



World Scientific News

An International Scientific Journal

WSN 125 (2019) 139-158

EISSN 2392-2192

Teaching lingua franca English – teaching the impossible?

Krzysztof Polok^a and Elwira Lewandowska^b

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Bielsko-Biala,
2 Willowa Str., 43-300 Bielsko-Biala, Poland

^{a,b}E-mail address: sworntran@interia.pl , lewandowskaelwira1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper discusses the use of English as a *lingua franca* (ELF), in pedagogical activities in the language class. On the basis of the didactic approach called CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) it was pointed out that the treatment of learning a foreign language as a *lingua franca* rather than as a foreign language *sensu stricto* may be an effective aid for a student (and often a teacher) in their collaborative efforts leading to effective L2 learning.

Keywords: *lingua franca*, foreign language, autonomous learners, teaching LFE

1. INTRODUCTION

We all have to agree on the fact that English mastered the world (Crystal, 2002). Efficient communication in this language seems to be an indispensable element allowing for effective functioning in the modern world. Latin and French are languages known as *lingua franca* in the past. Currently, this function is fulfilled by the English language used during international communication in situations where none of the participants knows the mother tongue of the other interlocutor, while each of them is able to use English for communication purposes. In any of such cases, English remains a substitute language for each of these people. The choice of language, which is to act as a relay of information at the international level, usually has its

legitimacy in a socio-cultural situation; more important, however, are the political factors that are behind the global promotion of language (Richards et al., 1985). According to Phillipson (1992), the most important reasons for the current dominance of English can be seen both in the imperialist imperatives of Great Britain in the colonial period, and, later, in the US politics after the Second World War, which resulted in the sudden development of globalization currents. Currently, the position of English is also strengthened by many other factors. English has become the language of science, economics, media and politics. What's more, it is also the dominant language in the virtual world, constituting the basis of communication on the most important social platforms, such as: Wikipedia, Facebook, or Twitter (Graddol, 2000). All these factors, regardless of which of them we consider to be dominant, have realistically influenced (and continue to influence) that English is considered to be an international language, i.e. a lingua franca (hereinafter: ELF).

For the vast majority of people in the world, effective communication requires learning English. In most cases, the average (non-native) user will communicate with another, non-native user using a different set of communication features from those that appear in the situation of communication with the native user. Therefore, the definition of ELF refers to communication situations when people involved in the exchange of information use English of their choice, because their native languages differ (Seidlhofer, 2011, p. 7).

The definition proposed by Seidlhofer (2011) was often the reason for the criticism of the ELF concept. This criticism, despite the fact that the definition itself does not exclude the fact that lingua franca users may also be native speakers of the language, constituting - due to their number - a minority compared to non-native users, led to a change in defining the phenomenon itself. Currently, it is assumed that ELF refers to communication between users whose native languages differ, and communication itself takes place in the international context and context (Mortensen, 2013). In turn, assuming that such communication takes place mainly between non-native English speakers, the standards imposed by native users will not necessarily facilitate this type of communication. In this situation, the question often posed by the researchers seems to be legitimate (e.g., Rajagopalan, 2004; Seidlhofer, 2011), what type of English language should be the norm in international communication, and what language should be taught at school to facilitate users communicate in English. The choice of a specific etymology of language will shape both the general level and the way of producing any of the appearing messages; it is here that - when assessing their quality - one ought to take into account the level of English language knowledge demonstrated by both the sender and the recipient of the message. Therefore, the main assumption of this article is an attempt to answer the question which - in the context of language education of the 21st century - seems particularly justified, namely: Is it appropriate to teach English as a lingua franca in a classroom?

The article will therefore constitute a theoretical attempt to find an answer to this question, along with potential guidelines that could justify and facilitate the decision to use ELF.

2. TEACHING ENGLISH TO (POLISH) STUDENTS

Learning a modern foreign language at a Polish school starts already in kindergarten¹ and lasts continuously for eleven (in the case of industry schools), twelve (in the case of general

¹ Regulation of the Minister of National Education of February 14, 2017 on the core curriculum of pre-school education and the core curriculum of general education for primary school, including moderately or severely

schools), or thirteen (in the case of technical schools) years². In the vast majority of European countries, English is the most-taught foreign language in primary and secondary schools (EURYDICE, 2017), with a second foreign language introduced at the level of older primary school classes. The number of hours spent on learning a language depends on the level of education. In Poland, following the framework of integrated teaching, any teacher who also has the right to teach a foreign language, can devote any amount of time to teaching it anytime during the course. When a language lesson is taught by another teacher, the regulations specify the minimum number of hours that must be spent on learning a first (I) modern foreign language (i.e., 180 hours in three years). In grades 4-8, the regulations provide for a total of 450 hours for learning a modern foreign language I, and for a high school 360 hours. In total, 990 hours of English language learning at school should allow students to achieve B1+/B2 levels by CEFR³ and passing the matriculation examination. However, according to the Cambridge English Language Assessment, such number of hours should be enough to achieve the C1/C2 level. Regardless of the attempts to estimate the levels of language proficiency that should be achieved by students after working the appropriate number of hours, the fact remains that Polish students fall out poorly when compared to their peers as regards their key language competences in the modern world. In the years 2011-2014, the English Language Efficiency Survey in the primary school (ELES) was held, aimed at bringing the English language learning situation closer to the implementation of the 2008 core curriculum in primary schools for foreign languages. As part of the study, 5,572 students in grade 3 (after the first cycle of education) and then in class 6 (after the second educational cycle) checked their skills in listening, reading comprehension, repeating short sentences, and writing a paragraph (this task was expected to be completed by students in class 6 only). Although the study was multidimensional, for the purpose of the article, only the results concerning linguistic skills of the students and the results of the description of school reality in which the competences studied were shaped will be quoted (Table 1).

Table 1. The data based upon the IBE Report of 2015⁴ (own elaboration).

Problems concerning students' skills in English	Description of school reality
Problem with the ability to repeat sentences after a teacher (the first cycle of education completed)	Teaching model focused on the teacher;

mentally retarded students, general education for the industry level school, general education for special education aimed at the learners' work preparation and general education for the post-secondary school.

² Regulation of the Minister of National Education of January 30, 2018 regarding the core curriculum of general education for general secondary school, technical secondary school and industry school of second cycle.

³ Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) defines the levels of language proficiency in the area of each of the four skills of language use: speaking, writing, listening and learning. Levels B1/B2 are recognized as intermediate levels, whereas C1/C2 as advanced levels.

