to use, almost all students used the present tense (T7 (T=57)) for example for asking the partner

(19)

Was machen Sie am Wochenende?

(What are you going to do on the (this coming) weekend?

as well as the PT (T8 (T=66)) as in (20) below and the

partners gave two or three sentences in return as answers.

(20)

TS 8

S1

(8:245) Was haben Sie gestern gemacht?

(What did you do yesterday?)

S2

(8:246) Um 2 Uhr habe ich Badminton gespielt.

(8:247) Um 11 Uhr habe ich geschlafen

(At 2:00 I played badminton. At 11:00 I went to bed.)

The oral examination was videotaped and parts relating to the PT were transcribed.

Lastly, the final written examination, (TS10) without dictionary or any other props, contained both “Was machen Sie am Wochenende?” (What are you going to do next weekend?) and “Was haben Sie 2004 gemacht?” (What did you do in 2004?). On average three answers were given for the present tense (T9 (T=84)) as well as for the PT (T10 (T=81)).

(21) 10:623

Am August habe ich gestudiert

(In August I studied)

(Note the slight problems with *am* instead of *im* and the missing *t* and the wrong *ge* on the PPP *studiert*).



None of the students came to the additional German class in the next term or mentioned anything regarding the PT or the test series in their final teacher evaluation, so checking how the students felt about learning this material was not possible.

In summary, after confirming knowledge of the present tense (T1), the perfect tense (PT) was extensively introduced by the teacher only once, accompanied by homework (T2), then checked for learner retention (T3) and interfering contents (T4). Then, after a settling period of one week, checked for retrievability within the learners mental storage (T5) and its retention (T6) followed. Learner-initiated (unsolicited) use of both present and perfect tenses in both oral (T7 and T8) and written examinations (T9 and T10) concluded the data gathering.

## Results and discussion

As the datasets T1 to T10 (could not and) did not all have the same capacity, only simple statistics was possible.

If a learner had fulfilled all tasks, he would have produced just over 40 sentences, about 28 in the PT, of which:

- T1 had 10 sentences
- T2 had 10 sentences
- T3 had 3 sentences
- T4 had 3 sentences
- T5 had 2 sentences
- T6 had 4 sentences

T7 to T10 were open sets, but most students produced up to 3 sentences each.

Upon advice, up to three sentences from each student in each data set were considered. Every sentence in T2 to T6 and T8 and T10 was scored according to whether the perfect tense was used (=one point) or not (=no points), and whether it was used correctly (one point) or not (no point), disregarding minor errors such as obvious misspellings.

Note that with the very inconsistent attendance pattern, all datasets and all totals were different from each other not only in terms of total number of sentences but also in terms of who wrote them. Therefore, we can only consider results of a whole class, and average them.

The points gained in the test were as in table 1.

**Table 1. Averaged scores per dataset**

Prs. dataset	1						7	9
average	1.72						2	1.72
Prf. dataset	2	3	4	5	6	8		10
average		1.93	1.51	1.76	1.93	1.88	1.83	1.92

Prs=present tense

Prt=perfect tense

Upper row: Dataset nr.

Lower row: Respective average points (T=2)

Without over-interpretation and despite an obvious lack of “scientificness”, we can still see that the students did use the perfect tense, even when not solicited by the test or the teacher, as in the oral examination. At least for this class,

we can say that learning of the perfect tense had taken place (at least until the oral and following written examination). Thus, the language processing hierarchy was refuted, again for this class only. Also, the two hypotheses were proven in that learning had actually taken place. In the tests, no materials were allowed and the students' productions were truly original.

If such learning could be proven on a wider scale, this would have important consequences: If the PT i.e. “the first systematic use of the structure” (Nielsen 1995) can be learned in this way, this would mean that even in a fairly restricted learning environment, a number of steps can be “jumped” and content which is to be taught considerably later can be taught earlier than in the usual “order”.

### Conclusion and tasks for future research

Our interpretation considered only a small part of the data obtained. For example, a relationship may hold between the duration of use after instruction and the correctness of forms. Since all datasets are fully coded for a host of other criteria such as PPP form etc., the interested reader is invited to contact the author at <reinelt@iec.ehime-u.ac.jp> and attempt to find more relationships.

The datasets in this study were generated under “normal” teaching conditions with all their hardly controllable external influences. But since the results have been somewhat surprising, this may warrant a sheltered project where “cleaner”, more “scientifically sound” results can be obtained.

The present study was performed for PT in German only. This “pre-teaching” may also be wishful for other parts of

German, too, e.g. the very frequent “*es gibt*”-phrase. Also, other languages may have phrases or constructions whose pre-teaching maybe wishful, such “*il y a*” in French and the adjective conversion in Chinese (“*Ta shuohanyu shuo de hen hao* > *Ta hanyu shuo de hen hao*”) etc.