⁴ Muszyński, M., Campfield, D., Szpotowicz, M. (2015). *Język angielski w szkole podstawowej – proces i efekty nauczania. Wyniki podłużnego badania efektywności nauczania języka angielskiego (2011–2014)*. [Eng.: English in primary school - the process and learning outcomes. Results of the longitudinal study of the effectiveness of teaching English (2011-2014)]. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Edukacyjnych.

Low competence in the communication skills	A small number of situations conducive to communication in a foreign language;
Satisfactory competence in reading comprehension and listening to short texts	Large participation of the Polish language as part of language classes;
Problems with listening comprehension and reading comprehension of longer texts.	Language classes tend to be monotonous and predictable, based on the implementation of the textbook;
Significant problems (in half of the respondents) with combining information from various sources	A small share of technology and authentic materials in working on the language
	Marginalization of shaping of metacognitive and meta-linguistic skills

According to the authors of the report, the results achieved by students participating in the study are lower than expected. Muszyński, Campfield and Szpotowicz (2015) draw attention to the students' relatively poor competences in understanding more demanding information that appears in both (printed) read and listened form, where the average score of correct answers slightly exceeded 50%. When investigating communication competence after the first cycle of education, the authors point to generally insufficient level of the competencies of the students who had a serious problem with repeating English sentences. At the same time, one of the quite significant observations made by the authors is "(...) *the existence of a fairly large group of students who has reached the maximum or close to the maximum result in the test. The existence of such a group of "leaders" is probably the result of additional classes in English*". (2015, p. 80). The results of the English Language Effectiveness Survey (ELES) find their continuation in a study conducted as part of the Polish segment of the European Survey on Language Competence (ESLC) from 2011, carried out on students from the 3rd grade of lower secondary school.

The results of the ESLC⁵ study show that every third pupil is at A1 level, from the range of 3 measured competences (reading, listening and writing), and every fourth achieved the level of -A1, i.e. s/he did not achieve a result allowing to measure his/her competences. These results place Polish students in the bottom positions in the ranking list of all the 13 European countries participating in the ESLC study. The ESLC study itself did not test speaking competence, but the Speech Skills Study (SSS)⁶ conducted on a group of Polish students included in the main ESLC study showed that:

⁵ European Language Competence Survey ESLC THEMATIC REPORT, National report from 2011 available at: <http://eduentuzjasci.pl/publikacje-ee-lista/165-raport/raport-z-badania/europejskie-badanie-kompetencji-jezykowych-eslc/854-European-competence-study-linguistic-eslc.html> Accessed: January 21st, 2019;

⁶ Speech Skills Study (SSS) was conducted in 2011 as a component of the international measurement of ESLC teenagers' language skills, available at: <http://eduentuzjasci.pl/publikacje-ee-lista/110-badanie/1162-badanie-umienajnosci-mowienia-bum.html>. Accessed January 21st 2019;

- Level -A1 was reached 6% of pupils;
- Level A1 was reached 31% of pupils;
- Level A2 was reached 37% of pupils;
- Level B1 was reached 26% of pupils;
- Level B2 was reached 5% of pupils.

Over 1/3 of students achieved the basic level of their linguistic competences after 8 years of schooling. Such results show that the effectiveness of English language teaching is quite miserable. In the context of these studies, Grzegorz Śpiewak (2015) produced an interesting observation, when he made an attempt to observe the existing correlations between the results of ESCL and SSS, on the one hand, and the results of the junior high school exam from 2014 and 2015, on the other. In his study the graphs showing the normal distribution of results differ from the standard assumed form of the Gaussian curve and show the opposite tendency, namely a large percentage of respondents achieving either poor or very good results, with a statistically lower share of average results. As if producing a commentary to his observations, Śpiewak (2015, p. 117) writes: “(...) *success in learning a foreign language is the observed in those students who, in addition to their mandatory schooling, make use of various foreign trips, language camps, as well as other forms of out-of-school education and appropriate teaching aids financed by parents. This remark is also confirmed by the report from the TNS Polska study from 2015 for the PASE association quoted in the course of the on-going debate, which shows that 23% of children and youth learn a foreign language outside their kindergarten and school. That is, every fifth young Pole has a chance for linguistic success, while the vast majority of students lacking additional support from outside the school system are clearly doomed to failure.*”

The results of the lower secondary school exam in subsequent years, i.e. 2016, 2017 and 2018 did not show any significant changes in the achieved results of their language competence examinations⁷. In 2016, up to 64 % of students reached their basic level and 45% of them the extended level, in 2017 the results were more or less similar (67% of basic level students vs. 49% of extended level students, respectively), and in 2008 - 68% basic level students and 52% extended level students were reported. It easy to observed that these results do not show any significant increase in students' competences as part of their English language skills. In particular, poor results within the extended level of the students who continue their education after their primary school foreign language education appear to be alarming at least. It is also worth noting that the lower secondary school exam tests two receptive competences - listening and reading comprehension, but only one of productive competences - writing. Therefore, the students are not examined in their communicative competence. It is only the matriculation exam, which takes place after at least 12 years of school education, that contains a component of speaking.

The results of the matriculation examination from 2015 after the introduction of changes in the form of the exam⁸ show that the trends that can be observed in the results of the leaving lower secondary school examination are similar to those of the matriculation examination. In 2015, the average result of the mandatory written exam at the basic level of a modern foreign

⁷ Reports with results are available on the CKE website: <https://cke.gov.pl/egzamin-gimnazjalny/wyniki/> Accessed January 21st 2019)

⁸ Regulation of the Minister of National Education of 27 August 2012 on the core curriculum of pre-school education and general education in particular types of schools

language, was for English 77%, in 2016 - 71%, in 2017 – also 71% and in 2018 - 78%. Although the results seem to be satisfactory, it is worth noting that the form of the exam itself does not effectively test knowledge and each of the four skills, but rather the ability to write tests⁹. On the other hand, the oral exam does not measure significant communication competences that are useful in the era of globalization. Only one of the tasks checks the ability to take a participant's dialogue with the examiners, the subsequent ones being of a clearly reproductive nature. Passing the matriculation examination does not have to be recognized as equal to having high communication skills.

Results of the Eurobarometer Survey "Europeans and their languages" conducted in 2012 show that only 18.26% of Poles recognize that they speak English. In the 15-34 age group, 31.88% of polled people demonstrate their English competencies. The respective results for the remaining groups are: the group 35-54 - 15.38%, and the 55+ group – only 5.66%. Generally, the survey shows that 1 in 5 Poles speak English. The most interesting data result from the study of the 15-34 age group, that is the one covered by compulsory language education, where less than 1 in 3 respondents demonstrated their knowledge of English. While having a glance at a rather cursory analysis of the results of the reports of ELES, ESLC, SSS, as well as the results of junior high school and high school exams, it is worth posing a question about the effectiveness of English language teaching by the Polish school. From the EURYDICE (2017) study quoted earlier in this paper, Polish students begin to learn English early, but this has no direct impact on their language competence. It follows that the Polish school is still struggling with problems in the implementation of such changes that would be effective in providing students with adequate facilities needed for their linguistic development. This paper aims to present a thesis that effective foreign language education should grow out of the analysis of the current socio-cultural situation of both school and (partly) out-of-school environment. So what language should we learn?

3. LEARNING ENGLISH – BUT WHICH ONE?

Undoubtedly, the quality issues of both the production and the reception of messages depend on the methods of obtaining such messages by each of the interaction participants, both in the earlier period (e.g. school time) and later (e.g. independent work on the language used in interaction processes). The process of learning English, understood here as a process of independent formation of personal inter-language (hereinafter IL - interlanguage) by each participant of the communication contact, means recognizing inherent ways of non-linguistic reality descriptions by each non-native English speaker, then adjusting the recognized possibilities of such a description to their currently possible ways of interpreting the perceived reality. Therefore, as Selinker (1972) notes, as well as a number of other researchers (e.g. Corder, 1981, Bialystok and Hakuta, 1994, Lambert, 1981/2006), such a language will contain many expressions and descriptions, often poorly suited to one's actual descriptive possibilities of the language used by them. It will include not only the terms that the user has learned when studying English, but also those he knew by first shaping in his own way and, subsequently, adjusting them to the description of reality used by his native language. This combination of

⁹ Cf. Jacek Członkowski on the results of the final exams:
http://warszawa.wyborcza.pl/warszawa/1,34862,18285984,Zdanie_matury_z_angielskiego_nie_oznacza_znajomosci.html Accessed January 21st 2019;

two different ways of describing reality within the linguistic awareness of the user of a non-native language will result in the appearance of a whole range of seemingly correct ways of interpretation of the said reality when using the individually stored potential of a relatively weaker language. Such a possibility occurs due to two different structural ways of describing reality by each language known by users as well as a result of not always correctly developed and internalized lexical and semantic possibilities of the non-native language.

The level of current communication contact in the field of the language (English), as demonstrated by each of its non-native participants, will be assessed not only on the ground of the grammatical correctness, but - above all - of the semantic possibilities available to manage their language. This approach means that paying attention to the grammatical quality of the target language, although important from the point of its general use - which is often the case when learning this language at school - should not be considered the primary form of work of a foreign language teacher while working on the language during a language lesson (see Repka, Šipošova, 2017)¹⁰. When looking on it from the point of view of the production of the message, it is not the grammatical rules that fulfill the most important role during the whole communication process; this role is played by a set of descriptions of the non-linguistic reality, appropriately selected by each of the authors of the produced messages. Didactic functions in this aspect of learning the production of a message depend on the number of interactive units to which the student was admitted. Because, which is generally an open secret, the majority of language lessons focus on exercises that shape the structural correctness of the statements produced, not their semantic validity, the student is usually closed in a vicious circle of communication priorities that clearly promote various forms of structural correctness. Another important fact emerging on this occasion is that the negative perception of the idea of teaching LFE is an attempt to implement those elements of international communication that are dominant and which distinguish English as a lingua franca from its native variations (mainly British and American).

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA (LFE)

One of the most important elements of the LFE is its unpredictable variability resulting from the potential influence of sociolinguistic factors of the first (i.e., native) language on the second one (see Maley, 2009, p. 191). In the case of LFE, this element is even more important, because the cultural elements of native languages are treated in communication not so much as a source of potential problems, but rather as a form of communication enrichment. As a result, the goal of communication in an international environment (i.e., using LFE), which should be achieving proficiency at the near-native level, is not an end in itself (Seidlhofer, 2001). Such an educational stance remains in contradiction with the idea of teaching English as a foreign language, the final goal of which is to achieve proficiency similar to native. In the case of teaching English as a foreign language, the elements that differ from each other in the native language and the taught language become a problem; as such, they may constitute a communication barrier between a non-native and native English user. In the case, however,

¹⁰ Both authors draw attention to the fact that, although the basis of the classroom activity should continue to remain interactive and - as a result - general communication learning, however, every language teacher must remember about the language resources with which both forms of language learning are implemented, that is - possibly parallel - learning pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar and discourse.

when the main axis of communication in English has become communication between non-native users, what each student has to face in the context of learning English as a foreign language will not only become possible differences within two languages (L1 and L2); in the context of building the foundations of international LFE-based communication, the more important role will be played by both the sociolinguistic influences of the native languages of their users, as well as those that belong to the English language. Therefore, an important element aimed at facilitating communication exchanges between non-native speakers of English in the first phase of the on-going research on the nature of LFE has become the definition of its characteristics, as well as an attempt to characterize LFE as a variation of English.

During the first phase of research on the nature of LFE, an overarching goal became an attempt to codify it; the attention of the researchers was focused on defining the characteristic features of LFE as a language of international communication. It can be concluded that the milestone of this period was the research on the LFE phonetics carried out by Jennifer Jenkins (2000), which resulted in the creation of *Lingua Franca Core (LFC)*, a descriptive list of characteristics in the field of phonetics and phonology emerging and dominant in *lingua franca* communication. Another important element of the first phase of the research was the formation of the two corpora: the *VOICE corpus (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English)* by Barbara Siedlhofer in 2004, and the *ELFA corpus (The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings)* by Anna Mauranen in 2003. The corpus analysis allowed for the specification of LFE features at the grammatical and lexical level. It is worth noting that the Jenkins research on LFC resulted in criticism emerging from various linguists and methodologists of English language teaching (in Poland the most noticeable were the voices raised by Sobkowiak, 2005 and Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2008), who mainly emphasized that the only phonetic model appropriate for use in the teaching processes of a foreign (English) language must remain the native model, because it constitutes a basic language model. Similarly, ongoing research on the attitudes of English speakers themselves towards communication (Soruç, 2015; Jenkins, 2005; Timmis, 2002) indicated their negative attitude to the adaptation of the native model in the context of Jenkins' proposals. The author herself indicated that the negative comments appearing in the context of LFC research are, first of all, a result of prejudices and have no power in research, and, secondly, they are the result of linguistic indoctrination, in which the overriding of native norms is the primary goal. Despite the negative reception of research the presenting a new communication trend, situated away from the native model, a research confirming the existence of a set of features defined by Jenkins in the field of phonetics (Kirkpatrick, 2010; Rajadurai, 2007) was continued; apart from that, Siedlhofer's research at the lexical-grammatical level (Dewey, 2007; Hülmbauer, 2007) also appeared an important element in the discussion on the future of LFE.