There are also important theoretical ramifications. We would have to find out whether this possibility of “pre-teaching” is a phenomenon of all language teaching, and would thus require a revision of language acquisition theories. Or it may be a characteristic of multiple foreign language acquisition, becoming easier with more foreign languages learned. All these tasks have to be left for future research.

**Rudolf Reinelt** has been teaching all aspects of German on all levels at Ehime University and various other institutions in and around Matsuyama, Japan, since 1981. In the 1990s, he was asked to start the Other Language Educators (OLE) Special Interest Group and has been its coordinator since then. In the early 2000s, he did comparative studies on early phases of French, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog and German as 2FLs. Besides language teaching, he has published papers on various languages and sociolinguistics, syllabus development, intercultural communication, and the development of writing. He recently co-edited (with Petra Balmus and Guido Oebel) a book on "challenges and opportunities: crisis management in German as a foreign language", published by iudicium in Munich. He can be reached at Integrated Education Center, Ehime University, Bunkyo-cho 3, 790-8577 Matsuyama, 089-927-9359 (T/F), Email: <reinelt@iec.ehime-u.ac.jp>.

## References

- Aufderstrasse, H. & Bock, H. & Gerdes, M. & Mueller, J. & Mueller, H. (1997). *Themen neu*. Lehrwerk fuer Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Muenchen: Max Hueber.
- Boeckmann, K.B., & Slivensky, S. & Roesler, A. (eds.) (2000). *An japanischen Hochschulen lehren* (Teaching at Japanese universities). Zur Vermittlung von Sprache und Kultur der deutschsprachigen Laender. Muenchen: Iudicium.
- Course Syllabus German 4 AP. (n.d.). [Online] Available: <[http://www.mckinneyisd.net/Campuses/school\\_websites/mhs/Syllabus/APGerman4.pdf+APGerman4&hl=ja](http://www.mckinneyisd.net/Campuses/school_websites/mhs/Syllabus/APGerman4.pdf+APGerman4&hl=ja)>.
- Frau Jorys Webseite fuer Deutsch. (n.d.). [Online] Available: <<http://bangor.k12.pa.us/cgi-bin/classpage.asp?pageID=330121013259>>.
- German 1 Semester 1 (n.d.). [Online] Available: <[http://www.power-glide.com/powerglideschool/educators/images/GR\\_ACTFL\\_Standards.pdf](http://www.power-glide.com/powerglideschool/educators/images/GR_ACTFL_Standards.pdf)>.
- German 1 Semester 1 (n.d.). [Online] Available: <[http://www.power-glide.com/powerglideschool/educators/images/GR\\_ACTFL\\_Standards.pdf](http://www.power-glide.com/powerglideschool/educators/images/GR_ACTFL_Standards.pdf)>.
- Griesshaber, W. (2004). *Erwerb und Vermittlung des Deutschen als Zweitsprache*; Sprachenzentrum der Westfaelischen Wilhelms- Universitaet Muenster. [Online] Available: <<http://spzwww.uni-muenster.de/%7Egriessha/pub/tdaz-eri.pdf>>.
- Holzer-Terada S. (2003). *Der Erwerb der deutschen Verbflexion durch japanische Lerner* (The acquisition of German verb inflexion by Japanese learners). Graz: Studienverlag.
- Ichikawa A. & Hildebrandt H. & Carol F. (2001). *Guten Tag! Berlin!*. Lektion 9, 39-43. Tokyo: Ikubundo.
- Kasuga M. (2006). *Tor! Tor! Tor!*. Lektion 10, 69-74. Tokyo: Ikubundo.
- Maeda R. & Takagi Y. ( 2006). *Deutsch mit aktuellen Themen*. Lektion 8, 34-37. Tokyo: Ikubundo.
- Nielsen H. L. (1995). *Acquisition Order in Arabic as a Foreign Language - a Cognitive Approach* The third Nordic conference on Middle Eastern Studies: Ethnic encounter and culture change Joensuu, Finland, 19-22 June 1995. [Online] Available: <<http://www.hf.uib.no/smi/paj/nielsen.html>>.
- Nitta, H. & Graeb-Koenneker, S. (2001). *Zwischen zwei Welten*. Lektion 12, 56-60. Tokyo: Ikubundo.
- Pienemann, M. (1998). *Language Processing and Second Language Development*. Processibility Theory. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Reinelt, R. & Balmus, P. & Oebel, G (2005). *Einleitung* (Introduction). In: Balmus, P. & Oebel, G. & Reinelt, R (eds.) *Herausforderung und Chance*. Krisenmanagement im DaF in Japan. (Challenge and Opportunity: Crisis management in German as FL in Japan ). Munich: iudicium.
- Reinelt, R. (2000). *Muendliche Pruefungen im Unterricht DaF in Japan* (Oral tests in German as 2FL in Japan). *Der Deutschunterricht in Japan* (日本独文学会ドイツ語教育部会会報) Der Japanische Deutschlehrerverband 118-123.
- Slivensky, S. (1996): *Regionale Lehrwerkforschung in Japan*. Muenchen: iudicium