Another important element of the research on the nature of LFE were the attempts aimed at defining its pragmatic features. Such attempts to outline possible significant and characteristic features appearing in LFE communication situations constituted a significant change in the direction of the research and initiated the second phase of observation of this form of language use (Jenkins, 2015). The most important research achievements of this stage was the statement that LFE users approach the need for communication in a much more creative way. An example of this type of pragmatic strategy was examined by Pitzl (2005); when analyzing the situation of lack of understanding between interlocutors, he noted that the levels of creativity (as well as the progressing levels of parallel agreement) are shaped on the basis of negotiation of meanings. In other words, the interlocutors approach communication problems

in a creative way and as a result are able to communicate effectively. In addition, Mauranen (2006) stated that the so-called pro-active behaviors are conducive to effective communication. One example is the change of language codes (code switching), which in the context of LFE is treated as completely natural, as well as characteristic in an attempt to ensure the continuity of communication (Klimpfinger, 2007). In 2008, Cogo noticed that the strategies of changing linguistic codes or mixing them, as well as frequently attempted paraphrases or repetitions, are an inseparable feature of lingua franca users' communication. It follows that accommodative strategies among LFE users are an inherent feature of this type of communication, whose overriding goal in this context is to maintain the continuity of communication exchange between interlocutors. The last, but not least, important element of the research in this phase was Böhringer's (2007) analysis of filled pauses and silent pauses, which in the context of ELF constitute an element of the creation of meanings and should not be perceived as interruptions in communication. This stage of the research was to answer the basic question, namely whether it is possible to codify LFE, which will enable its teaching as a separate variant of English.

According to Coleman (2006), one cannot speak about teaching English as a lingua franca before the variation is correctly and accurately described. However, the prevailing belief is that despite attempts to describe LFE aimed at creating a comparative framework for LFE as clearly different from other types of English, one cannot talk about a situation in which such a frame would be close to emergence. Despite the fact that due to the work of many researchers (Seidlhofer, 2004, Breiteneder, 2005, Dewy, 2007) one may indicate some regularities appearing in the communication of LFE users, one can state that the inherent feature of this form of L2 communication that does not allow its standardized description is its continuous variation. LFE continually exceeds possibly standardized native standards, which results from the continuous influence of the language and culture of its native users (L1) on ongoing communication in L2, in a way that is difficult to predict. Therefore, despite the constant attempts of the researchers focused on the search for possible symptoms of repeatability in LFE communication, the second phase of research was based mainly on the analysis of not so much the forms as the processes affecting the diversity of communication in ELF (Jenkins, 2015).

One of the most important discoveries of this phase of research was the change in the attempt to define LFE as a variation of English. Niżegorodcew (2011), in the paper on the role of culture in LFE, argues that it is difficult to objectively determine what the use of language is; in other words, the question arises whether LFE is a separate variant of English, or whether this term refers to a specific function that LFE performs in international communication. The problem of responding to such doubts may be due to the observed difficulties in defining LFE as a language variant, as this term (Hülmbauer et al., 2008) refers to the specificity of the language used by members of a given, well-established community. As for LFE and its fluid nature, this important aspect cannot be met. Therefore, Seidlhofer (2009) proposes an analysis of the LFE phenomenon in the context of Wenger's "communities of practice".

According to Wenger (1998), this community of practice is a community that can be characterized not as a group of people who communicate in an easily defined and limited geographical and social conditions, but rather as a community whose dominant feature is the social involvement of people, that is, their need and willingness to communicate. In the light of the considerations on the nature of LFE, Wenger's "community of practice" seems to be an issue in the context of which the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca should be considered. In this light, according to Seidlhofer, LFE should not be defined as a variation of language, but as an emergent variety. Such differentiation results not only from the nature of the LFE, but also

from the character of the "community of practice", in which the community is not created by a common language variation, but rather the language variation is created by the community. As mentioned by the researcher (Seidlhofer, 2007, pp. 313-315), currently in many communities formed on a global scale, the majority of members do not communicate with the use of their mother tongue but with the type of communication bridge; LFE became an example of such a bridge.

Research on LFE variability has shown that communication in English as a lingua franca among international users around the world depends on the situation and the context. Research into the liquidity of this phenomenon proves that LFE users use in communication a whole range of strategies that aim to maintain communication. These strategies, among which entail, among others, the aforementioned numerous repetitions, mixing language codes, using accommodative processes, creativity in the choice of media, and many other, as well as the characteristics of both language forms and structures among which one can mention, for example, the lack of articles, often incorrect application of prepositions (attempt of their regularization); forgetting about verb inflection; regularization of the plural of nouns; the tendency to create progressive forms that become superior to infinite forms, and, last but not least, the abandonment of metaphorical language in favor of literality seem to be the most important elements characterizing LFE and playing an important role in the pedagogical context. Bearing in mind these dominant features of LFE with respect to the native norms, the question of the position of LFE in the pedagogical paradigm should be asked here.

5. LEARNING ENGLISH AS A WAY OF IDENTIFYING THE USERS WITH THEIR CULTURAL BASES

As noted by J. West-Burnham (2004), until the end of the twentieth century, the methods that promoted teaching L2 were mostly the ones, which largely approximated the educational preferences of the organizer of such courses. Such an approach often meant clear dominance of these methods of L2 education, which either were in fashion when the course organizer (or any of its contractors) completed their language education, or which were advocated as useful by the course-book authors (or publishers). These types of activities rarely included the student's personal preferences. Since the student's personal expectations were of little significance, it was the language teacher who mostly decided what, how, and when a given topic should be implemented. In this way, the decision on the final level of language proficiency of the language learners still remained in the hands of the teacher and should later be referred to as regards the reception, construction, or transmission of any of probable L2-based messages the course learners could get in touch with.

So if, for example, a specific language teacher decided that it were language releasing rules that were more important for the student, and not his/her general communication production capabilities, the effect of this type of decision could be - as one might suppose - the student's belief that what s/he ought to focus upon first of all is full internalization of grammar rules. Naturally, such a decision prevents him from participating independently in the communication process, which, in turn, means no decision regarding the semantic correctness required by external linguistic rules in relation to English. In other words, it would be easier to decide not to participate in a possible discourse (due mainly to his/her strong face-saving desire), rather than to participate in it. Even if the learner remains aware of the fact that such a

disconnection from on-coming course tasks/activities will not turn beneficial to his/her linguistic growth, s/he often prefers not to get involved in them, because his/her anxiety as to the correct forms of message production outweighs his/her belief in their possible successful realization.

The issues of participation (or lack of it) in taking part in a communication contact with the use of the second language mean the possibility of transferring information (or its lack) in the language chosen for this type of communication. Such a decision means using only these internalized L2 rules that define semantic and structural regulations for communication purposes of various types, which have been recognized as structurally correct by the discourse participants. It should also be remembered (as recalled, among others, by Fiedler, 2011), that such a decision means not only the use of grammatical (syntactic) rules, but also all other rules directly related to the production of a message (including, for example, a series of rules communication on the issue of spontaneous level and direct identification of the L2 user with the baseline level L1)¹¹. It should be noted that this version of the hypotheses developed by Hüllen (1992) or McKay (2015) definitely loses clarity and becomes only a topic for discussion¹². The question arises as to how each of the L2 participants, creating their personal (changeable) IL level, is able to consciously use (i.e. internalize) the contact with L2 enabled for them, in the purposes of identifying them with this language. In other words, there is an important question regarding the mutual level of the too-obvious - as it seems - establishing the mutual proportions between LFE and FLE.

If, despite the fact that a certain part of the more-conscious L2 teachers will not be able to reconcile with this type of situation internally, the following assumptions, commonly observed during the L2 study, are taken:

- L2 is mostly based on the linguistic description principles the students are familiar with that they know when using L1, while it is the learners themselves who - when participating in the process of L2 learning – are responsible for successive identification and projection of the said principles;
- the issues concerning the forms and ways of L2 education are based mainly on the teacher's decisions (which directly result from his/her individually formed philosophy of L2 teaching);
- in a large number of situations, L2 students should remain passive (i.e. a non-autonomous) ones, who complacently agree with their teacher's decisions, blindly believing that this form of educational behavior would help them become fluent users of the language learnt by them;

¹¹ Activities of this type mean, for example, the use of various forms of language prefabricates that must be reconstructed, and thus independently entered into the L2 area as information identifying the L2 user as a participant in the communication process running under L1 (see .Fiedler, 2011).

¹² W. Hüllen (1992) assumes the existence of substantial differences between the language of communication (*Kommunikationsprache*) and the language of identification (*Identifikationsprache*). According to this concept, the language used for communication purposes contains language forms used mainly for reference purposes, by definition devoid of native cultural stimuli, which are then replaced by cultural stimuli that actually exist in the culture of its current non-native users. The language used for identifying purposes can therefore only be attributed to its native users. Such a language will also contain a full palette of all the cultural shades on the basis of which it was created. (See Ch. Meierkord, *Lingua Franca communication in multiethnic contexts*. In: *Handbook of Intercultural Communication* (edited by H. Kotthoff and K. Spencer-Oatey. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1992 -218).

- in most situations, the educational activity of the students who participate in a foreign language course should be based mainly on reproductive activity;
- due to the high possibility of the prevalence of appearance of language errors, the students should focus on the correct reproductive completion of the exercises in the textbook, which end goal should be to bring them to the correct use of specific syntactic structures;
- learning L2 should - in the vast majority - be based on the observation, analysis and reproduction of the presented L2 rules for the purposes of the learners' ability to identify with the L2 native users.

It is difficult to talk about any teacher's (and, above all, student's) efforts related to learning a second language for genuine communication purposes. On the contrary, it can be said with a large degree of truth that this type of learning that forces a student to admit that knowledge of language mainly consists of intensive reproduction activities within the area used for communication purposes language, will not lead them to a situation in which they could grasp the essence of L2 functioning.

Such a conscious way of treating language is clearly suggested by Knapp (1992), when he describes the results of his experiment¹³. The language should be recognized by its users primarily on the usable level, not on the identifying one, mainly due to the undeniable fact that the main goal of the vast majority of language course participants is learning to interact within the foreign language they learn, and only a small number of participants assume future personal identification with its native users.

Obviously, basing on the results of the mentioned Knapp experiment, but also on many correct observations offered by S. Fielder (2011), the questions raised in this case relate to the limit of communication capabilities of each non-native L2 user, and the mutual influence of both forms of the target language use. If, in accordance with the above-mentioned proposal of W. Hüllen (1992), a fairly strict boundary based on active acceptance of L2 cultural patterns for their immediate use by the second language speakers is to be determined, it will be possible to talk about the increasing stratification of goals and methods of L2 education. It can also be said that this L2 learning system, which is often proposed to many participants of compulsory language classes in schools, does not exactly follow the forms of subsequent use of linguistic knowledge suggested by Hüllen.

What's more, it can be even tempting to identify the existing and increasingly persistent misunderstanding about the final objectives of learning the target language: while the current L2 educational situation with regards to the expectations of almost all participants of language courses requires the organization of L2 education that should meet the educational assumptions offered by LFE activities (which, among others, approximate the language use proposals given by Hüllen), so much of these forms (of school, mainly) language learning, in which the pupils activity has been defined as compulsory, treat L2 as a foreign language (FLE).

¹³ Conducted in 1992, and a few years later, among the participants of the international conference (young people under 16-17), the research experiment was aimed at confirming the role that can be played by the level of L2 knowledge. The research results suggest, among others, a clear dominance of language communication forms and not explicitly identifiable expressions when using English (L2) to convince other conference participants to the results of a number of economic goals and proposals presented during the conference (See: K. Knapp, Ch. Meierkord (eds.) *Lingua Franca Communication*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 217 – 244);

There is a fairly significant difference between the two approaches to language learning: in addition to not very true assumptions that participants of such language classes will in the future visit mainly places directly related to the culture of a foreign language and based on - endolinguistic above all - description of non-linguistic reality, under these conditions, it is difficult to believe that the participants of the language courses, organized in the way presented in the ball-point section above, will be able to rise independently to the level of autonomous participation in classes. Such a level requires that each user voluntarily see (and wish to obtain) a specific end goal of his or her action, which is quite difficult when learning a language that assumes his/her knowledge as a foreign language. If this situation is added to a change, recognized by J. West-Burnham (2004) as significant from the pupil's point of view, that is, a producer-led approach to a user-led one, it is clearly visible that only learning LFE has a good chance of success here. Only then can one expect that the learners will notice the end-goal of their linguistic engagement, and therefore that they will not only be motivated to work on the language, but also that in a much easier way they will be able to reach the level of clearly autonomous involvement in these forms of language work. An additional incentive will be an easier access to various forms of internal motivation, which usually means the emergence of two educationally important issues. The first of them will definitely herald a much greater possibility of the final success of work on the goals set by the students (see M. Maehr and H. Meyer, 1997); the second one will inform about the appearance of a faster and more explicit establishment of boundary conditions for the personalization of knowledge. As pointed out by the whole series of researchers dealing with the impact of personalized knowledge on the final state of the student's knowledge store (see, among others, West-Burnham, 2004; Atherton, 2004; Beetham, 2005; Moss, 2005; Montchienvichienchai, 2005), this way of organizing work makes the students not only increase their interest in the subject matter of the course, but also gather the necessary knowledge/skill in a faster and much more systematic way.

Certainly, personalizing the entire course of language learning is not a simple activity. Not only does it require (mainly from the teacher) a significant level of personal involvement in the development of a syllabus that may be recognized as attractive by the students, but also a highly creative setting of language classes to participate in that would allow the students to notice the personal purpose within the activities proposed by the teacher. As it seems it is such a creative approach to proposed language activities that should mean a *sine qua non* condition for the entire process of personalized language learning activities. Without the existence of a well-defined creative syllabus, carried out during the whole glottodidactic proceedings, one cannot realistically assume that the students will take joint responsibility for the entire language education process. Such a suggestion should be based mainly on one fundamental premise, which was mentioned in the previous part of the article - in order for a pupil to act autonomously, s/he must see the goal in the action in which s/he has been invited to participate. If then the purpose to get involved in such organized language classes has not been noticed by the learners, they also have not noticed the reasons for which they are to engage in the tasks proposed to them. After all, this is a basic condition of every form of motivation, regardless of the caliber, or the quality of the problem.

The issues of determining the goals of glotto-didactic activity during the classroom work form an important educational context, both from the point of view of the teacher creating the language lesson and the one determining active participation of the student in such classes. The explanatory validity of this claim can be found during a cursory observation of the student's functioning during the lesson. C. Dweck (2003, p. 118), when asking a question about internal

sources of student motivation during classes, states that one of the most important forms of motivation of the student's activity is the teacher's attitude to the activities planned and carried out by him/her. Basing on the assumption that the student's general personal intelligence actually increases with the level of knowledge they have internalized, Dweck indicates that the individual internal level of material intermediation by the student depends directly on the teacher's attitude towards the internalization of this material by the student. As the whole process of shaping the ways of knowledge acquisition by a student always finds its point of departure during the student's participation in classes, what seems to matter in such situations is the so-called "wise requirement syndrome", that is, the creation of a science pattern, during which the teacher is not satisfied with just any achievements of the student, but expects them to work according to their internal capabilities. It seems understandable that this procedure cannot be implemented without actions, during which the actual personalization of the student's entire learning will play a fundamental issue. The most important contribution to this type of activity must be searched for in the method of creative organization of lessons by the teacher¹⁴.

6. CREATIVE ORGANIZATION OF LANGUAGE ACTIVITIES IN THE SYSTEM OF LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE AS A LINGUA FRANCA

Based on the assumptions of the theory of mediation (see Feuerstein, 1980), as well as many other scientific proposals mentioned in this article, it should be assumed that the essence of working on a foreign language is the functioning of a language teacher as a person giving students real interaction opportunities which become an inclusive part of the L2 learning processes. To this end, it would be necessary to introduce the principles of foreign language learning based on a creative and personalized lesson structure, which assume not only the students' unintentional involvement in the language activity proposed to them, but which also clearly define the purpose of such an activity (that is, to learn the principles of interaction, essential during their participation in the communication process). Since this goal is L2 real communication, it should be assumed that during their period of L2 education, the students should rather pay attention to the principles of organizing the production and reception of the message content, instead of the correct language forms, consistent with the morpho-grammatical rules in force in a given language.

This assumption means that the goal to which the student will strive is to organize a language based on the students' native language emergent principles of lingua franca, that is incomplete communication, often incorrect, though completely fulfilling the essence and meaning of communication activity *sensu stricto*. This does not mean that during the organization of this type of communication one should give up the activity of grammatical (and also semantic) correctness of the learned language; however, it seems that a stronger emphasis on this type of functioning should be postponed for a later period (without clearly defining when the period like that could happen).

¹⁴ This type of activity was also assumed by T. Rodgers and J. Richards, when they created their theory of method. If, according to their concept, one of the essential parts of the method is *design* (Richards and Rodgers set this element in the middle of a pictorial illustration of the theory of the method), the very fact, resulting from the semantics of the word chosen by them, that they used this term here indicates that the creative activities of a language teacher should be the very basis of each language lesson. See. T. Rodgers, J Richards, (2001), *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* OUP, Oxford, pp. 18-36).

Communication, which is, among others, ensured by D. Hymes (1974), is always context-dependent; because in the course of learning a foreign language, context as such always appears before the knowledge of terms that could be used for its correct description, it would naturally allow students to attempt to describe the situation by means of these individual inter-language potentials, which they currently have, without bitter enough acceptance of their communicational insufficiency and the immediate feeling that they are still not able to produce an correct message. Appearing as a possible consequence of the students' behavior, the acceptance of his/her failure by the teacher, in accordance with the previously presented concept of C. Dweck (2003), will lead the student to a situation where the quality of the presentation will be the priority, not the message content as such. Therefore, this type of conduct will mean for the student a significant determination of the hierarchy of learning goals: the student will position the goal of correctness (belonging to the presentation activities) before the goal of the quality of message content (associated with the activities related to the processes of the production of the message). Because, as one can see, the presentation activities will be regarded by the student as more important than the communication activities as such (in accordance with the hierarchy imposed on them by the teacher), s/he will try to pay more attention to what s/he says than to what he wants to communicate in the message. If, however, s/he comes to the conclusion that the purpose of correctness of the intended message may not be met by them, in the majority of cases s/he will rather give up the production of such a message. In this way, not being able to match the expectations of the teacher in relation to the correctness of communication, the student in many cases will consider their actions in this regard as futile and will give up independent attempts to produce the message.

Obviously, this situation can be avoided when one accepts the fact of learning the language as a lingua franca (and in accordance with Wenger's "community of practice" idea). This method presupposes *a priori* not very full (and often insignificant) knowledge of all the rules of the learned foreign language, with the preference for the very phenomenon of the production of the message itself. It is recognized here that it is not important how a specific message will sound: what is important, instead is its very contextual appearance. The emerging imperfections and shortcomings are something natural, even expected, and the message produced by the student is analyzed and properly corrected by the teacher, who throughout the production of the message gives the student to know that what is important to him/her is the fact of the information production, not whether (and what) errors it contained. When this element of activity is additionally attached to the element of creativity (revealed by both the student and the teacher), the student will have a chance to recognize the principles of real interaction, finding them out as more important than the quality of the produced message.

In this way, not only moments of troublesome (but lesson time precious) silence will have a chance to be avoided during language classes, but above all situations in which the student recognizes that s/he is not yet able to do the task in a way that, in his/her judgment, would satisfy the expectations of the teacher listening to him/her. The forms of improvement and correction of a student's expression depend also on the situational context, appropriately assessed by both participating sides, namely the teacher and the student. If, therefore, the situation of a statement correction is not a situation naturally arising from the context of interaction, but reveals clear features of its quality assessment instead, the student will certainly pay attention to the aspect of quality of performance, because s/he will not be able to provide this quality of performance which - as s/he believes - is required by the teacher, and in the vast majority of cases, will not even try to create a message at all.

The above-mentioned forms of organization of language classes require, of course, appropriate drawing of the situational context of the activities, and thus the ways in which the creative factor in the pupil's linguistic activity should appear¹⁵. In this context, it is necessary to determine not only how to reach the creative potential that the learner possesses, but also the way in which the student could be able to use it. Because, for example, it is known that the potential of self-active student-based actions can be seen in the moments of stronger influence of affective factors (e.g., when a student is offered to participate in verbal games or other forms of behavior based on emotions), in such situations the creative factor should be strongly integrated and the student be offered an independent organization of various types of individual language activities (e.g., different types of activities based on drama requirements). Reproduction of various types of situations with a clearly marked situational context should not only lead to the emergence of the personal involvement in a situation in which the student willfully begins to take part in a task, but even to the emergence of a situation that Csikszentmihalyi (1997) describes as *flow*, or the appearance of an unprecedented charge of emotional experience, "merging into the unity of one's own thoughts, heart, mind and will" (ibid, p. 28). As a result, the activities performed are not only recognized by the participants of such activities as more pleasant and understandable, but also performed more quickly and with clearly greater involvement. As it seems, one does not need to remind that the search for a *flow* situation in any glotto-didactic activity must be based on three important principles, mentioned earlier (and in a completely different situation) by R. Feuerstein: /1/ the student must consider the activity personally interesting; /2/ the task must be recognized by him/her as important for his/her personal intellectual development; and /3/ this task should be qualified by the student as having a clearly defined partial final goal, that does not interfere with the final goal of the activities in which s/he participates (see Williams & Burden, 1997, p. 69). These circumstances, all of which are based on the student's sovereign decisions, should, however, be created as a result of the planned activities of the teacher. Only such a planned and creatively established form of glotto-didactic behavior, when in the interaction contacts, emphasis will be placed on the production of the message, not on its form, can lead to the appearance of the situations that can stimulate the learning of individual forms and ways of communicating by students. In any case, when instead of one's willingness to learn a lingua franca, there will appear forms of action that stimulate the learning of individual "technical" elements of language (grammar, morphology, phonetics, lexis, semantics, syntax, etc.), the student will soon lose sight of the final goal of his/her personal glotto-didactic action i.e., the possibility of independent participation in the communication process regardless of their production capabilities.

7. FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Despite the obvious and rational premises to accept linguistic reality in the context of communication in English as a lingua franca, as well as indisputable benefits in engaging the students to participate in their own educational process, the mere assumption of learning

¹⁵ A. Wright (2016, p. 14) in his article proposes the use of three methodologically significant ways of working with a student in English classes: / 1 / putting students ahead of challenges that they will have to overcome; / 2 / creating an atmosphere inviting them to independently create texts in a foreign language, draw conclusions and share them with other participants of the classes; and / 3 / show students that the content is more important to the teacher than the forms of their production.

English as a lingua franca is treated as an attempt of an attack on the essence of English as a language unquestionably associated with its native users. Strevens (1980) sees the reasons for this state in various –not always fully reasonable - approaches to language education. The academic model, mostly aimed at the stressing correctness of linguistic forms, will be a primary goal for many people in language education, while some others will mainly focus on more practical, and therefore largely purely communicational goals. The academic model will be based on the language used by native speakers, while the practical model will be an amalgamation of forms and structures that appear in the various communication-describing situations and - in this way - provide some forms of information transfer. Because of the totally different approach to the process of language deliverance (and language use), this type of mildly creative approach to language application still remains difficult to be accepted by those who treat English as belonging to the circle of native users, made responsible for setting out the rules that define how to use it.

Therefore, it seems quite obvious that LFE users escape the traditional norms imposed by native speakers of English, as they tend to display a large dose of creativity in their language choices, and tend to use less traditional grammatical and linguistic forms in their statements. These choices, which are worth emphasizing, do not however result from ignorance of correct constructions, and often, as suggested by Cogo and Dewey (2006) testify to the conscious choices made by LFE users and aimed at the transmission of information.

Although such LFE reception in the context of the language choices of their users should be the norm in the world largely dominated by LFE, in the field of language education there is still strong attachment to the traditional understanding of language as the property of its native speakers. The acceptance of such a traditional approach to language requires the selection of the teaching methods and techniques to help reproduce the language implementation processes that largely underline this outdated approach to language learning. Despite the fact that language education should, to a minimum extent, take into account the changes taking place in the world in the context of the evolution of English on the international arena, the currently observed realities seem to deny this assumption. Thus, although in the context of LFE, students should be shown (among other things) that the rules of communication in the modern world - in many situations - elude the norms imposed on them at school, and they themselves - as conscious language users - should show a large dose of creativity and flexibility during many attempts of language communication made by them, such an educational step is - as it seems - a future that has yet to come.

References

- [1] Atherton, G. (2004). *Aimhigher: Widening participation to higher education and personalized learning*. [in:] S. de Freitas & Ch. Yapp. (eds.) *Personalizing Learning in the 21st Century*, Network Educational Press, Stafford.
- [2] Beetham, H. (2005). *Personalization in the Curriculum: A view from learning theory*. In: S. de Freitas & Ch. Yapp. (eds.) *Personalizing Learning in the 21st Century*, Network Educational Press, Stafford.
- [3] Bialystok, E. & K. Hakuta (1994). *In Other Words*, Basic Books, New York.

- [4] Breiteneder, A. (2005). The naturalness of English as a European lingua franca: The case of the 'third persons'. *Vienna English Working Papers* 14.2, 3-26
- [5] Böhringer, H. (2007). The sound of silence: Silent and filled pauses in English as a lingua franca business interaction. Unpublished master dissertation, University of Vienna.
- [6] Cogo, A. (2008). English as a Lingua Franca. Form follows function. *English Today* 95 (3), 58-61
- [7] Cogo, A., Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF communication. From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 5(2)
- [8] Coleman, J. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching* 39: 1-14
- [9] Corder, S. Pit. (1981), *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [10] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). *Finding Flow*, Basic Books, New York.
- [11] Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca: an empirical study of innovation in lexis and grammar. Unpublished PhD dissertation, King's College, London. Retrieved from;
- [12] Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1040-1048. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.10.1040>
- [13] Fiedler, S. (2011). English as a lingua franca – a native-culture-free code? Language of communication vs. language of identification. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, Vol. 5, 3, pp. 79-97
- [14] Graddol, D. (2000). *The Future of English?* London: The British Council.
- [15] Hymes, D., (1974). *Foundations of Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- [16] Hüllen, W. (1992). Identifikationssprache und Kommunikationssprache. Über problem der Mehr-sprachigkeit. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* Vol. 20, 3, pp. 298-317
- [17] Hülmbauer, C. (2007). You moved, aren't?' – The relationship between lexicogrammatical correctness and communicative effectiveness in English as a lingua franca. *Vienna English Working Papers* 16 (2), 3-35
- [18] Hülmbauer, C., Bohringer, H., Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca (ELF): Precursor and partner in intercultural communication. *Synergies Europe* 3, pp. 25-36
- [19] Jenkins, J. (2000). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [20] Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice* 2(3): 49-85
- [21] Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of Teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 535-543

- [22] Klimpfinger, T. (2007). Mind you sometimes you have to mix' – The role of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. *Vienna English Working Paper* S16/2, 36-61
- [23] Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). Researching English as a lingua franca in Asia: The Asian Corpus of English (ACE) project. *Asian Englishes* 31.1, 4-18
- [24] Knapp, K. (2002). The fading of the non-native speaker. Native speaker dominance in lingua franca situations. In: K. Knapp, Ch. Meierkord (eds.) *Lingua Franca Communication*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 217-244
- [25] Lambert, W. E. (1981). Bilingualism and Language Acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 379, 1, pp. 9-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1981.tb41993.x>
- [26] Maehr, M. L., & Meyer, H. A. (1997). Understanding motivation and schooling: Where we've been, where we are, and where we need to go. *Educational Psychology Review*, 9, pp. 371-409
- [27] Mauranen, A. (2006). Signalling and preventing misunderstanding in English as lingua franca communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 177, pp. 123-150
- [28] McKay, L.S. (2014), *Teaching English as an International language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [29] Montchienvichienvchai, R. (2005). Personalized e-Learning in Primary and Secondary Education: The impact of inconsistent definitions and goals. In: S. de Freitas & Ch. Yapp. (eds.) *Personalizing Learning in the 21st Century*, Network Educational Press, Stafford.
- [30] Mortensen, J. (2013). Notes on English used as a lingua franca as an object of study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2(1), pp. 25-46
- [31] Moss, M. (2005). Personalized learning: A failure to collaborate? In: S. de Freitas & Ch. Yapp. (eds.) *Personalizing Learning in the 21st Century*, Network Educational Press, Stafford.
- [32] Niżegorodcew, A. (2011). Understanding culture through a lingua franca. In: *Aspects of culture in second language acquisition and foreign language learning*, J. Arabski and A. Wojtaszek (eds.), 7-20. Katowice: Oficyna Wydawnicza, Poland
- [33] Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [34] Pitzl, M. (2005). Non-understanding in English as a lingua franca: Examples from a business context. *Vienna English Working Papers* 14.2, pp. 50-71
- [35] Ranta, E. (2006). The 'Attractive' Progressive – Why use the -ing Form in English as a Lingua Franca? Special issue: English as a Lingua Franca, *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), pp. 95-116
- [36] Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: A consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *World Englishes* 26.1, pp. 87-98
- [37] Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journals* 58 (2): pp. 111-117

- [38] Richards, J., Platt, J., Platt, H. (1985). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. 2nd Ed. Harlow, Essex, England: Longman.
- [39] Rodgers, T., Richards, J. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, OUP, Oxford; pp. 18-36.
- [40] Seidlhofer, B. (2005). Language variation and change: The case of English as a lingua franca. In: Dziubalska-Kolaczyk, K., Przedlacka, J.. (eds.) English pronunciation models: a changing scene. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 59-75.
- [41] Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2007. English as a lingua franca and communities of practice. In: Volk-Birke, Sabine; Julia Lippert, (eds.). Anglistentag 2006 Halle Proceedings. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, pp. 307-318.
- [42] Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes* 28 (2), pp. 236-245
- [43] Seidlhofer, B. (2011). Understanding English as a lingua franca. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- [44] Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *Product Information International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10, 209-241.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- [45] Sobkowiak, W. (2008). Why Not LFC? In: English Pronunciation Models: A Changing Scene, K. Dziubalska-Kolaczyk i J. Przedlacka (red), pp. 131-149 Bern, Peter Lang.
- [46] Soruc, A. (2015). Non-native Teachers' Attitudes towards English as a Lingua Franca. *H. U. Journal of Education* 30(1): pp. 239-251
- [47] Stevans, P. (1980). Teaching English as an international language. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [48] Szpyra-Kozłowska, J. (2008). Lingua Franca Core, Phonetic Universals and the Polish Context. In: English Pronunciation Models: A Changing Scene, (eds). K. Dziubalska-Kolaczyk i J. Przedlacka, pp. 151-176. Bern, Peter Lang.
- [49] Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: A classroom view. *ELT Journal* 56(3), pp. 240-249
- [50] Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice. Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge University Press.
- [51] West-Burnham, J. (2004), Leadership for personalizing learning In: S. de Freitas & Ch. Yapp. (eds.) Personalizing Learning in the 21st Century, Network Educational Press, Stafford.
- [52] Williams, M. & R.L. Burden, (1997). Psychology for Language Teachers, Cambridge University Press.
- [53] Wright, A. (2016). Medium: companion or slave? In: A. Maley i N. Peachey (eds.), Creativity in the English Language Classroom, The British Council, Bornemouth.